

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS  
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/05/2016 01:47 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Denver School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160003)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	34
<b>Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	10
<b>Quality of the Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	10	7
<b>Quality of the Management Plan &amp; Personnel</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
<b>Quality of Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	10	7
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Supporting High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	0
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. CPP 2	3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>79</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Charter Management Organization - 2: 84.282M

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Denver School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160003)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors--

Reader's Score: 34

#### Sub Question

1.

#### Strengths:

DSST schools has all five of the best ACCESS growth scores in the state for 2014-15.

DSST's first high school (Stapleton) has nine straight years of 100% college acceptance.

The three DSST high schools ranked 1, 2, and 4 in the state on PARCC results. (e21)

According to the most recent evaluation from DPS, all nine DSST schools were ranked "Meets Expectations," and six achieved the higher "Distinguished" rating. (e27)

11.85% of DSST ELLs scored proficient or above on PARCC, compared to 4.81% in DPS and 3.92% for the state.

24% of DSST SpEd students scored proficient or above on PARCC, compared to 7.83% in DPS and 4.73% for the state. (e24)

Taken on the whole, DSST has consistently outperformed the district on all subgroups (black, Latino, FRL, ELL, and SWD) by impressive margins (nearly double in many cases). (e30-1)

#### Weaknesses:

Academic growth based on the TCAP results provided was inconsistent across schools and subgroups. (e641)

Additionally many campuses showed losses from 12-13 to 13-14.

Reader's Score: 15

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111 (b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

A report by the Education Equality index indicates that three DSST campuses are among seven in the city of Denver with essentially no achievement gap. (e28)

DSST FRL students score 21 or above at a higher rate than their non-FRL peers across the city. (e29)

Taken on the whole, DSST has consistently outperformed the district on all subgroups (black, Latino, FRL, ELL, and SWD) by impressive margins (nearly double in many cases). (e30-1)

### Weaknesses:

Academic data indicates that achievement gaps still persist at DSST schools. The losses referenced above were almost uniformly more pronounced for non-white students, and for subgroups as compared to all students. (e641) Additionally, on the whole, DSST graduates its white students at a significantly higher rate than its students of color. (e32-3)

Reader's Score: 7

3. **The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).**

### Strengths:

College enrollment and persistence rates have increased year over year for all students and for almost every subgroup. The gaps between white students and subgroups are minimal. (e643) DSST consistently out-graduates its students across all subgroups when compared to DPS and the state. (e642)

Attendance rates are high overall, and actually in many cases is better for subgroups considered educationally disadvantaged than the overall rates. (e640)

DSST uses a variety of tools to support alumni including a mobile app and web platform aimed at supporting alumni in college and career. (e34)

### Weaknesses:

Four year graduation rates appear to have fallen over the last year for most subgroups at DSST. (e642)

Reader's Score: 12

## Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

1. **The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

**Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and**

**how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.**

**Strengths:**

The application sets specific targets for new student population diversity, including maintaining FRL percentages at the current level and 60% or more minority students at each new campus. DSST's track record of outperforming the district for all subgroups on all academic measures, combined with its specialized programs for students with severe needs classification and ELLs put it in the most favorable position for access to DPS facilities. (e35) Schools will be sited collaboratively with DPS in areas that: increase socio-economic integration, increase access for students who live an area with low performing schools, and provides enrollment preference for FRL students. Additionally, parent demand for DSST campuses has influenced site selection previously.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

**Strengths:**

The logic model demonstrates alignment of the expansion with the CPP to promote diversity by not only adding new school options but also by working collaboratively with DPS to create more equitable access through the uniform enrollment systems. (e37)

The curriculum in place is clearly supporting student achievement well beyond the district as a whole across all types of students.

The objectives are clearly specified, include a variety of measures, and are likely to be attainable based on the current trajectory of the organization.

**Weaknesses:**

The "performance targets" for GPRA 2 and 3 are not provided. (e38)

Some of the individual performance targets appear less than ambitious, for example, 70% teacher retention is a flat expectation over time and doesn't clearly align to creating the type of supportive culture that the narrative described previously. (e39)

Some of the individual measures proposed seem less than ideal. For example, meeting expectations on the DPS financial performance framework is might be too low of a bar in terms of demonstrating financial sustainability.

Many of the performance targets remain static over time rather than increasing, and some of the measures, especially around academics, are vague. For example, "outperforming surrounding DPS Schools." (e40)

There is no ACT target for the college readiness objective. (e41)

Reader's Score: 7

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers-

Reader's Score: 18

#### Sub Question

1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (4 points).

#### Strengths:

The narrative includes a high-level description of the work managed by the CMO staff across a variety of areas, and delineates which school-level staff engages in each area. (e45)

The application also includes a "school design plan" (e645-660) that lays out in detail the process for launching a DSST school including the specific individuals who lead and support various work streams.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

2. The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).

#### Strengths:

DSST has \$19M in cash reserves, with a goal to grow that surplus to \$36M in 2025, which would equate to three months' operating expenses. (e47)

DSST operates entirely in DPS facilities that the district maintains, under separately negotiated FUA's, and pays a per-pupil fee for the facilities it uses. (e47)

The CMO handles a substantial portion of the non-academic work for each school including human capital, accounting and finance, operations, IT, development, and communications. Over the last twelve years, the CMO has instituted asset management protocols and even a proprietary software tool for laptop tracking, to ensure that schools are supported in budget and asset control. (e49)

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 4

3. A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).

**Strengths:**

DSST has \$19M in cash reserves, with a goal to grow that surplus to \$36M in 2025, which would equate to three months' operating expenses. (e47)

DSST has a history of significant fundraising success with large foundations that make repeat gifts, and names a number of donors and corporate partners. (e50) They also host an annual fundraiser, which this year met its goal of raising \$1.3M. The application includes letters of support from funders, families, board members, and elected officials (e112-124).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

4. The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not include a closure plan. The information in this section is a direct copy of the closure clause of the DPS standard contract. The criterion asks for a plan for closing schools, however this only addresses authorizer practice, not how the applicant intends to self-monitor and take corrective action.

Reader's Score: 0

5. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project (6 points).

**Strengths:**

The application identifies high qualified leaders for the first two schools to open under the grant. CMO staff that will support the project include a grants manager who already oversees a \$22M grants portfolio, a development director with a track record of meeting goals for the organization, a data and assessment manager, communications manager, CEO, COO accounting manager, chief of staff, chief of schools, two directors of schools, director of operations, and director of educational technology.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project.

**Strengths:**

DSST has sufficient internal resources to self-evaluate, using the data and assessment and educational technology teams. (e55)

The evaluation plan includes monthly assessment of progress on track, and twice annual staff and student data analysis. DSST plans to evaluate both the quality of its implementation and the outcomes of the schools funded under the grant. (e56)

**Weaknesses:**

Other than the annual contractual performance ranking by DPS, no external evaluation is included.

**Reader's Score:** 7

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students**

1. This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive points for only one of the three parts of Competitive Preference Priority 1, and should specify which part it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one part of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing part (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the part addressed in the application that has the highest maximum potential point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular part of Competitive Preference Priority 1.

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

**(a) Supporting High Need Students. (0 or 5 points).**

Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes, learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

**(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points).**

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more LEAs in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA, and as described in the notice of final requirements for School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

**Note:** Applicants in States that are exercising flexibility under the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2015-16 school year may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility," at [www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility](http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility), and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE's) December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>). Applicants in all States should review OESE's January 28, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transitionsy1617-dcl.pdf>, for information on interventions required in 2016-2017.

**(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point).**

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

**Note:** As a participant in the Administration's Promise Zones Initiative, the Department is cooperating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and nine other Federal agencies to support comprehensive revitalization efforts in 20 high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities across the country. Each application for Replication and Expansion grant funds that is accompanied by a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153), signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by HUD or USDA supporting the application, will meet this priority. To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to [www.hud.gov/promisezones](http://www.hud.gov/promisezones). The certification form is available at [https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD\\_Form\\_50153.pdf](https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf).

**Strengths:**

The priority was not addressed.

**Weaknesses:**

The priority was not addressed.

**Reader's Score:** 0

**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity**

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding (as defined in this notice) under this grant), taking active measures to --

- (a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
- (b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
- (c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

**Note:** An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 2 is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

**Strengths:**

DSST currently promotes student body diversity by focusing recruitment on students "who live in under-served communities, are low income, would be the first generation in their families to go to college, and or are of minority ethnicity." (e22) For the network as a whole, the student body is 53% Hispanic, 19% African American, 18% Caucasian, and 67.7% FRL. It should be noted that the school-level enrollment data is not fully disaggregated, so it is difficult to assess the true diversity of the individual schools within the network. (e25) For example, it would appear that the white students are heavily concentrated in the Byers, Stapleton and Conservatory Green Campuses, which also have lower FRL, ELL, and SPED percentages than the schools with more "racial minority" students. Additionally, it is not possible to understand how the individual school or network populations compare to the DPS or state demographically because comparison information is not provided.

Because DSST is part of the DPS unified enrollment system, they do not have full control over the population of their schools. (e24) However, DSST works with DPS to incorporate weighting factors into the lottery process in order to promote diversity at various campuses.

DSST specifically addresses two areas that the network intends to focus on to continue to break down barriers to access and success, national origin and disability. (e10) Teacher PD trains teachers in cultural competency and developing culturally responsive classrooms and supporting ELL students. DSST has also committed to “providing all parent communications in both English and Spanish, better translations services, and an opportunity for our faculty to learn Spanish.” (e11) They also offer Spanish for native speakers, native language clubs, and have native language advisories. DSST has SpEd centers at two of its middle schools. (e22) Significant PD to support both GenEd and SpEd teachers in meeting the needs of diverse learners is described. (e12) In the coming school year DSST will have four SpEd centers for students with severe needs such as autism, emotional disabilities and intellectual disabilities. By 2019 all existing campuses will have one of these centers, and eventually campuses added under this grant will also have SpEd centers. (e23) Different sites will have different focuses such as PLEX or AN programs. Three DSST schools are part of an explicit partnership with DPS focusing on whole school inclusive practices. 24% of DSST SpEd students scored proficient or above on PARCC, compared to 7.83% in DPS and 4.73% for the state. (e24) All DSST teachers must have or gain after hire an ELL endorsement (e24) as part of a commitment to serving these students well. 11.85% of DSST ELLs scored proficient or above on PARCC, compared to 4.81% in DPS and 3.92% for the state.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/05/2016 01:47 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2016 10:15 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Denver School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160003)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	42
<b>Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	9
<b>Quality of the Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan &amp; Personnel</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	13
<b>Quality of Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Supporting High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	0
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. CPP 2	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>83</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Charter Management Organization - 2: 84.282M

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Denver School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160003)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors--

Reader's Score: 42

#### Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

#### Strengths:

Per the applicant (page e27), all schools within the network were ranked (2013) as meeting expectations by Denver Public Schools with four of them being ranked as distinguished. This ranking system included data from the following performance areas: academic growth, academic proficiency, college & career readiness, improvement in college & career readiness over time, student engagement, enrollment rates, and parent satisfaction.

On page e21, the applicant outlines other performance outcomes that would meet the condition for achievement: Showing that 100% of its students (at Stapleton High School) has been accepted into a four-year college for nine straight years; showing that 78% of the network's students accepted into a college program are first generational; and showing that the network possessed the top five English language learner scores across the state adequately shows the network's commitment to achievement.

Finally, on pages e30-31, the applicant shows the network outperforming the district and state (2013-2015) in serving students of color, students with disabilities, and students of lower socioeconomic means.

#### Weaknesses:

The criterion for achievement is relegated to demonstrating it over the past three years. The applicant does not provide three years' worth of achievement data for its schools.

Reader's Score: 16

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or  
  
(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111 (b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to

### Sub Question

**which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).**

#### **Strengths:**

Per the applicant, the network operates three out of only seven schools in the city with little or no achievement gap (Stapleton Middle School, Green Valley Ranch Middle School, and Green Valley Ranch High School). This is significant because per the applicant (page e27), Denver is noted as having one of the largest achievement gaps in the country.

In addition, the applicant shows (pages e29-33) how educationally disadvantaged students are out performing their counterparts at the district and state levels: per ACT, TCAP, AND PARCC scores and graduation rates.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant has not made clear if the network has worked to close the achievement gap. To do this, the applicant would need to show how those learners identified as educationally disadvantaged were underperforming in schools they previously attended and then by way of the programming within the network show their performance becoming comparable to learners who have historically performed. Without demonstrating an increase in students' (per this specific classification) performance, it is not clear if the network is closing the gap or simply attracting higher performing students who incidentally represent (racially, socioeconomically, etc.) communities who have historically underperformed.

**Reader's Score: 13**

- 3. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).**

#### **Strengths:**

Per tables provided on pages e29-33, the applicant makes a strong case that the network has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students over the past three years. For example, the graduation rates for Black students in the network (86.2% in 2012/13, 88.89% in 2013/14, and 89.13% in 2014/15) were significantly higher than their counterparts in DPS (64.26% in 2012/13, 62.4% in 2013/14, and 63.98% in 2014/15).

#### **Weaknesses:**

While the applicant demonstrates strong achievement data for educationally disadvantaged students over the past three years, it is still not clear if this data is the result of programming or recruitment. The applicant would make a stronger case if it showed performance data of its learners in previously enrolled schools and then compared data to current performance in the network. Without comparative data, these learners are reduced to the classifications in which they represent and their specific (individual) performance is omitted.

**Reader's Score: 13**

### **Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students**

- 1. The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection**

**criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

**Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has already shown its commitment to serving educationally disadvantaged students as indicated by the performance data outlined on pages e29-33. In regards to continuing on in this vein, the network is working with DPS to identify the best locations for the facilities of its proposed projects. Using a Facility Allocation Policy (attached in Appendix H-Additional Information), the collaboration will seek locations (as noted on page e36) that consists of underserved student populations (low-income students, special needs and English language learners, and other students who are off track). Locations will also be selected based on established gaps in students' performance as well as a high enrollment demand.

On pages e37-38, the applicant shows specific design inputs that allow the program to generally meet the educational needs of educationally disadvantaged learners.

**Weaknesses:**

As already stated, the general nature of these design essentials does not show an understanding /approach to the specific needs of disadvantaged learners. Specifically, the applicant has not outlined the disadvantages beyond the labels in which society has given them. This is not stated to negate the validity of the disadvantage; however, in terms of demonstrating the network's capacity to meet those needs, a nuanced understanding of those needs should be articulated/outlined.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

**Strengths:**

This applicant is not proposing to serve substantially different populations than those currently served by the model. As repeatedly indicated in earlier sections of this application, the applicant already holds an instructional and cultural commitment to serving its current population of diverse learners (as outlined by Table 1 on page e25).

The design for the expansion and replication process (as outlined in Table 13 on pages e37-44) includes inputs: collaborating with critical stakeholders (DPS, parents and community members); proven, researched based curriculum (methods for engaging and assessing students have been adequately outlined on pages e41-44); communication systems between school leaders and home office; and a system to collect data, evaluate performance, and to inform instruction (specifically stated on page e38).

Measurable performance objectives are outlined in Table 14 (pages e38-39) with details to those measurements outlined in Tables 15, 16, 17, and 18 (pages e39-41).

**Weaknesses:**

To strengthen this section, the applicant should have provided a rationale as to why the logic model used in Table 13 was used—specifically outlining why the value of the design essentials (as outlined above in the strengths section) were included.

Also, when discussing the performance measures, it would have helped if the applicant would have distinguished between student performance and organizational/leadership performance. Such a distinction clarifies the actual performance and the relationship this performance has with the project.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers-**

**Reader's Score: 13**

**Sub Question**

- 1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

The existence of a home/central office is critical in managing a network of schools. The applicant outlines core components of its network's central office: strategy, academics, operations, and finance (outlined in Table 19 on pages e45-46). Key personnel responsible for these areas at the local sites have been identified. For example, school directors are responsible for executing the strategy, leadership, and communications for each local site.

**Weaknesses:**

Except for the strategy section, the management plan does not identify the personnel responsible for those components outlined above in the strengths section. This specification strengthens the applicants' readiness for handling complex and often time competing priorities that pertain to operations, academics, etc. Without the specification, it is not clear how the central office will effectively tackle these complex/competing objectives.

**Reader's Score: 3**

- 2. The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal**

**Sub Question**

**funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

On pages e47-50, the applicant outlines key features of its business plan such as financial management, governance, human resources, academic achievement, facilities, and central office necessary for ensuring the quality and performance of the network. For example, the applicant's discussion of the network's financial management activities (operating each year with a surplus, generating a \$19 million cash reserve, and performing budget forecasts and staff projections) shows an awareness for details relevant for successful operations.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not discuss its understanding and commitment to the communities it serves as relating to marketing and engagement (or provide a central mechanism for stakeholders to connect/stay connected). Such understanding will strengthen the plan's capacity for long-term sustainability. Research argues the strengths of schools when they are culturally connected to the communities in which they serve. School networks should also meet this standard.

**Reader's Score: 3**

- 3. A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

While Appendix G-Supplemental Organizational Budgets and Financial Information is missing (as referenced by the applicant on page e50), the applicant describes a multi-year financial model which includes estimates of revenues and expenditures over time based on historical data. The applicant says this model also includes multiple streams of revenue: per pupil revenue and private funding (foundations, corporations, and donors). To strengthen this description, the applicant also provides the additional revenue sources (page e50) embedded within the financial model: Malone Family Foundation, the Gates Family Foundation, the Piton Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Louis Calder Foundation, as well as an annual (11 years) Slice of Pi fundraiser. These additional revenue sources are a plus for the organization as it allows the network to not be financially dependent on per pupil funds from the state.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted in this section of the application.

**Reader's Score: 3**

- 4. The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).**

**Strengths:**

The plan for school closures if the network does not comply with high standards of quality are outlined in the contract. It includes four conditions for closure (page e51) and outlines the division of duties between the authorizer and the network as well as outlines the redistribution of material assets/resources.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted in this section of the application.

**Sub Question**

**Reader's Score: 2**

**5. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project (6 points).**

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates (page e51-55) that some of the project's personnel have the experience to manage the proposed project in its size and scope. The COO has experience in managing the network's finance, information systems, and operations departments. The applicant outlines specific experiences with operational management essential to the project: HR & financial systems, project management development, and strategic planning. In addition this key position, the applicant offers additional positions/personnel that will assist the COO in executing his duties; thereby, strengthening the network's capacity in this area: accounting manager, chief of staff, chief of schools, director of schools, etc.

**Weaknesses:**

While the CEO of the network will serve as the CSP project director, the applicant does not indicate his experience in building a project to scale. In the application section (page e51), the applicant only outlines the CEO educational degrees. This project requires more than an academic understanding in the specific areas mentioned in its business plan (financial management, governance, human resources, facilities, etc.).

In addition, descriptions of the additional positions listed under the COO are needed to better demonstrate how the project will managed. Providing the names of persons fulfilling those positions and their professional background alone does not convey this message.

Although additional points were not deducted, the lack of diversity among key network leadership was troubling? It poorly represents the application's claim to promote diversity. Diversity should not be restricted to learners but should be reflected throughout the organization.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has outlined several ways in which the project will be evaluated: 1) by basing the project off of four specific/measurable objectives (re-outlined on page e56); 2) maintaining existing systems (such as within the central office) already proven to evaluate and protect the integrity of the network's mission (page e56); 3) a tracking system that allows the network to monitor federal funds (page e57); 4) a grading system (minimum of 70%) that ensures competitive graduation rates within the local district (page e59); and 5) a charter contract that mandates a higher level of performance (in exchange for greater autonomy) that monitors the performance of the network.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted in this section of the application.

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive points for only one of the three parts of Competitive Preference Priority 1, and should specify which part it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one part of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing part (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the part addressed in the application that has the highest maximum potential point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular part of Competitive Preference Priority 1.

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

**(a) Supporting High Need Students. (0 or 5 points).**

Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes, learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

**(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points).**

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more LEAs in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA, and as described in the notice of final requirements for School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

**Note:** Applicants in States that are exercising flexibility under the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2015-16 school year may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility," at [www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility](http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility), and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE's) December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>). Applicants in all States should review OESE's January 28, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transitionsy1617-dcl.pdf>, for information on interventions required in 2016-2017.

**(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point).**

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

**Note:** As a participant in the Administration's Promise Zones Initiative, the Department is cooperating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and nine other Federal agencies to support comprehensive revitalization efforts in 20 high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities across the country. Each application for Replication and Expansion grant funds that is accompanied by a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153), signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by HUD or USDA supporting the application, will meet this priority. To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to [www.hud.gov/promisezones](http://www.hud.gov/promisezones). The certification form is available at [https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD\\_Form\\_50153.pdf](https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf).

#### Strengths:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

**Weaknesses:**

This competitive preference was not addressed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity**

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding (as defined in this notice) under this grant), taking active measures to --

- (a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
- (b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
- (c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

**Note:** An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 2 is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

**Strengths:**

No strengths identified in this section.

**Weaknesses:**

While the applicant shows the network's initial effort to address diversity, the applicant does not demonstrate the required notion of "promotion." Specifically in addressing the needs of ethnic minorities, responding to their learning needs requires an understanding of the sociopolitical uniqueness of each group and how this uniqueness influences the process for teaching and learning. Labels such as special needs, English language learners, and ethnic minorities are names we assign to nuanced experiences. Simply housing students that fall within those labels does not necessarily fulfill the premise of "promotion." To truly promote diversity, the applicant should address specific strategies for the nuances associated with each group.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/03/2016 10:15 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/16/2016 12:44 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Denver School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160003)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	30
<b>Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	8
<b>Quality of the Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan &amp; Personnel</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	16
<b>Quality of Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	10	7
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Supporting High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	0
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. CPP 2	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>70</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Charter Management Organization - 2: 84.282M

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Denver School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160003)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors--

Reader's Score: 30

#### Sub Question

1.

#### Strengths:

The applicant does provide portions of 3 year student achievement data for several schools.

#### Weaknesses:

Three year student achievement by school and subgroups is included, but for many of the cell years, no data was included. For many of the groups/subjects and years, there was little or no historical demonstration of increases in student achievement, p. 641.

Reader's Score: 9

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111 (b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides a strong and clear commitment to closing student achievement gaps, p. 28.

**Sub Question**

The Education Equality organization is reported to have concluded that three of the applicant schools have little or no achievement gap, p. 28.

FRL student sub group average ACT scores do not show any significant gaps during 3 years, p. 29. Moreover, the achievement of all of the charter sub groups was already significantly higher than their all district subgroups. Sub criterion ii is met, p. 30+.

**Weaknesses:**

Only two year historical achievement data (math, ELA and reading) is reported for these sub groups: FRL, Blacks, Special Education and Hispanics/ELLs.

No TCAP achievement data is provided for year 3 (2014-15).

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 3. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).**

**Strengths:**

Detailed, three year data is provided about HS graduation rates (Table 11, page 32), college enrollment, college persistence and HS graduation rates, p. 643, Page 31, Narrative, Student academic achievement, Table 11, Graduation Rates, p. 32.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant refers the reader to an Appendix 5, Student Academic Achievement. No such Appendix was listed in Table of Contents nor located.

Page 641 includes three year student achievement by school and subgroups, but for many of the cell years, no data was included.

**Reader's Score: 11**

**Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students**

- 1. The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

**Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant thoroughly discusses the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served, page 34.

Several effective strategies are proposed to assist educationally disadvantaged students such as cultural competency training (p. 10), shared value of equity and eliminating disability barriers (p. 10+).

**Weaknesses:**

The discussion of the specific contributions that will be made in assisting educationally disadvantaged students to meet or exceed State academic content standards is limited and unclear, p. 36+.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

**Strengths:**

Generally, the Logic Model is sound, thorough and complete because it includes detailed and specific activities, outputs, outcomes and impact. Page 37+.

A thorough and comprehensive presentation of four major objectives, performance objectives and performance targets is provided. p. 39+.

Overall, the design is clearly specified, measurable, and attainable.

The design includes a highly rigorous core curriculum. In middle school and continuing through their high school years, students complete seven years of secondary math, eight years of social sciences, seven years of English, six years of science, and three years of Spanish of their liberal arts/ social sciences focused program, p. 59.

**Weaknesses:**

It is confusing how many schools the applicant has and is planning. The Abstract says there are currently 3 schools and they plan to replicate 4 new schools for a total of 7, by the end of the grant period. Table 1 has a list of nine charter schools, but Appendix E, p. 126, has twelve.

Reader's Score: 9

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers-

Reader's Score: 16

#### Sub Question

1.

#### Strengths:

A detailed description of Home Office Functions provides specific job functions, Table 19, p. 45+.

A Timeline for expansion is provided, p. 46.

A Design Plan does include useful, detailed and comprehensive start up action steps and timelines, p. 645+.

#### Weaknesses:

The management plan does not directly describe the various responsibilities and milestones needed in the existing schools.

They refer the reader to an Appendix H, Additional Information, but this was not located because no specific pagination was provided.

The School Design Plan to guide the creation of new schools is lacking because it does not clearly include defined responsibilities and milestones for accomplishing project tasks at existing schools, p. 645.

Reader's Score: 2

2. The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).

#### Strengths:

The business plan provides a thorough and well documented description of each of these areas: facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources, p. 48+.

**Sub Question**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 3. A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a strong list of partners and stakeholders because they include these foundations: Malone, Gates, Piton, Louis Calder (and other local and national foundations) and corporate partners such as CH2M Hill and Zayo that support educational equity, p. 50.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant refers the reader to an Appx. G, Supplemental Organizational Budgets and Financial Information, but such documentation was not located.

**Reader's Score: 2**

- 4. The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).**

**Strengths:**

A plan for closing any of their chartered schools is described, p. 50.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

- 5. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project (6 points).**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides convincing and extensive information about the qualifications or their project leadership and their key personnel. This includes detailed and relevant resumes and narrative descriptions.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 6**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation**

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project.

**Strengths:**

A concise Evaluation Data Collection Plan is presented, p. 56. It includes data overview, data collection, timeline and data analysis, p. 55+.

**Weaknesses:**

Several of the data collection tools are overly ambiguous such as: culture indicators, sustainability, Implementation Quality, and Comparison to Performance Measures and Targets, p. 56, Table 1.

**Reader's Score:** 7

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students**

1. This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive points for only one of the three parts of Competitive Preference Priority 1, and should specify which part it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one part of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing part (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the part addressed in the application that has the highest maximum potential point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular part of Competitive Preference Priority 1.

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

**(a) Supporting High Need Students. (0 or 5 points).**

Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes, learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

**(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points).**

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more LEAs in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA, and as described in the notice of final requirements for School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

**Note:** Applicants in States that are exercising flexibility under the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2015-16 school year may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility," at [www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility](http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility), and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE's) December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>). Applicants in all States should review OESE's January 28, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transitionsy1617-dcl.pdf>, for information on interventions required in 2016-2017.

**(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point).**

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

**Note:** As a participant in the Administration's Promise Zones Initiative, the Department is cooperating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and nine other Federal agencies to support comprehensive revitalization efforts in 20 high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities across the country. Each application for Replication and Expansion grant funds that is accompanied by a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153), signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by HUD or USDA supporting the application, will meet this priority. To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to [www.hud.gov/promisezones](http://www.hud.gov/promisezones). The certification form is available at [https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD\\_Form\\_50153.pdf](https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf).

**Strengths:**

None. Not addressed by applicant.

**Weaknesses:**

Priority not addressed by applicant.

**Reader's Score:** 0

**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity**

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding (as defined in this notice) under this grant), taking active measures to --

- (a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
- (b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
- (c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

**Note:** An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 2 is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant does not provide sufficient information that they will promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, pages 4-7.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/16/2016 12:44 PM