

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/09/2014 12:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Charter for Accelerated Learning dba Tindley Network Schools (U282M140025)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	31
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	6
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	12
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Low Income Demographic		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
School Improvement		
1. CPP 2	4	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

0

Total

121

74

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 84.282m - 3: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Charter for Accelerated Learning dba Tindley Network Schools (U282M140025)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Eligible Applicant

1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant (50 points)

In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 31

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:

The applicant provides data showing that Tindley 8th graders have surpassed the passing percentages for the State and for African American students for the past three years, on the ISTEP+ (page 10). The applicant states on page 14 that 90% of student pass the Algebra end of course assessments in 8th grade, and that passing rates of end of course assessments in English and Biology exceed the state average pass rates by as much as 40%. Three years of high school graduation rates are provided on page 23. These rates show an increasingly higher percentage each year. The chart on page 27 shows increasing performance on the ISTEP+ from 2010 through 2013.

Weaknesses:

Three years of data is provided for 8th grade on page 10, but it is unclear as to what grades and schools the chart on page 27 is referencing. Information was not clearly presented to demonstrate three years of consistently increasing student academic achievement and improvement at each of the schools and grade levels served. For example, no elementary data was provided.

Reader's Score: 13

2. 2.) Either:

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

Sub Question

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 graph on page 27 documents that Tindley students, who are 99% minority, are outperforming the average for African Americans in the state, and state averages as a whole for three continuous years.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not clearly present disaggregated data by subgroup to demonstrate three years of success in closing historic achievement groups (students for disabilities, ELL students, and economically disadvantaged students, for example).

Reader's Score: 8

- 3. 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:

Attendance rates for 2014 and attrition data for 2013 and 2014 are found on page 23. A college enrollment rate of 99% (no year provided) is provided on page 23. Student performance data on page 27 demonstrate three years of consistent results on I-STEP+ scores that are significantly above the average academic results for the state and for African Americans in the state.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide data showing three years of consistent results for attendance (only one year is provided), retention (only two years are provided), and performance on statewide tests for all schools served (the graph on page 27 does not clearly communicate which schools and grade levels are represented). A college persistence rate of 80% is provided on page 23, but it is unclear how this rate was established and for what time period this figure represents. Performance data for the K-5 schools was not provided.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students (10 points)

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 describes the potential locations of the schools to be created in Indianapolis and the grade levels to be served on page 35. The applicant provides the percentages of students in poverty, minority students, and students with disabilities served in five schools currently operating in the network. Tindley has larger percentages than the statewide average for all three categories, and a higher minority percentage than the district. Evidence is provided showing prior success working with minority youth. The applicant describes the plan to provide pre-K instruction for educationally disadvantaged children (page 35-36).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide clear information on the percentage of ELL students served. The applicant does not provide clear, disaggregated information on the prior success working with students with disabilities as a specific subcategory. A thorough description of the populations to be served was not provided, especially for the potential out of state school (the applicant may open a school in Baton Rouge, Memphis or St. Louis, as mentioned in the appendix and within the Abstract). The applicant does not clearly define how students with disabilities and ELL students will be identified and served.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. Quality of the Project Design (15 points)

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 following factors:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 10

Sub Question

- 1) 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 (5 points).**

Strengths:

The applicant describes the proposal goals in the abstract. The goals are to increase student enrollment, provide professional development and expand the number of students meeting academic success leading to high school graduation, college enrollment and persistence. Objectives are provided in the project plan on pages 39-42.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide clearly specified and measurable academic achievement, growth and graduation targets for the schools and clarity on when those targets will be measured. The applicant does not address the

Sub Question

process to measure college persistence.

The applicant does not clearly address how they will modify their program to adapt to the new student populations to be served - Pre-K and Hispanic or provide much detail on the proposed out of state school.

Reader's Score: 3

2. 2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise (as defined in this notice) (10 points).

Strengths:

The applicant provides citations for many of the elements of the educational program, such as mentoring, extended school day and school year, and early college (pages 36-37). The Logic Model is provided on page 44.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide clear information substantiating that research cited met requirements, such as 1) correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias; 2) quasi-experimental study, or 3) randomized controlled trial, or the "statistically significant or substantively important" definition as required in the notice.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (20 points)

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:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 12

Sub Question

1. 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 applicant provides objectives, activities, responsible party, performance measurements, timelines and milestones on pages 39-42.

The applicant wisely attends to data management needs, and plans for a customer relations management system and dashboards in order to track performance across different sites. Board members are active in the schools and participate as guest speakers, volunteers, facilitators, and are involved with fundraising.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The management plan needed more specific detail for each of the schools. The project plan does not address facilities needs, recruitment of students and staff, staff professional development and curriculum and assessment design in adequate detail.

The timeline and milestones/deliverables were not clear. For example, page 42 includes "By end of 1st semester, 85% of pupils meet previous year's State mean average in Math & English/LA." This states an academic performance goal for the 1st semester, but end of year academic achievement and/or growth goals are not provided. As many students may enter the school academically behind peers, this goal could be better specified for first year and returning students.

Reader's Score: 2

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 applicant describes the role and functions of Central Office. The applicant displays a good understanding and success of fundraising and school development efforts.

Weaknesses:

The business plan did not clearly detail how resources will be used to support facilities, financial management, student achievement and human resources needs so that high quality will be assured beyond the initial period of federal funding. For example, on page 46, the applicant explains that the grant will allow for additional staffing, but doesn't explain how these positions or services will be sustained after the grant. The applicant references ongoing Federal funding on page 46, but does not explain state funding. The applicant does not describe their knowledge of or how they would go about learning the school funding processes and amounts in the proposed out of state school. The applicant does not describe how the preschool program will be funded and how this relates to the business plan.

Reader's Score: 2

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 projects long-term success (4 points).**

Strengths:

The organization has secured a number of community and philanthropic partners, with confirmed financial commitments. The applicant has been approved for funding with the Charter School Growth Fund (page 48). A three year financial outlook for the organization is provided. Letters of Support are included in the appendix.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 4

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

A plan for closing non-performing schools is provided on page 49. Evaluation results will be presented quarterly to the Board of Directors, enabling early identification of concerns and ongoing communications. The Board has the authority to make closure decisions.

Weaknesses:

The plan for closure did not detail the specific measures to be evaluated for closure (eg. the performance measures in the charter contract), how families would be informed, transition for students, record keeping, assuring that staff are paid, and facility, property and financial management.

Reader's Score: 2

5. 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 (4 points).

Strengths:

The applicant describes the duties of key personnel on pages 49-51. The CEO has a PhD and many years of charter school administration experience, including serving on the Charter School Accountability Site Teams for the Indianapolis Mayor's Office. Ms. Rella has experience with development and nonprofit management, and a degree in Finance.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide the qualifications, including relevant training and experience of key project personnel. For example, the Project Director will be hired upon receipt of the grant (page 51) and leaders for the new schools have not been identified. Information on managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project, particularly in the case of opening an out of state school, was not clearly provided.

Reader's Score: 2

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (5 points)

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 and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.

Strengths:

An external evaluation, using quasi-experimental design, will be conducted by the Center for Urban Measurement and Evaluation at Indiana Purdue University. Quantitative and qualitative data will be gathered and evaluated (pages 52-53). Evaluation data will be used summative project evaluation, and also for ongoing feedback to improve the program during implementation. The qualifications of the Director of Research are provided, and Tindley demonstrates experience collecting and reporting data.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Low Income Demographic**

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools it currently operates or manages are individuals from low-income families (as defined in this notice).

Note 1: The Secretary encourages an applicant responding to this priority to describe the extent to which the charter schools it currently operates or manages serve individuals from low-income families at rates that are at least comparable to the rates at which these individuals are served by public schools in the surrounding area.

Note 2: For charter schools that serve students younger than 5 or older than 17 in accordance with their State's definition of "elementary education" or "secondary education," at least 60 percent of all students in the schools who are between the ages of 5 and 17 must be individuals from low-income families to meet this priority.

Strengths:

69% of Tindley students are low income, as documented on the Chart on page 5. This compares to the 49% state average and the 82% district average. This meets the criteria for Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - School Improvement

1. 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 local educational agencies (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 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), and as described in the notice of final requirements for the School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States operating under ESEA Flexibility that have opted to waive the requirement in ESEA section 1116(b) for LEAs to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, their Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the June 7, 2012, "ESEA Flexibility" guidance at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects complement the efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in States' approved requests for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

Strengths:

No strengths were found.

Weaknesses:

In response to this competitive priority, the applicant writes "The Tindley Network will continue to provide assistance to IPS schools where the IPS district has received a State letter grade of F for all 3 years of this reporting system (page 6)," but does not clearly define how the proposed expansion will occur in partnership with a specific LEA or explain the academic or structural interventions to be done as part of this partnership. Not enough information was provided to award full points on this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - 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 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 1: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Diversity, is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project would 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, or to avoid racial isolation.

Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf>.

Strengths:

No strengths were found.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant describes strategies to promote racial and ethnic diversity - including having bilingual materials and translators, and opening schools in a hispanic neighborhood, and demonstrates that the rate of students with disabilities was within 3% of the rate of IPS and above the State average, and at a much higher at the takeover school, the applicant does not provide data on the percentage of ELL students served at the school, or the comparative district and state data for ELL students. This competitive priority requires that all subsections be addressed in order for points to be awarded.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Promise Zones

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

Note: Applicants should submit a letter from the lead entity of a designated Promise Zone attesting to the contribution that the proposed activities would make, and supporting the application. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at www.hud.gov/promisezones.

Strengths:

No strengths were found.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

- 1. Overall/additional comments**

General:

The applicant's first school, Charles Tindley Accelerated School opened in 2004-2005. The school graduated 27 students (with a 90% graduation rate) in 2013. They report a 99% college enrollment rate and an 80% college persistence rate with nearly all African American students, greatly exceeding national and state norms. Tindley Preparatory Academy opened in 2012-2013, Tindley Collegiate and Tindley Renaissance opened in 2013-2014, and Arlington Park (a take over from IPS) was done in 2013-4. Tindley Summit and Tindley Genesis are opening this school year, and Tindley Odyssey is planned for 2015. The applicant describes the significant community need in Indianapolis, and the demonstrated success the applicant has in providing high quality education and increasing the opportunities of students served. The applicant provides strong attention to community involvement in the planning of schools, and also actively engages parents, and provides parent resources, including mentoring and supports. The network has received several prestigious awards - including EPIC, Distinguished Title 1 and National Blue Ribbon Award, Model Site for Early College, and Four Star status from Indiana Department of Education.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/09/2014 12:14 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/30/2014 09:34 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Charter for Accelerated Learning dba Tindley Network Schools (U282M140025)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	37
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	16
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Low Income Demographic		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
School Improvement		
1. CPP 2	4	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

Total

121

93

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 84.282m - 3: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Charter for Accelerated Learning dba Tindley Network Schools (U282M140025)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Eligible Applicant

1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant (50 points)

In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 37

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:

Tindley 8th grade pass rate on both math and ELA assessments is 79.1% compared to the state average of 73.7% and the IPS average of 51.3%.

Since 2010-11, Tindley 8th grade student scores have consistently risen and exceeded both the state average and the average for African American students in the state.

The pass rate for Tindley HS students on the EOC assessment in ELA and Math is 95.3% compared to the state average of 70.4% and an IPS pass rate of 39.5%.

Weaknesses:

The application does not include student academic achievement scores for the past three years beyond 8th grade. The graphs are not easy to decipher and difficult to read.

Reader's Score: 15

2. 2.) Either:

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

Sub Question

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:

Since 2010-11, Tindley 8th grade scores on the ISTEP+ have consistently risen. Tindley 8th graders continue to outperform the state average for all students and the state average for black students. Nearly 100% of Tindley students are African American so the overall scores represent subgroup progress as well.

Weaknesses:

Tindley did not include student achievement data for Special Education or ELL students.

Reader's Score: 10

- 3. 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:

Since 2010-11, Tindley 8th grade scores on the ISTEP+ have consistently risen. Tindley 8th graders continue to outperform the state average for all students and the state average for black students. Nearly 100% of Tindley students are African American so the overall scores represent subgroup progress as well.

Weaknesses:

Most data is provided in narrative form. There are few charts to substantiate what's embedded in the narrative. Much of the data is also generalized and lacks a date.

Attendance and retention data is not provided in comparison to local peer schools.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students (10 points)

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:

Tindley's current student population is nearly 70% low-income and it anticipates serving a similar population at its new schools. Tindley's graduation rate is over 20% higher than that of the IPS rate and slightly higher than the state rate. 100% of Tindley graduates gain acceptable to college and 75% matriculate. Tindley focuses on a culture of acceleration for all students verse a culture of remediation commonly found with this student population.

The student achievement data provided shows that Tindley students outperform their peers.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**1. Quality of the Project Design (15 points)**

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 following factors:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

- 1) 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 (5 points).**

Strengths:

The project design includes four primary objectives with well-delineated persons responsible, benchmarks, and timelines. Objectives include: creating schools within Indianapolis, creating schools outside of Indianapolis, ensuring academic achievement above state averages, and holding school accountable to rigorous state standards (p.39-42). Each objective includes corresponding activity, how thy will be measured, and what there anticipated deliverable is. Their plan uses attainable and well defined steps for program expansion.

For example, one activity is to "open 3 additional elementary schools; expand Tindley Accelerated to include 2 pilot pre-schools classrooms." The performance measurement and deliverable speak to the number of students who will enroll and how many will persist as measured by their student information system.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

- 2. 2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise (as defined in this notice) (10 points).**

Strengths:

Tindley currently operates four schools in Indianapolis; the school's program is design around the "Lucky 13." These 13 changes to traditional schools are proven through research to produce increased academic achievement (p.13-33). Examples include: a college going culture, accelerated curriculum, and single gender classes.

A logic model is included in the application.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (20 points)

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:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 16

Sub Question

- 1. 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:

Tindley created a detailed logic model for the management plan. The plan focuses on the academic program and al the short and long-term goals deal with student achievement.

Weaknesses:

The logic model does not address management of expansion or replication; it speaks to student achievement only. There is no inclusion of facilities, budgeting, human capital, or operations.

Reader's Score: 2

- 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).**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The Tindley central office has grown in relation to the network's growth and will continue to scale up proportionally (p45). The Central Office will manage quality across the schools by setting clear expectations and regularly basing decisions on accountability data points. Data will be collected using a Customer Relations management system.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 4

- 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 projects long-term success (4 points).**

Strengths:

Tindley proportionally divides Federal funding for its school sites in each sites first year through expansion. Tindley has a broad support from high-impact national funders to local foundations and individuals (p.48). For example, the Charter School Growth Fund pledged \$1,500,000 over three years for expansion.

Weaknesses:

It is not clear where the federal/state grant funding will come from.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

Each Tindley school is evaluated by an External Evaluator annually (p.49). Findings are presented to the Board of Directors who make recommended adjustments to school-based leadership. If those cannot be adopted, the board has the authority to close a school.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 4

- 5. 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 (4 points).**

Strengths:

The responsibilities of the key leadership are well-delineated and cover the major functions of a high-performing school. The resumes provided show qualified leaders at the helm of Tindley. Thought it is not clear who will be filling what role, many of the resumes provided have been working with Tindley for several years and other have been part of the start up of other charter schools.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear if the positions listed are at the central office or school level. An organizational chart is not included, nor is the Project Director's credentials.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (5 points)

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 and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.

Strengths:

Tindley will partner with the Center for Urban Measurement and Evaluation (CUME) to conducted a quasi-experimental design evaluation. The evaluation will collect quantitative and qualitative data from multiple stakeholders to be used for program refinement and improvement. CUME and Tindley both have prior experience working on external evaluations for schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Low Income Demographic

- 1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools it currently operates or manages are individuals from low-income families (as defined in this notice).**

Note 1: The Secretary encourages an applicant responding to this priority to describe the extent to which the charter schools it currently operates or manages serve individuals from low-income families at rates that are at least comparable to the rates at which these individuals are served by public schools in the surrounding area.

Note 2: For charter schools that serve students younger than 5 or older than 17 in accordance with their State's definition of "elementary education" or "secondary education," at least 60 percent of all students in the schools who are between the ages of 5 and 17 must be individuals from low-income families to meet this priority.

Strengths:

69% of Tindley students are low-income compared to 82% of IPS students and 49% of students in Indiana as a whole.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - School Improvement

- 1. 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 local educational agencies (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 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), and as described in the notice of final requirements for the School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States operating under ESEA Flexibility that have opted to waive the requirement in ESEA section 1116(b) for LEAs to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, their Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the June 7, 2012, "ESEA Flexibility" guidance at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects complement the efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in States' approved requests for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

Strengths:

No strengths identified.

Weaknesses:

Tindley works with the IPS district by providing assistance to IPS schools that have received a letter grade of F for 3 consecutive years. Tindley works with schools to implement academic and structural interventions (p.26). However, the level of support Tindley provides is not strong enough to qualify as a formal academic or structural intervention as outlined in this RFP.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - 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 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 1: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Diversity, is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project would 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, or to avoid racial isolation.

Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf>.

Strengths:

No strengths noted

Weaknesses:

Although 97% of Tindley students are minorities, it assumed that most, if not all of those students are African American.

Tindley is actively recruiting more Latino families by translating all material into Spanish, adding Spanish classes at the elementary level, and opening a new elementary school in a neighborhood with a high Latino population. However, they do not speak to the percentage of ELL students served by them or their comparison districts.

15.4% of students in the Tindley network qualify for Special Education services compared to 18% of IDS students and 14% of Indiana students.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Promise Zones

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

Note: Applicants should submit a letter from the lead entity of a designated Promise Zone attesting to the contribution that the proposed activities would make, and supporting the application. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at www.hud.gov/promisezones.

Strengths:

Not applicable

Weaknesses:

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

- 1. Overall/additional comments**

General:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/30/2014 09:34 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/28/2014 12:33 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Charter for Accelerated Learning dba Tindley Network Schools (U282M140025)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	41
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Low Income Demographic		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
School Improvement		
1. CPP 2	4	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

0

Total

121

100

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 84.282m - 3: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Charter for Accelerated Learning dba Tindley Network Schools (U282M140025)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Eligible Applicant

1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant (50 points)

In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 41

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:

The proposal provides data to show that the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement. For example, on page 10, the proposal shows that 8th grade achievement at Tindley 8th grade is higher than the state average and the state average for African-American 8th graders. In addition, the percent of students passing at Tindley has grown steadily each year.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not address the student performance on page 27. In addition, the proposal does not make clear what content area ISTEP is assessing or what the student performance means on the ISTEP on page 27.

Reader's Score: 16

2. 2.) Either:

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:

The proposal provides some evidence that the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps. The table on page 11 offers evidence that Tindley schools are decreasing the achievement gaps. For example, the makeup of the middle school and the high school is 99% African American (p. 11). In comparisons with IPS and the state, both the middle school students and the high school students are out performing the overall mean performance. (p. 11).

Weaknesses:

The proposal did not include student performance data for special education students and students identified as English language learners.

Reader's Score: 10

- 3. 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:

In addition to the data mentioned for the other strengths in this section, the applicant conveys several other data points related to their schools' high performance. For example, the graduation rate was 90% in the high school, which was higher than the school district's and the state's percentage.(p. 23 and 11). In addition, college entrance was listed at 100%, which was significantly higher than the percentage for the state. (p. 11).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students (10 points)

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 proposal provides evidence that this project will make a contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students. For instance, the proposal states that the expansion of schools would serve a similar, disadvantaged demographic to what the school is currently serving. Furthermore, this proposed work is intent on opening 3 additional

elementary schools in Indianapolis and at least one high school out-of-state. Additionally, 2 pilot pre-school classrooms will be added to the existing Tindley Accelerated High School. This pilot program will allow for an outreach to many educationally-disadvantaged children before they enter kindergarten or 1st grade (since K is not required in Indiana). (p. 35). The proposal also points out that preliminary talks have been undertaken with the Assistant Director of the State Child Protective Services to enroll the neglected, delinquent, wards of the court, and foster youth in an area Tindley school—as almost all of those youth have fallen behind in their academic success, including credits at the high school level. (p. 38).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. Quality of the Project Design (15 points)

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 following factors:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

- 1. 1) 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 (5 points).**

Strengths:

The proposal provides extensive evidence of a high quality project design. On pages 39-42, a table is provided in the proposal that lists four objectives. For each objective, an activity is identified related to the objective, a responsible party or responsible parties are linked to the particular activity, a performance measurement is provided in the form of a target, a timeline is given to suggest when the activity will take place and a milestone is provided to indicate an outcome of the activity that will constitute completion of the activity. (p. 39-42).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

- 2. 2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise (as defined in this notice) (10 points).**

Strengths:

The proposal provides an extensive evidence base for the proposed project. For example, on pages 13-33, the proposal describes what are called the Lucky 13 elements that guide the educational model of Tindley. These thirteen elements, such as technology in the classroom, are described and buttressed with citations to research to

Sub Question

support their place in the educational model. In addition, on page e94 of the proposal, there is a logic model that makes explicit the links between inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes for the expansion of the Tindley schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (20 points)

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:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 19

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 table on pages 39-42 provided a comprehensive management plan in that it provided responsibilities for who was accountable for what activity, a timeline to guide when and how often an activity would take place and the milestones that would come from each of the activities.

Weaknesses:

As the management plan in the proposal is expressing the expansion of the schools, the proposal does not make clear the role or need of school facilities within the expansion of the work.

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 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 proposal makes clear that the central office will be responsible for systems of growth and improvement. For example, the proposal states that Central Office systems will focus on managing quality outcomes across all areas of the organization: operations and finance, academics, human resources and talent management, development and community outreach. In addition to quality outcomes, processes have been implemented and honed for the most efficient and cost effective management of multiple schools. (p. 45). A data system will be purchased through the grant to collect data from teachers and make class-by-class comparisons (p. 45). The proposal also states that will work with the Indiana Department of Education to secure

Sub Question

unused Indianapolis Public School district buildings that meet specifications. Construction and renovation costs for each program vary depending on the access to quality facilities. (p. e109).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 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 projects long-term success (4 points).**

Strengths:

The proposal includes a three-year cost estimate for the school network's budget on page 47. This includes funds that come from federal formulas allocated each year as well as commitments from partners. For example, page 48 provides the names of philanthropies and organizations that have pledged money for the expansion or offering some other partnership agreement to support the work of the school.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The proposal provides a plan for closing a school if the school is not performing at a high level. The proposal states that the external evaluator will present a formative evaluation every semester to the board of directors (p. 49). If, after making recommended adjustments based on the formative feedback—or should it be impossible to adopt and adapt such recommendations—the Board shall have the authority to vote to close and terminate such a (unsuccessful) school, as stated in the original charter, signed by the Chancellor and the Mayor of Indianapolis, the charter authorizer.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 5. 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 (4 points).**

Strengths:

The proposal provides a description of many of the key personnel positions. These descriptions include the work to be accomplished and in some cases, whom the person in that position will be managing (p. 49-52). On pages e117 to e131, the CVs are provided for many of the key personnel, which offers evidence of their experience and training related to the work of this project.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (5 points)

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 and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.

Strengths:

The proposal provides extensive evidence for a high quality evaluation plan. For example, the proposal states that the evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator with extensive experience, as evidenced by her CV in the appendix. In addition, the evaluation approach is termed extended term mixed method. As the name gives away, the evaluation will collect quantitative and qualitative data. (p. 53). Also, the proposal states that the External Evaluation will be both Formative and Summative with a written Formative report on progress toward new high-quality charter schools at the end of each semester (p. 54).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Low Income Demographic

- 1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools it currently operates or manages are individuals from low-income families (as defined in this notice).**

Note 1: The Secretary encourages an applicant responding to this priority to describe the extent to which the charter schools it currently operates or manages serve individuals from low-income families at rates that are at least comparable to the rates at which these individuals are served by public schools in the surrounding area.

Note 2: For charter schools that serve students younger than 5 or older than 17 in accordance with their State's definition of "elementary education" or "secondary education," at least 60 percent of all students in the schools who are between the ages of 5 and 17 must be individuals from low-income families to meet this priority.

Strengths:

The proposal provides extensive evidence for this competitive preference priority. For example, the proposal states that 69% of the students at Tindley qualify for free or reduced lunch. This is higher than the state average of 49%. (p. 5) and demonstrates that the applicant is above the 60 percent threshold.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - School Improvement

1. 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 local educational agencies (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 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), and as described in the notice of final requirements for the School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States operating under ESEA Flexibility that have opted to waive the requirement in ESEA section 1116(b) for LEAs to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, their Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the June 7, 2012, "ESEA Flexibility" guidance at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects complement the efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in States' approved requests for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

Although the proposal states that Tindley has already demonstrated its ongoing work with a Persistently Failing School (Arlington Community School) within Indianapolis Public Schools. (p. 5). the proposal does not clarify or provide specific information for how this replication project will be a partnership or assist Indianapolis Public Schools.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - 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 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 1: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Diversity, is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project would 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, or to avoid racial isolation.

Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf>.

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

It is worth noting that the proposal mentions steps that Tindley is taking to promote student diversity. Also, the proposal also communicates that Tindley is serving students with disabilities. In school year 2012-13, Tindley was within 3% of a comparable rate for students with disabilities in IPS and above the State average. At the Tindley take-over Arlington Community School, almost 1/3 of the school (32%) are classified as special needs (12% higher than the IPS district).

However, the applicant failed to provide data to describe that they 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 and therefore did not meet the criteria for this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Promise Zones

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

Note: Applicants should submit a letter from the lead entity of a designated Promise Zone attesting to the contribution that the proposed activities would make, and supporting the application. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at www.hud.gov/promisezones.

Strengths:

Did not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

Did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

- 1. Overall/additional comments**

General:

No additional comments.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/28/2014 12:33 PM