

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/25/2014 05:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools, Inc. (U282M140027)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	37
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	7
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	13
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	3
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Low Income Demographic		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
School Improvement		
1. CPP 2	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

0

Total

121

96

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 84.282m - 3: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools, Inc. (U282M140027)

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:

The applicant provides three years of data for end of course exams on page 21. Scores are continually increasing for English I, Algebra I and Biology. The data demonstrate that LEAD schools, which serve a population that is 88% free and reduced lunch, exceeded state average proficiency rates on five exams in 2014. Graduation rate data on page 21 show that LEAD Academy's 2014 graduation rate for economically disadvantaged students (94%), was higher than the Tennessee average (82%) and the average for Davidson County (72%).

Three years of TCAP data in Math, Science and Reading are provided for LEAD schools, the state, and nearby district schools (2014 data is not yet available for district schools). The results show that the achievement of LEAD schools, which average economically disadvantaged rates of 90% or more, exceeds that of the state and district. The applicant explain that first year LEAD students enter school performing several years below grade level, but after a few years, have significantly increased their performance and are exceeding peers.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not clearly present three years of comparative data. The chart on page 21 only included one year of state data. The applicant did not specifically break out and compare students in specific educationally disadvantaged subgroups consistently for three years.

LEAD Academy Math scores have declined to less than 30% proficient in the last year (page 23).

Reader's Score: 16

- 2.) Either:

Sub Question

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 data on pages 28 and 29 show some areas of strength. For example, 2013 results on Algebra exceed the state for all subgroups (pages 29-30). The applicant provides convincing data that they are assisting a historically underserved population access postsecondary education at rates higher than is typical. The RIT Score data in the appendix provides good evidence that the LEAD schools are closing historic achievement gaps, compared to the national average.

Weaknesses:

The data on pages 28 and 29 indicate that not all subgroups are consistently achieving at high levels. For example, students with disabilities had a 10% passage rate on the English II exam, compared to 23% in the state, and 37% of economically disadvantaged students had a passing rate, compared to 45% at the state.

Reader's Score: 11

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:

The data provided on pages 28-30 show that African American students and economically disadvantaged LEAD students are generally performing better than their peers in the State. The data provided on pages 32-33 provide information for some subgroups. Attendance data for the past three years is provided in the attachment. 2013 ACT score data on page 22 show that the LEAD high school students performed higher than local districts.

Weaknesses:

Consistent data is not provided for three years. Only one year of graduation rate data is provided, and comparison data is not yet available. The applicant provides a 18.8 average ACT score on page 22 and percent meeting ACT benchmark data on page 26 (18% in Math, for example), and this data does not fully demonstrate that LEAD students are performing significantly above the average results for comparative students in the state. Only one cohort of students have graduated, thus there is not enough information to evaluate college attendance and persistence rates, which is a central part of the organization's mission. The applicant does not fully address how supports will be provided to students so that they can successfully matriculate to and through college.

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 data and description of the education program provide a convincing case that the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students meet or exceed State academic standards and achievement standards and graduate more college and career ready than their current options. The applicant provides good detail on how they will assure that students with disabilities will receive a free and appropriate education. The applicant describes transition services for students, and services for students with 504 plans. The applicant provides detail on how IDEA will be complied with (pages 38-39).

The applicant explains that the new schools will be in partnership with the Metropolitan Nashville or Achievement District, in Tennessee. The applicant is currently serving students from these two districts.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not clearly present the locations and/or grade levels of the new schools to be served. The academic data for ELL students showed pass rates at 10% and the applicant did not fully describe programs and services to address the instructional needs of these students.

Reader's Score: 7

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: 13

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

Sub Question

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 overarching goal is to have 500 more low-income, college ready graduates each year, when at scale. Page 40 provides the specific, measurable, and attainable targets to achieve the overall goal. Goals for student achievement include outperforming state and local districts in every grade and tested subject within a few years, and having 70% of students meet or exceed annual growth on NWEA/MAP in reading and math (pages 40-41). The applicant states that the student population of the new schools will be similar to schools already in operation.

Weaknesses:

Timelines for when goals will be measured or completed were not clear. The applicant does not clearly provide the location, grade levels and student demographics of the proposed schools.

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 good description of the educational practices that have shown to have results with challenged populations - data driven instruction, service learning, and authentic instruction, among others. The applicant cites relevant research that provides an empirical basis for the practices selected (pages 41, 42 and 45). Frameworks mirror those of highly successful schools (Fountas and Pinnell, for example), and follow recommendations from national education organizations (National Research Council, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the Council of Chief State School Officers, for example). A Logic model is provided on page 44.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

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: 17

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

Sub Question

accomplishing project tasks (4 points).

Strengths:

The table on page 47 describes the organization roles and the role of the school for 16 key functions. Back office functions performed by LEAD Central Office enable schools to focus on instruction, and this brings consistency across schools.

The applicant provides a timeline for the planning and opening of five new schools.

Weaknesses:

Clearly defined timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks are not provided. The Project Timeline on page 50 is too broad. It is difficult to evaluate if this plan can be executed on time and within budget. The selection of leaders for the new schools is not addressed.

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 costs savings of operating conversion charter schools. These savings in operational costs will enable the school to be sustainable beyond the initial period of federal funding. The applicant addresses how key functions of human resources, governance, operations, etc. will be supported. The applicant explains that they have an established track record of ensuring and sustaining high quality schools with past replications

Weaknesses:

The Business Plan was not clearly presented. Although there are considerable cost savings with facilities, because the locations have not yet been identified it is unknown what facility costs may arise. The applicant notes that schools will operate with deficits until they are at full enrollment, which is 600 students per school (page 54).

Reader's Score: 3

- 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:

A multi-year financial plan is provided on page 54. The charter conversion model allows for considerable cost savings on facilities. There is substantial demonstrated commitment from stakeholders, including \$750,000 from the Charter School Growth Fund and Letters of Support from . The applicant's long-term presence in the community and ability to work well with community partners, including districts, are good indicators of the ability to achieve long-term success.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Sub Question

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 applicant provides a plan for closing charter schools that are not meeting high standards of quality on page 56. The applicant describes an annual performance evaluation, and if a school has successive years of poor performance, a deep review will occur, which may lead to significant changes in management and operations. The applicant references authorizer performance metrics, and addresses where students would go in the case of closure, and efforts to minimize disruption.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

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 qualifications of the Project Director include completion of the Broad Residency program in Urban Education. The Chief Executive Officer has strong experience in charter school finance and grants management, including startup grants, SIG grants and grants from private foundations.. The Chief Academic Officer has experience with high performing charter schools and is a former colleague of [REDACTED] of the acclaimed Uncommon Schools.

All team members have strong business management backgrounds.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

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 applicant provides relevant performance outcomes in areas including academic achievement, academic growth, college acceptance, and measures of school culture and financial management. The outcomes are clearly related to the project. Many of the measures involve publicly verifiable data points.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan did not provide adequate detail regarding timelines or responsible parties. The applicant does not describe who will be doing the evaluation, how often data will be collected, methods of analysis, and how results will be shared formatively and summatively throughout the organization and beyond. The qualitative measures provided on page 60 are quantitative, thus no true qualitative measures are described.

Reader's Score: 3

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 applicant provides a chart on page 5 showing the percentage of students that qualify for free and reduced lunch at each school location (LEAD Academy - 88%; Brick Church College Prep - 97%; Cameron College Prep - 96%; and LEAD Prep Southeast - 87%). These figures clearly meet the criteria of 60% or above.

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:

The proposed replications are specifically for schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring in the two districts the applicant is already working with - Tennessee Achievement School District and Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 4

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:

The applicant writes that they use race-neutral approaches in choosing school locations and in student recruiting, and that they strive to hire staff that represent the racial composition of the students served (page 6, and page 7 notes that 36% of staff are members of underrepresented minorities). Demographic data from Cameron College Prep (1/3 Latino, 1/3 White and 1/3 African American) and LEAD Southeast (40% Latino, 30% White and 30% African American), provided on page 6, demonstrate that racial isolation is not occurring in current schools. The chart on page 7 compares the percentage of low-income, ELL, Special Education and minority students of the LEAD schools to the local district. All rates, including students with disabilities and ELL student rates, are comparable to the district.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

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:

LEAD currently operates four high schools, including two conversion schools done in partnership with Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools and the TN Achievement School District, and one middle school. The schools are evidencing very high student academic growth and have a strong commitment to improving education to students in need and in working in concert with districts.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/25/2014 05:09 PM

Status: Draft

Last Updated: 08/20/2014 03:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools, Inc. (U282M140027)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	36
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	13
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	3
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Low Income Demographic		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
School Improvement		
1. CPP 2	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

Total

121

98

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 84.282m - 3: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools, Inc. (U282M140027)

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: 36

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:

All of LEAD's schools have high percentages of economically disadvantaged students (87% being the lowest). In TN, schools are evaluated by the TN Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS) and ranked as level 1-5. Students at level 5 schools show the most growth. Three of LEAD's four schools currently in operation are level 5 and one is level 4.

LEAD Academy is the network's only high school; only the three selective high schools exceed LEAD Academy student on state exams. LEAD Academy students scores on end of course assessments exceed the state average on 5 of 7 exams.

Middle schools proficiency in math and reading outperforms that of most MNPS peer campuses in 2011-12 and 2012-13.

Weaknesses:

The charts provided are difficult to read in the black and white printing provided. Middle school comparison data is only available for two years.

Reader's Score: 18

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

Sub Question

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:

In 2011-2012, African American students at LEAD Academy outperformed state peers on all end of year exams.

In 2012-13, LEAD Academy students outperformed their peers on the Algebra I assessment. That same year, the African American subgroup outperformed their state peers on in three of four exams (save English III).

Weaknesses:

The ACT data provided compares LEAD scores from 2014 to the most recently available which is 2013. The data is not for the same year. 2013 ACT scores for LEAD students are not provided for true comparison.

LEAD Academy (HS) student achievement is inconsistent and mixed. In 2012-13, the last reported year, LEAD Academy students underperformed the state average in English II and III and Algebra II.

There is no consistent data to show that there have been decreases in the achievement gaps for students with disabilities or economically disadvantaged students at LEAD.

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:

100% of LEAD Academy's graduating class was accepted to college. Comparison graduation data is not available for 2014, though if rates remained the same as in 2013, LEAD Academy's rate for white students, African American students, and low income students who exceed the state average.

LEAD Academy's 2014 ACT average exceeds the 2013 average for African American students and MNPS students.

Attendance at all campuses exceed 90%.

Weaknesses:

Data is provided in the appendices, but little accompanying analysis is provided. The bar graph charts do not include numbers and the charts are difficult to read when printed. The data could be provided much more clearly.

LEAD Academy graduated their first class of seniors in 2014; though 100% of seniors graduated, there is no evidence to support matriculation or college success arguments.

Attrition data for LEAD schools is provided but comparison data is not.

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:

LEAD currently serves the highest proportion of economically disadvantaged students in the city, more than the district or any other charter school (p.34). LEAD proposes to open five new schools between 2015 and 2017. At capacity, the schools would add 3,000 seats and LEAD would serve 6,620 students. LEAD projects that at full enrollment they would produce 500 college ready seniors annually which would double the rate of college ready seniors graduating in Nashville.

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: 13

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:

LEAD's Theory of Action provides an overarching framework for the network's expansion. LEAD's overall goal is to produce 500 college ready graduates per year when at scale. LEAD identified four main objectives that must be achieved in order to make that goal a reality (p.40). Each of the objective is supported by a LEADer Essential (p. 41-43) which is based on data and best practices.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The application does not include a clear timeline or data collection methods.

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:

LEAD's Theory of Action includes three "LEADer Essentials": Data Driven Instruction, Strong School Culture, and Observation and Feedback. Each of these elements is based on research (Fuchs et al, Marzano et al, and Hattie) (p.44-46).

LEAD is also committed to honing their Theory of Action so it can be used as a prototype for systemic education reform in other local school districts.

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: 17

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 network lays out a clear plan for what the management organization will lead versus what the schools themselves will lead. The LEAD plan is designed to allow school-based leaders to focus on academics and quality instruction while the network focuses on financial, legal, and operational elements. The management plan also allows the network to share effective modeling and best practices across all schools to ensure fidelity to the new school or conversion model.

Weaknesses:

The application lacks sufficient detail to ensure that the project will stay on time and be completed within budget.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 3

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:

LEAD works in partnership with the MNPS district through its charter conversion model. By converting a public school to a charter grade-by grade, LEAD benefits from the existing infrastructure of the city. LEAD is able to access facilities and transportation at a significantly reduced cost.

Weaknesses:

Though the charter conversion model is innovative and cost effective, it does not directly address how LEAD will sustain the quality of its network once CSP funding expires.

Reader's Score: 3

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 multi-year financial modeling relies on "other philanthropy". However, this line item decreases as the network expands. The majority of funding for this line item in the 2015 budget is already committed.

Weaknesses:

LEAD is planning for operating deficits in 2018 and 2019, yet it does not speak to how those deficits will be countered.

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:

LEAD's Board of Directors evaluates its schools' performance annually in conjunction with each school's authorizers' review. Successive years of poor performance would trigger a deep review by the Academic Committee of the Board and there would be an attempt to make progress through leadership and programmatic changes. If a school had to close, LEAD would make that decision by January and work with the authorizer to ensure a smooth transition for its students.

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).

Sub Question

Strengths:

LEAD's senior leadership bring a wealth of knowledge in education, charters, non-profit management, and finance and operations.

Weaknesses:

The network has not undertaken an expansion of this magnitude before and there are not clear job descriptions provided to detail about who is responsible for what.

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 evaluation plan includes indicators in student growth, student achievement, college acceptance, internal measures, school culture, and financial, operations, and growth.

Weaknesses:

There is no mention of who will be responsible for the evaluation or when it will occur. There is very little qualitative evidence included in the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

Each of the LEAD Public School campuses serve high percentages of low income students (above 87%). On average, 92% of the network's students are low-income (p.5)

Weaknesses:

The application includes a chart, but the half of the chart that refers to MNPS is blank (p.5).

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:

LEAD proposes to replicate its high-wuality charter model in partnership with the Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools (MNPS) and the Tennessee Achievement School District (ASD). LEAD was the first charter operator in TN (2011) to parter with a district for a charter transformation of a low performing Priority School. LEAD completed one additional conversation since 2011.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified

Reader's Score: 4

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:

Two LEAD schools are among the most diverse in MNPS; both are close to 1/3 each white, African American, and Latino. As a whole, LEAD students are most ethnically diverse than MNPS (83% vs 64%). More students at LEAD qualify for FRL, slightly more students qualify for special education services, however slightly fewer students at LEAD are ELLS.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified

Reader's Score: 5

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: Draft
Last Updated: 08/20/2014 03:29 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/25/2014 09:48 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools, Inc. (U282M140027)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	38
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	13
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	2
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Low Income Demographic		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
School Improvement		
1. CPP 2	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

0

Total

121

95

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 84.282m - 3: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools, Inc. (U282M140027)

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: 38

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 demonstrates some success with student performance growth. For example, the proposal states that the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS) ranks every school in the state based on growth quintiles and Level 5 is the highest. Three out of the four schools have a level 5 rating. (p. 19-20). On page 21, three years of end of course exams demonstrate a general growth pattern for student performance. Moreover, the TCAP scores for math also demonstrate a general pattern of growth for student performance over three years. (p. 41). And the same can be said for reading and science (p. 42).

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not make clear the extent to which there has been an overall growth trajectory for students for three years across all of the content areas.

Reader's Score: 18

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 demonstrates some success for addressing the achievement gap. For example, on page 21, the proposal shows that the graduation rate for white students and black students is virtually the same and much more similar to each other than evident for the school district. The ACT scores in the proposal reveal that the achievement gap is being addressed by LEAD as well. (p. 26).

Weaknesses:

The proposal shows that some of the schools are under-performing. For example, on page 23, the graph demonstrates that the LEAD Academy has less than a third of their students performing at a proficient level in mathematics.

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:

Overall, the proposal has demonstrated student success. For example, when compared to the 17 high schools in Nashville, LEAD Academy's test performance is exceeded only by Nashville's three selective enrollment magnet schools. In addition, the overall SAT scores for LEAD students is higher than the average scores from nearby school districts where students at LEAD would have been attending if it weren't for its existence. (p. 22).

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not provide data for over three years that would demonstrate a level of consistency for this criterion. Moreover, the proposal does not make apparent with comparison data the extent to which the schools have been successful in addressing the needs of English Language Learners and Special Education Students. o weaknesses noted.

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 proposal provides some evidence for its contribution to assisting educationally disadvantaged students. For example, the proposal states that LEAD serves the highest proportion of low-income students in the city – significantly more than the district and other charter schools. Moreover, the proposal states that they have created or expanded special education departments and appropriate facilities at each campus to serve our growing population of students with severe disabilities – primarily autism and Downs syndrome. (p. 34). Also, the proposal states that schools currently served and those identified in this proposal are in areas that have had decades of low performance, with many of them falling in the bottom 5% of schools statewide (p. 34).

Weaknesses:

One weakness for this criterion is that the proposal does not specifically address the strategies with which the schools will serve English Language Learners.

Reader's Score: 8

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: 13

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 proposal provides some evidence for a high quality project design. For example, an objective is stated to produce 500 college ready graduates each year once at scale (p. 40). The proposal identifies goals to map onto this objective, such as Proficiency rates for all students will meet or exceed the state average (p. 40). Additional goals for student progress are stated that are related to the overall objective, such as 70% of students will meet or exceed annual growth target on MAP in reading and math.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not make clear what sources of data will be used to assess some of the measurable goals listed. For example, the goal of 100% of LEAD students will be accepted into a four-year college or university does not describe how that information will be ascertained. (p. 40). In addition, the proposal does not make evident when the goals will be fully measured and assessed.

Sub Question

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 proposal provides extensive evidence that the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise. For example, the proposal provides research citations to support the ELA and mathematics model. (p. 41-42). In addition, the proposal provides a theory of action that links the essential elements of the LEAD model of instruction with their intended outcomes (p. 44).

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: 15

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 proposal provides a somewhat adequate management plan. For example, on pages 46-49, the general functions of the project are listed and what positions are associated with those functions. In addition, a project timeline is provided on page 50 with milestones and school years provided. On pages 51-52, the teams that accomplish the work are listed that provides some evidence for the responsibilities of the work.

Weaknesses:

On page 50, the timeline's milestones and segments of time are too general to be informative for what actually constitutes completing an activity and when the activity needs to be completed. It is not clear who is carrying out all of the activities in the project timeline to suggest who is accountable for the milestones.

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

Sub Question

schools (4 points).

Strengths:

The proposal provides some evidence of a business plan for improving and ensuring quality and performance. For example, in the table on page 47-48 provides the various functions that will be carried out in preparation for this work as well as implementation. For example, functions include professional development, student recruitment and community relations, to name a few. In addition, the table aligns these functions with the organizational decision-making necessary to carry out the work as well as the school-based decision-making. For instance, for professional development, the table identifies who will be responsible for overseeing instructional professional development in general as well as who will oversee the school-based professional development.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not make clear how the business plan has taken into account the sustainability for the proposed schools.

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 proposal provides a financial model that suggests that the project is financially viable. The proposal notes that low-cost facilities and transportation, due entirely to LEAD's charter conversion work as discussed in the operation's sustainability model and budget narrative, allows LEAD to delay expected start-up deficits to the middle years of expansion of a given school. (p. 54-55).

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 low performing charters. For example, it states that successive years of poor performance would trigger a deep review by the Academic Committee of the board and may lead to significant changes in the management and operation of the school. Continued performance struggles would be assessed in conjunction with authorizer performance metrics, and in Tennessee any charter school that falls into the bottom 5% of schools statewide is closed by law. The proposal also states that in the rare event of a decision by the LEAD board to close a school, the decision would be made in January to provide time for students to enroll in other schools. (p. 56).

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).**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The proposal provides evidence for the key staff possessing the appropriate experience and training. For example, on pages 57-58, the proposal shows provides bios for key staff that shows their experience is sufficient enough to carry out the work at a high level. On pages e82-e89, the proposal also includes CVs that further convey the qualifications of the key staff involved in the project.

Weaknesses:

There are key staff members that are not accounted for in the proposal. For example, the proposal mentions on page 58 that there are five school directors. If they have been hired, it would be worth having their CVs. If they are not yet hired, it would be useful to provide a job description to suggest that their roles would be adequately prepared to do this work. Similarly, there is no description of the instructional staff or what would be expected of candidates applying for the position.

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:

The evaluation plan has some elements of a high quality plan. For example, the plan includes qualitative and quantitative data, which suggests that the data could be potentially robust. In addition, the plan lists categories of performance, such as growth or college acceptance and within those categories, a performance target is listed (p. 59).

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan does contain some weaknesses. For instance, the plan does not state who will carry out the evaluation. In addition, there are guiding questions or timeline to guide the work of the evaluation. Furthermore, the data sources are not included to show how the targets would be ascertained.

Reader's Score: 2

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 evidence to address this competitive preference priority. For example, on page five in the proposal, a table is provided with the percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch at each of the schools. In total, this number is 92%, which is 20% higher than the percentage for the school district. (p. 5).

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:

The proposal provides extensive evidence to address this competitive preference priority. For example, the proposal states that LEAD's proposed replication of 5 high-quality charter schools will continue its groundbreaking partnership with Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools (MNPS) and the Tennessee Achievement School District (ASD) to transform low-performing schools into high-performing charters serving the same-zoned enrollment populations. (p. 5). In the past, LEAD has partnered with MNPS for a charter conversion of a low-performing school.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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:

The proposal addresses this competitive preference priority in several ways. The proposal states that LEAD uses only race-neutral approaches in choosing school locations and student recruiting and strives to hire highly qualified staff who mirror the racial makeup of our student population.(p. 6). The proposal also states that LEAD schools serve approximately the same population of ELLs and students with disabilities (12-15%) (p. 6). The schools are more ethnically diverse than the district

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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:

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive preference 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: 08/25/2014 09:48 AM