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**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

*1. Type of Submission:*
- [] Preapplication
- [X] Application
- [] Changed/Corrected Application

*2. Type of Application:*
- [X] New
- [] Continuation
- [] Revision

*3. Date Received:*

02/13/2017

*4. Applicant Identifier:*


*5a. Federal Entity Identifier:*


*5b. Federal Award Identifier:*

NA

*State Use Only:*

6. Date Received by State:

7. State Application Identifier:

8. **APPLICANT INFORMATION:**

*a. Legal Name:*

Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis

*b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN):*

55-6002488

*c. Organizational DUNS:*

0759679920000

*d. Address:*

- *Street1:*
  120 East Walnut Street

- *City:
  Indianapolis

- *County/Parish:
  Marion

- *State:*
  IN: Indiana

- *Province:*
  USA: UNITED STATES

- *Zip / Postal Code:*
  46204-1312

e. **Organizational Unit:**

- *Department Name:*
  Office of Enrollment & Options

- *Division Name:*
  Academic

f. **Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:**

- *Prefix:*
  Mr.

- *First Name:*
  Patrick

- *Middle Name:*
  

- *Last Name:*
  Herrel

- *Suffix:*
  

- *Title:*
  Director of Enrollment and Options

- *Organizational Affiliation:*
  Indianapolis Public Schools

- *Telephone Number:*
  317-226-6000

- *Fax Number:*
  317-226-4424

- *Email:*
  herrelip@mypa.org
**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **9. Type of Applicant 1:** | Select Applicant Type:  
| X: Other (specify) | |
| **Type of Applicant 2:** | Select Applicant Type:  |
| **Type of Applicant 3:** | Select Applicant Type:  |
| **Other (specify):** | Public School System |
| **10. Name of Federal Agency:** | Department of Education |
| **11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:** |  |
| CFDA Title: |  |
| **12. Funding Opportunity Number:** | ED-GRANTS-121416-001 |
| **Title:** | Office of Elementary and Secondary Education Opening Doors, Expanding CFDA Number 84.377C |
| **13. Competition Identification Number:** | 84-377C2017-1 |
| Title: |  |
| **14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):** |  |
| **15. Descriptive Title of Applicant’s Project:** | Student Success through Socioeconomic Diversity |

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

---
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Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

### 16. Congressional Districts Of:
- **a. Applicant:** IN-007
- **b. Program/Project:** IN-007

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

### 17. Proposed Project:
- **a. Start Date:** 03/01/2017
- **b. End Date:** 06/29/2018

### 18. Estimated Funding ($) :
- **a. Federal:** 443,050.00
- **b. Applicant:** 0.00
- **c. State:** 0.00
- **d. Local:** 0.00
- **e. Other:** 0.00
- **f. Program Income:** 0.00
- **g. TOTAL:** 443,050.00

### 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?
- a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on __________.
- b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
- x. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

### 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes," provide explanation in attachment.)
- x. Yes
- □. No

If "Yes", provide explanation and attach

### 21. "By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications** and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)

x. I AGREE

** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

### Authorized Representative:
- **Prefix:** Mrs.
- **First Name:** Bridgette
- **Middle Name:** Trette
- **Last Name:** Robinson
- **Suffix:**
- **Title:** Director of Federal and Special Programs
- **Telephone Number:** 317-226-4520
- **Fax Number:** 317-226-4327
- **Email:** robinby@mips.org
- **Signature of Authorized Representative:** Bridgette Robinson
- **Date Signed:** 02/13/2017
The requested indirect cost rate is

%__

If you have an approved indirect cost rate agreement with another Federal Agency, you may use the negotiated rate of 10% of modified direct costs and wages.

If you do not have an approved indirect cost rate agreement, you may use the negotiated rate of 20% of modified direct costs and wages.

This is your first report and you do not have an approved indirect cost rate agreement with a State, local government or higher education and are not subject to the indirect rate.

The indirect cost rate is

%__

If you have an approved indirect cost rate agreement, you may use the negotiated rate of 10% of modified direct costs and wages.

Prior year indirect cost rate agreement:

From:______To:______

If you are paying for the indirect cost rate agreement:

Yes__No__

If you are reimbursing an indirect cost rate agreement:

Yes__No__

If you are not reimbursing an indirect cost rate agreement:

Yes__No__

(1) Do you have an indirect cost rate agreement by the Federal Government?

Yes__No__

(2) If yes, please provide the following information:

(3) If no, prior indirect cost rate agreement:

From:______To:______

(4) Total Costs:

1. Project Year 1

2. Project Year 2

3. Project Year 3

4. Project Year 4

5. Project Year 5

(5) Total Coding

US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUDGET SUMMARY

12. Total Costs

11. Training Supplies

10. Indirect Costs

9. Total Direct Costs

8. Other

7. Construction

6. Commercial

5. Support

4. Equipment

3. Travel

2. fringe benefits

1. Personnel

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

BUDGET INFORMATION

EXPLANATION DATE: 06-20-2007

ONE NUMBER 1844-0008

EXPLANATION DATE: 06-20-2007

ONE NUMBER 1844-0008

Department of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis

Program of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis

Name of Indirect Cost Agreement

Approved indirect cost rate agreement by the Federal Government

For any year you would like to report the column under

Budgeted Costs

Program Year 1

Program Year 2

Program Year 3

Program Year 4

Program Year 5
### SECTION C - BUDGET NARRATIVE (see instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>(g)</th>
<th>(h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Training Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Total Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(j)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Project Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Year 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NON-FEDERAL FUNDS**

**SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY**

Please read all instructions before completing. Non-federal costs should be computed as applicable under column 1. Applications received on or after May 15th should complete the column under "Projected Year."

Name of Institution/Organization: [Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis]
ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.

2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.

3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.

4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.

5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).

6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U. S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.

11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).


14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.

17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1966 and OMB Circular No. A-133, “Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.”

18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.

19. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

---

**SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL**

| Bridgette Robinson |

**TITLE**

| Director of Federal and Special Programs |

**APPLICANT ORGANIZATION**

| Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis |

**DATE SUBMITTED**

| 02/13/2017 |
DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352

1. * Type of Federal Action:
   - a. contract
   - b. grant
   - c. cooperative agreement
   - d. loan
   - e. loan guarantee
   - f. loan insurance

2. * Status of Federal Action:
   - a. bid/offer/application
   - b. initial award
   - c. post-award

3. * Report Type:
   - a. initial filing
   - b. material change

4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity:
   - Prime ✗ SubAwardee
   * Name
   * Street 1
   * Street 2
   * City
   * State
   * Zip

   Congressional District, if known:

5. If Reporting Entity in No.4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime:

6. * Federal Department/Agency:

7. * Federal Program Name/Description:
   - CFDA Number, if applicable:

8. Federal Action Number, if known:
   - n/a

9. Award Amount, if known:
   - $

10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant:
    - Prefix
    - * First Name
    - Middle Name
    - * Last Name
    - Suffix
    - * Street 1
    - Street 2
    - * City
    - * State
    - * Zip

11. b. Individual Performing Services (including address if different from No. 10a)
    - Prefix
    - * First Name
    - Middle Name
    - * Last Name
    - Suffix
    - * Street 1
    - Street 2
    - * City
    - * State
    - * Zip

11. Information requested through this form is authorized by Title 31 U.S.C. Section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact, upon which reliance was placed by the awardee when the transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

* Signature: Bridgette Robinson

* Name: Prefix * First Name * Middle Name * Last Name

* Title: Telephone No.: Date:

[Form Footer]
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Federal Use Only:

Authorized for Local Reproduction
Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-97)
NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education’s General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain-potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

1. An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.

2. An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.

3. An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct “outreach” efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

4. An applicant that proposes a project to increase school safety might describe the special efforts it will take to address concern of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students, and efforts to reach out to and involve the families of LGBT students.

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Public Law 103-382). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-0005.

Optional - You may attach 1 file to this page.
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General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) Section 427 Requirements

Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS) takes careful consideration to provide accessible information, communication strategies, outreach efforts and educational opportunities for all of the families within their district. IPS has a foundation of current policies in place to address harassment and discrimination:

a. It is the policy of the Board to maintain an education and work environment, which is free from all forms of unlawful discrimination and harassment. This commitment applies to all IPS operations, programs, and activities. All students, administrators, teachers, staff, and all other school personnel share responsibility for avoiding, discouraging, and reporting any form of unlawful discrimination and harassment. This policy applies to unlawful conduct occurring on school property, or at another location if such conduct occurs during an activity sponsored by the Board.

b. The Board will vigorously enforce its prohibition against discrimination and harassment based on race, color, national origin, religion, disability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or any other unlawful basis, and encourages those within the IPS community as well as third parties who feel aggrieved to seek assistance to rectify the problems. IPS will investigate all allegations of discrimination and harassment and, in those cases where unlawful conduct is substantiated, IPS will take immediate steps to end the discrimination or harassment. Individuals who are found to have engaged in unlawful discrimination or harassment will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

IPS strives to carefully and proactively consider the challenges potentially created or addressed through the potential development of their blueprint through the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunity grant process. IPS has identified a couple potential barriers specifically related to race and national origins in relation to the development of this program. IPS will follow their current standards of discrimination
policies to address any other barriers that arise throughout the process. In moving forward with this proposal, some identified potential barriers are the following:

1. Race- Race and poverty are very closely connected in Indianapolis. As noted in the narrative of this application a high rate of African American families are living at or below the poverty line and compiling a significant amount of students in low performing schools. One current barrier IPS identifies is a lack of engagement with Parents of Color in the schools. As part of the development of this plan, IPS will work in accordance to best practices within the information they have garnered, and will continue to develop, from their Racial Equity Pilot programs. IPS has also developed communication strategies to attempt to be more inviting and approachable for parents.

2. National Origin- A potential barrier for some families in the IPS school district is a language barrier. A successful blueprint will require insights from as many families as possible within the IPS system and IPS has a significant amount of Spanish speakers, therefore special consideration should be made to ensure accessibility and communication to non-English speakers. IPS has already addressed this issue through other communication strategies and programs and will continue to develop this blueprint with the same consideration. Efforts to support approachable entry for bi-lingual families are the following: IPS has a bi-lingual program within the Global Preparatory Academy Innovation School, and IPS currently makes communication materials available for families in both English and Spanish.

As identified in this GEPA Section 427 Requirement response, IPS assures the Department of Education that they will take proper precautions into consideration and try to be as proactive as possible during the pursuit of funding to address and break down potential barriers.
CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.
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ED Abstract Form

In support of the proposed project, *Student Success through Socioeconomic Diversity*,
Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS) is requesting a $449,050 grant of to create a blueprint and implementation plan under the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities Grant CFDA 84.377C.

IPS is a public school corporation in Indianapolis, serving 28,714 students each year in an 80-square mile radius in Central Indiana. The district strives to be a leader in innovative urban education, preparing all students to be successful in the global economy. According to the Indiana Department of Education, 38 schools within the IPS LEA are SIG eligible for the 2016-17 school year. IPS constantly is working to ensure all of their schools are excellent places for students to learn and for teachers and staff to work. This funding will allow IPS to continue to work toward excellence with a specific focus on creating socioeconomic diversity across all buildings in the district, especially the SIG eligible buildings.

IPS's application is submitted under Absolute Priorities 1 (Increasing Socioeconomic Diversity in Schools) and 2 (Improving Schools by Increasing Student Diversity--Blueprint). IPS has engaged in extensive assessments of the students, community members and families. With significant research already collected, IPS is well positioned to pursue the second priority and pursue the development of a blueprint.

The objectives of developing this blueprint are to provide IPS with a better assessment of current programs, explore best practices and produce a blueprint addressing socioeconomic diversity in an urban school district.

Upon award of the grant, IPS assures following outcomes as a result of development of the *Student Success through Socioeconomic Diversity*;
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- A Needs Analysis Report including a comprehensive analysis of data, focus groups, and surveys.
- Best practice research that meets the Department of Education theory of action and evidence-based criteria.
- Development of strategies to address socioeconomic diversity, with a focus on SIG eligible schools within the IPS district.
- A greater understand of why families are or are not choosing IPS for their children.
- Completion of a Blueprint with an implementation plan that includes sustainability strategies.

In order to develop the outcomes listed above, IPS will conduct the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Analysis</td>
<td>Conduct Focus Groups, assess existing data, develop and distribute surveys, analyze the findings and generate a needs assessment report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice Research</td>
<td>Continue best practice research on addressing socioeconomic diversity in K-12 schools, conduct a site visit to a school district implementing effective strategies for addressing socioeconomic diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Current Programs</td>
<td>Assess Innovation Network Schools’ goals and plans addressing restart and transformation schools, identify target schools to begin implementation, assess potential cost saving strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Write Blueprint and Implementation Plan</strong></td>
<td>Compile all of their findings and work with appropriate partners to write the Blueprint, and gain approval for the plan from their Board of Commissioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></td>
<td>Create an implementation plan, including measurable goals and strategies for sustainability beyond the grant period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Add Mandatory Project Narrative File  Delete Mandatory Project Narrative File  View Mandatory Project Narrative File

To add more Project Narrative File attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

Add Optional Project Narrative File  Delete Optional Project Narrative File  View Optional Project Narrative File
# Table of Contents

- Introduction and Assurances ................................................................. 2
- Need .......................................................................................................... 2
- Significance ............................................................................................ 20
- Quality of Project Design ....................................................................... 21
- Quality of the Project Personnel ............................................................ 32
- Quality of Management Plan .................................................................. 36
- Adequacy of Resources ......................................................................... 40
- BIBLIOGRAPHY .................................................................................. 40
Student Success through Socioeconomic Diversity

Introduction and Assurances

Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS) is pleased to present the following assurances for the Department of Education: Opening Doors and Expanding Opportunities Program CFDA 84.377C. IPS is committed to the assurances of this application and program design. IPS will complete the following upon award of the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities grant:

Requirement 1: IPS will fully participate in the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities Community of Practice to explore strategies and design solutions to relevant problems addressing socioeconomic diversity in IPS schools. The Program Director will attend in-person, at least one of the project director meetings. IPS will participate in program evaluation conducted for or by the Department, including providing relevant program and project data and other information as appropriate. IPS will submit a blueprint with an implementation strategy as outlined in the application instructions.

Requirement 2: IPS will share how they plan to develop a blueprint by the end of the project period in the sections below, addressing the need for the project, significance of the project, project design, project personnel, management plan, and available resources. Each section is identified under its own header.

Need

As the largest public school district in Indiana, diverse in both population and choice, IPS is an agile, innovative educational organization committed to academic excellence built through individualized, relationship-based learning. IPS covers 80 square miles, serves nearly 30,000 students, and is committed to serving individual students based on individual needs through innovation in the classroom—from district-wide digital learning initiatives to individual schools
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fashioning their own rigorous curricula. IPS strives to provide excellent opportunities through
community schools and Choice (magnet) option programs focusing on math, science, performing
arts, Montessori, International Baccalaureate, specific career paths, Spanish immersion, among
others. IPS has significant community involvement, including partnering with the local library
for summer reading programs, securing funding from corporate foundations, and engaging in
health and wellness initiatives, parent advocacy efforts, among other meaningful activities.

The Case for Socioeconomic Integration – A Brief Overview of the Research
Research indicates that socioeconomic diversity in schools can lead to improvements in
educational outcomes for lower income students while maintaining outcomes for students from
more affluent families. Students in schools with high socioeconomic diversity, regardless of their
own socioeconomic status, are considerably more likely (68%) to enroll at a 4-year college than
students attending schools with a lack of socioeconomic diversity.\(^1\)

Additionally lower income students in schools where fewer than 50% of the students qualify for
free and reduced lunch, tend to have a more engaged community of parents and teachers
surrounding the students, holding them to higher expectations. These students experience fewer
disciplinary incidents. However, their low-income peers in schools where a majority of students
receive free and reduced lunch have higher disciplinary incidents.\(^2\) Each of these factors: low-
income students in a diverse socioeconomic setting and a community of support, independently
creating outcomes that are more favorable for low-income students. When combined, they can
compound the positive effect for students.

Schools with high poverty rates tend to experience lower demand for student enrollment. Both
high poverty rates and decreased student enrollment negatively affect school funding, creating a
cycle perpetuating these issues. Therefore, creating demand for schools in high poverty areas,
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although ambitious, may provide a path forward for these students. The Century Foundation, a
progressive think tank actively researching socioeconomic integration in schools, suggests that
magnet and charter schools in these areas may entice wealthier families outside of the district to
attend these schools. Additionally, incentives for wealthier schools to accept students from lower
income neighborhoods may allow for a more favorable socioeconomic composition within these
schools. IPS seeks to explore strategies like this to inform its blueprint and implementation plan.

IPS School District
Data from the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) shows that IPS enrollment continues to
decrease over time. At its peak enrollment in 1967, IPS served over 100,000 students. Since
then, enrollment has been in a steady decline and in the past ten years alone; IPS enrollment has
decreased by nearly 8,000 students, leaving enrollment this year at 29,583 according to data from
IDOE. Additionally, data from the IDOE indicate surrounding township and suburban districts
are among the fastest growing in the state.

To understand the IPS school district, it is important to understand the student population.

- 60% of students living within the geographic boundaries of the district attend IPS schools
- 24% attend charter schools and the remaining 16% attend private schools

While a 35-year old court order for busing IPS students to township schools aimed at building
diverse enrollment in schools ended in 2016, some believe that the court order contributed to
racial and socioeconomic segregation in IPS. As IPS students traveled out of the district to
township schools each day, transportation was not provided for students to travel into the district
from the townships schools. Today, IPS schools are more racially and socioeconomically
segregated then they were in 1981 when busing began. For instance, IPS records illustrate that in
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1980, when IPS enrollment was approximately 66,000 students, the district enrolled nearly equal proportions of Caucasian and African American students. In 1981, when busing began, IPS has a total enrollment of around 57,000 students, but with 5,000 fewer African American students relative to Caucasians. The 2016 enrollment data show that nearly 6000 IPS students are Caucasian, while nearly 14,500 students are African American, a 28% difference.

For students living in the IPS district, 2014 data generated from SAVI (a community data service by the Polis Center at Indiana University Purdue University – Indianapolis) shows that nearly three quarters of students in private schools (74%) pay for lunch, while nearly 20% of private school students receive free lunch and nearly 7% receive reduced cost. In comparison, that same data set showed that over three quarters (77%) of traditional (non-charter) public school students in IPS receive free and reduced lunch, leaving just less than a quarter (23%) paying for lunch.

While the IPS student demographics vary from building to building across the more than 60 schools in the district, as indicated in the chart below, of the nearly 30,000 students IPS serves across the district, in 2016, 70% of these students are eligible for free and reduced lunches. This rate is significant in understanding a baseline for students living in poverty and how that influences their educational needs. While 2016 data shows a slight decrease compared to the 2014 data, comparisons between private and public free and reduced lunch rates indicate the socioeconomic isolation among schools in this area.

| IPS Free and Reduced Lunch as a Percent of Enrollment |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Enrollment** | **Number of Students receiving Free or reduced lunches** | **% of Students Eligible Free and Reduced Lunch** |
| PK | 889 | 501 | 56 |
Employment, Education Attainment, and Income

Data generated from SAVI provides community level data within the city of Indianapolis on employment, educational attainment, and income for residents in Indianapolis. SAVI data from 2014 shows that the city’s unemployment rate within IPS boundaries was nearly 16%, while the unemployment rate for Marion County (which includes IPS and most of the township school districts surrounding IPS) was 11%7.
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Educational attainment shows among persons over the age of 25, within IPS boundaries, 22% did not have a high school diploma and only 22% had a Bachelor’s degree or higher. In contrast, in Marion County, 15% did not have a high school diploma while 27% had a Bachelor’s degree or higher.

Within IPS boundaries, nearly 16% of households have an income of less than $10,000, a quarter (25%) have an income between $10,000 and $24,999; just over a quarter (29%) of households have an income between $25,000 and $49,999; and just over 20% of households have an income over $50,000. In contrast, for Marion County overall, a slightly smaller number (10%), of households earn less than the same $10,000 a year; and the percentage (29%) of households earn between $25,000 and $49,000 a year. However, 43% of households in Marion County earn over $50,000, a value considerably higher than the 20% of households within IPS boundaries.

This is a particularly high-income disparity considering that IPS boundaries fall exclusively within Marion County. The differences in median income between IPS and Marion County provide further evidence for this disparity in income. In 2014, the median household income of those in Marion County was $42,378, while the median household income of those living within IPS boundaries was $31,400, a difference of nearly $11,000. Thirty-two percent (32%) of the population within IPS boundaries live in poverty. In contrast, only 21% of the overall population within Marion County live in poverty.

The image below, from IPS’s PowerPoint presentation on Choice enrollment, provides a color-coded visualization of poverty by census tract within the boundaries of IPS. Red, yellow, and orange represent areas where 20.5% or more of the population lives in poverty.
Student Success through Socioeconomic Diversity specifically, the red areas indicate the highest extent of poverty, ranging from 40.5% to 70.2% of the census tract living in poverty.

The Link between Race and Poverty

Findings from the National Poverty Center indicate in 2009 that one in three African American children, and one in four Latino children, were living in poverty; in contrast, only one in two Caucasian children were living in poverty. The study found that when controlled for poverty, education, and unemployment, still reported better health outcomes in comparison to African Americans, Latinos, and Asians. The study cites cumulative disadvantage—which includes the
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cumulative effect of disparities in education, social networks, health, and public policy--as a
contributor to the perpetuation of poverty among racial minorities.

McKinsey and Company’s analysis of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)
indicates that when educational outcomes are measured by race, Caucasians outperform African
American and Hispanic students at each income level\textsuperscript{11}. Data from the National Equity Atlas,
produced by PolicyLink and the University of California, show in 2014, among all public school
students, 43% of students of color attended high poverty schools while only 8% of Caucasian
students did\textsuperscript{12}. This socioeconomic isolation has negative consequences for achievement.

The McKinsey analysis indicates that poor Caucasian students performed better than non-poor
African American students on the NAEP’s 4\textsuperscript{th} grade math assessment. Additional research
suggests that socioeconomic isolation among students of color is the strongest predictor of racial
gaps in educational achievement\textsuperscript{13}. McKinsey and Company’s analysis of the National
Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicates that when educational outcomes are
measured by race, Caucasians outperform African American and Hispanic students at each
income level\textsuperscript{11}. For example, the analysis indicates that poor Caucasian students performed better
than non-poor, African American students on the NAEP’s 4\textsuperscript{th} grade math assessment. The same
study also shows that low-income students across races receive much lower test scores than
higher income students.

**The Local Link between Race and Poverty - SAVI Community Profile of Indianapolis**

IPS takes careful consideration for voluntary inclusion of racial information of their population
into consideration for the development of the blueprint. While the blueprint developed upon
award of this grant will be rooted in a race-neutral approach, the strategy developed to address
socioeconomic diversity within IPS includes consideration and awareness of race and racial issues within the district. The overlap between poverty and race in Indianapolis and its effect on student achievement warrants special consideration.

While the Opening Doors and Expanding Opportunities Program grant aims to address socioeconomic diversity, that issue cannot be addressed within the IPS region without considering the correlation between race and economic standing. Data from the Annie E. Casey Foundation indicates that African American children in Indiana are twice as likely to live in poverty as Caucasian children\textsuperscript{14}. Additionally, data from SAVI examines poverty rates within Indianapolis. Poverty rates by neighborhood in Indianapolis in 2014 indicates that non-Caucasians are disproportionately impoverished in Indianapolis compared Caucasian residents\textsuperscript{15}. Overall, within Indianapolis, at 16%, Caucasian residents have the lowest poverty rate. In contrast, the poverty rate for Asians and African Americans in Indianapolis are nearly equal, at approximately 25% and 26%, respectively. Hispanic residents in Indianapolis experience poverty at the highest rates at 33%. The IPS enrollment demographics and poverty rates mirror the community’s--overall poverty rates, and the poverty rates among racial minorities, are higher than poverty rates of Caucasian residents within the district\textsuperscript{15}.

The map generated from the SAVI website (below) shows that six communities in the center of the city have poverty rates over 40%. Nine more neighborhoods in this area have a poverty rate between 30 and 40%. Each of these neighborhoods is exclusively or partially in the IPS school district. As noted by the graphic to the left, the selection of IPS
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district neighborhoods with 25% or more of the residents living in poverty shows that while 29% of Caucasians within this cluster lived in poverty, the poverty rate for African Americans in this area was 44%, for Hispanics 44%, and for Asians 52%\textsuperscript{15}.

Additional SAVI data shows the racial and ethnic composition of residents within IPS geographic boundaries for all ages. Caucasians compose roughly half (53%) of the population within IPS geographic boundaries, with a Hispanic population of nearly 11%. African Americans compose nearly 40% of the population\textsuperscript{7}.

Based on enrollment and census data, as presented above, IPS has made a connection between poverty, race, and education in Indianapolis. In 2015, 81% of African American and 83% of Hispanic third graders in Indiana tested at grade level for reading compared to 94% of Caucasians, according Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) data\textsuperscript{16}. Additionally, IDOE data
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show that in 2016, 80% of African American and 86% of Hispanics in Indiana graduated from high school, while 91% of Caucasian students graduated\textsuperscript{17}.

In 2015, just over half (52\%) of the total school enrollment in Marion County (including public, private, and charter schools) was African American and just over a quarter of the total enrollment for all school types was Caucasian (29\%) and 13\% was Hispanic\textsuperscript{7}. At the same time, 54\% of Caucasian children in Marion country attended private or majority Caucasian township schools, compared to only 8\% of African Americans. A considerably lower percent of private school enrollment is African American (18\%), and an even lower percent is Hispanic (8.5\%)\textsuperscript{7}.

Private school enrollment in the district accounts for almost 16\% of the area’s enrollment, as previously referenced. However, private school enrollment contains considerably more (45\%) Caucasians than public schools. In contrast, a considerably lower portion of African Americans (32\%) and Hispanics (14.5\%) are attending private schools relative to public\textsuperscript{7}.

**Public School Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>2016 Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>14,454</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7440</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAVI Data from 2014 on public school enrollment is commensurate with DOE data from 2016, as provided in the table above – total IPS enrollment by race. These data show that half (50%) of the public school enrollment was African American\textsuperscript{Error! Bookmark not defined.}, than a quarter of the public school enrollment was Caucasian (22%) or Hispanic (23%). These differences are small for African Americans and Caucasians. They suggest a slightly lower proportion (2%) of African Americans are attending public schools, and they suggest that a slightly lower proportion of Caucasians (7%) are attending public schools. A larger disparity (10%) exists for Hispanic students, indicating a higher concentration within public schools than overall.

**Socioeconomic Integration in Schools**

IPS recognizes the challenge of creating more socioeconomic diversity within individual schools. An examination of similar urban public school districts has demonstrated some examples of successful programs for facilitating economic integration within school districts and provided evidence of the increased student outcomes that integration has for low-income students.

**Louisville, Kentucky:** In 2003, Louisville merged their city-county government in much the same way that Indianapolis did in 1970. However, the Louisville merger, unlike the Indianapolis merger included the consolidation of schools; the Indianapolis merger did not include the schools therefore, leaving Indianapolis Public Schools as a district separate from the county’s township schools. The Louisville city-county governmental merger and consolidation of the schools districts allowed for busing students between the city’s urban and suburban schools\textsuperscript{18}. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>6078</th>
<th>20.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong> 29,583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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School districts in Louisville assign students to a particular school based on two factors -- their residential neighborhood and a formula that ensures racial and socioeconomic diversity in each school. Research comparing the Louisville schools with those in Detroit indicates while the two cities’ schools were equally segregated in the late 1970s, today the average African American student in Louisville attends a school that is 50% Caucasian, while the average African American student in Detroit attends school with fewer than 2% Caucasian students. Based on standardized test scores alone it appears that this formula and the intentional integration of students from varying racial and socio-economic backgrounds has supported stronger academic performance. The study indicates that in 2011, 62% of Louisville’s fourth graders scored at or above basic levels for math, while only 31% of Detroit students scored as well\textsuperscript{19}.

**Omaha, Nebraska:** In 2007, the Learning Community Coordinating Council was created in Omaha, Nebraska to improve the educational outcomes of children living in poverty. The council governs eleven school districts in Omaha. The council oversaw a tax revenue distribution plan and inter-district transfer program, with the goal for the city’s schools to replicate the socioeconomic composition of the city. The tax distribution plan facilitated more equitable funding by appropriating additional tax revenue to schools that created a transfer plan based on socioeconomic status. School districts that accepted lower income children from outside districts did not have to allocate additional funding for their transportation. The Learning Community also created programming and community centers in the areas with the highest poverty rates to increase educational outcomes for low-income students\textsuperscript{20}. These community centers provide intellectually engaging after school programming. The council’s programming primarily focuses on the needs of the youngest children in poverty. They offer intensive early childhood programs that provide early education to low-income children as well as additional after school and
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summer programming to supplement the needs of low-income children who are struggling academically. Results from their annual evaluation shows that a proficiency gap of 21% exists between low and higher income students. However, their results show that between 2010 and 2016, students from lower incomes had greater gains in test scores than those of middle and higher incomes (16% vs. 9%), indicating they are improving at higher rates.21

Focus on SIG Schools

IPS strives for continuous performance improvement for all schools within district boundaries. Through the development of a blueprint, IPS will address socioeconomic disparities, and garner a better understanding for why families living within IPS boundaries choose or do not choose IPS with a special interest and consideration for SIG schools versus non-SIG schools.

The opportunity to apply for Choice schools within IPS positively correlates with higher socioeconomic status, as confirmed by the majority of demographics of families who submit applications on time for the Choice schools relative to families who submit late applications.9 IPS seeks to better understand the perspectives, and identify how to best communicate with all families, and cultivate more socioeconomically diverse school ecosystems.

IPS takes special care and consideration for addressing challenging topics. For example, IPS has created a Racial Equity Pilot program, which includes schools from across the district working to address racism in schools. IPS has partnered with Racial Equity Institute to understand best practices in approaching challenging conversations about race and equity within the district. IPS will take the same care and consideration, and build upon what they have learned within the racial equity pilot in their approach of addressing the high poverty rates and lack of
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socioeconomic diversity, particularly in SIG schools. The racial equity pilot is an important component within the holistic understanding of addressing diversity in IPS schools.

IPS plans to continue to utilize best practice research, assess the information gathered through a needs analysis, community and parent insights to best inform the strategy to support disadvantaged youth within the IPS system.

The purpose of this plan is to evaluate and create a plan, while taking the over 60 schools and nearly 30,000 students within the IPS LEA into consideration in order to effectively and efficiently develop the best strategy. Within this LEA, there are 37 SIG schools, ten are identified as focus schools and the others are considered priority. With this large population of students, and high number of students receiving free and reduced lunch, IPS remains focused on creating strategies to elevate the entire student population, thus creating better places to learn.

Through the development of the blueprint, IPS plans to explore weaknesses and opportunities through engagement with families, teachers, staff, and community members. One significant gap already noted is the loss of students either to private schools or other schools outside of IPS. IPS has seen a significant decline in enrollment over the past several decades. IPS would utilize the funds to support activities like the parent focus groups and surveys to better understand both why families are choosing to send their children to school outside of IPS, as well as assessing the needs of the current students and families. IPS seeks to keep and attract families to all of the IPS schools. By examining the community as a whole and considering the qualitative and quantitative data of the families within each school boundary, IPS will be able to address strategies for change influencing socioeconomic diversity for their schools.
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An Indy Star article shows that the desegregation order did not take effect until 1981, although the Indiana General Assembly passed a law in 1949 requiring the state to begin integrating schools. The order lasted for 35 years, ending before the beginning of the 2016-17 school year⁶.

As noted in the table on the next page, this data shows township and suburban schools have been among the fastest growing schools in the state⁴. In contrast, IPS enrollment has been shrinking; comparing the two provides evidence for families choosing these schools and neighborhoods over IPS. DOE data shows that between 2006 and 2016 IPS lost nearly 8000 students, down from nearly 38,000 in 2006. Over the same time period, enrollment in Washington Township, on the north central side of Indianapolis, increased by nearly 1300 students, for a 2016 enrollment of nearly 12,000 students. Wayne Township, to the west of IPS, experienced the largest increase of 1,849 students for a 2016 enrollment of 16,127 students. The table on the next page identifies how IPS ranks based on enrollment among other LEAs in the area.

| 2006 to 2016 Enrollment Differences at Selected Indianapolis MSA Schools⁴ |
|-----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|
| School Name                 | School Type | 2016     | 2006     | 10 Year  |
|                             |             | Enrollment| Enrollment| Difference|
| IPS                         | Urban       | 29,583    | 37,554   | -7971     |
| Decatur Township            | Township    | 6,234     | 6,028    | 206       |
| Franklin Township           | Township    | 9,069     | 7,818    | 1,251     |
| Lawrence Township           | Township    | 15,591    | 16,209   | -618      |
| Perry Township              | Township    | 15,608    | 13,840   | 1,768     |
| Pike Township               | Township    | 11,254    | 10,751   | 503       |
| Warren Township             | Township    | 12,267    | 11,771   | 496       |
An opportunity identified by IPS is the change in legislation in 2014, allowing schools to become Innovation Network Schools. IPS has launched several schools in the past couple of years, and the Innovation Network staff is in the process of developing a rubric to help detect, determine and assess the eligibility of a school that requests or requires an intervention strategy because of continued failing performance. Over the past two years with the development of the Innovation School Network, several of the schools IPS has worked with were SIG eligible, and often required the intervention of transformation or a restart into an Innovation Network School. Schools that are SIG eligible are often those with the highest economic isolation, with the majority (75% to 100%) of their students at or below the poverty line. This rubric development is an important piece in creating the strategy for addressing schools and students in distress, and
Student Success through Socioeconomic Diversity will be taken into consideration during the development of the blueprint. In thinking about the development of this rubric, it brings up the strategy discussed earlier in the document regarding the strategy for developing high enrollment demand in low demand areas. However, it is critical to note that students within the geographic boundaries understand the new opportunities and they have the first chance to apply for the new schools near their homes. The work conducted through the Innovation Network offices are critical in coordinating and planning efforts for the implementation of strategies for SIG schools.

For example, IPS has already seen immediate success with Riverside Elementary School, a school identified at the district level for a needed intervention after being a failing school for several years. Riverside is a restart school that joined the Innovation Network in 2015 to partner with Global Preparatory Academy, and has welcomed their first cohort of students in the 2016-17 school year. This school conducted several parent engagement sessions, community activities, and made sure to include the community within the transition. In fact, they increased parent engagement by having teachers meet with 95% of families for face-to-face beginning of the year conferences, and 72% have already met for mid-year conferences. The school is still rescheduling with those who have not yet come in. This school had open enrollment with a priority of making sure that the students who were within the geographic boundaries of the school were first priority, and then families from outside of the boundary were able to apply. This strategy has shown great success and is now growing at a very rapid rate. The district identified a need of restarting Riverside and identified another need for creating a bilingual program within the school. Riverside partnered with Global Preparatory Academy to develop the program, and students are thriving.
Significance

This project will allow IPS to move forward in properly assessing their current situation in order to proactively and effectively support students that are struggling. Ultimately, through the development of this blueprint and research developed, IPS looks forward to share their findings with other districts as possible to provide effective strategies addressing socioeconomic diversity.

IPS has collected a significant amount of data and feedback from community members, families, teachers, staff, and others; however, has been unable to allocate the resources to evaluate the current data. Through this funding opportunity, IPS will assess the information garnered through the positive changes implemented thus far during new leadership, as of 2013 with Superintendent Ferebee, and continue to push the system towards a higher standard of excellence. Through funding opportunities like this and in conjunction with other projects IPS is already developing, such as the lottery logic and the racial equity pilot this grant allows for exponential growth within a school system facing high poverty rates.

This funding opportunity will allow IPS to invest resources toward a needs analysis to better understand what the target population is facing and how IPS can play a role in facilitating positive change for families. Through the process of the needs analysis, IPS will garner valuable information to influence decisions on how to best serve their families, particularly those within the SIG schools. IPS currently does not have the capacity to complete the activities outlined in the Program Plan; therefore this funding stream would allow for incredible advancements to support an impact nearly 30,000 students. The blueprint will also help identify the types of additional partners to allow IPS continued expansion and innovation.
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Quality of Project Design

The quality of this project design is cultivated from the strong leadership of IPS. In September 2013, Dr. Lewis Ferebee joined the Indianapolis Public Schools Corporation as Superintendent. His appointment resulted in several positive leadership changes across the district over the past three years:

- IPS has worked to identify priority schools within the district for providing intensive academic support.
- IPS has streamlined the processes and procedures to enhance efficiencies and make access to resources easier for schools.
- IPS leadership has been supporting schools to become more autonomous, allowing schools to have more decision making power to address the needs of their students.

Through these changes, the IPS leadership team continues to pursue excellence by addressing challenges through engagement with families and community, as well as reviewing best practice research to construct strong and calculated solutions, thus resulting in the pursuit of the socioeconomic blueprint development.

The DOE Open Doors, Expanding Opportunities funding will support the current trajectory that IPS is on and provide the district with a solid foundation (blueprint) to continue to move forward and address socioeconomic diversity in buildings across the district. To produce an effective blueprint to increase socioeconomic diversity in schools, IPS will conduct the following:

- A Needs Analysis;
- Additional best practices research meeting the Department of Education standards of quality evidence; and
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- Evaluate current programs and systems affecting enrollment strategies and diversity.

The district will then utilize this information to develop a blueprint and an implementation plan.

IPS intends to hire a research and evaluation consultant to develop a needs analysis focused on better understanding the causes for variance in socioeconomic diversity across IPS and identifying needs to balance the socioeconomic variance of the lowest rated schools within the IPS system. The consultant will work with a team of identified IPS leaders at the district and school level to ensure that the assessment is holistic and accurate. All aspects of the consultant’s work will entail regular communication with IPS leadership.

**Task 1 – Analysis of Existing Data**

IPS will provide existing data to the consultant to provide baseline information and a foundation for the remaining tasks in the needs analysis. The existing data will likely include results of previous parent, community, and school surveys as well as existing student data. Data from previously administered, relevant surveys will be included in the final needs analysis report. Student data will focus on the socioeconomic composition of IPS schools, including free and reduced lunch and textbook rates. This analysis of existing student data is critical to identify next steps for data collection. Upon reviewing existing data, the team will start to identify notable differences or similarities with SIG schools versus non-SIG schools within the district. If after reviewing the existing data, the consultant feels there is a need to collect additional data, the consultant will work with IPS leadership to ensure that they adhere to IPS’s previously utilized methods, already scheduled, and projected needs for survey delivery and data collection to ensure consistency (see Task 3). The consultant will also ensure comparison of the demographic
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data of SIG schools and that of the residential population. IPS will ensure that the needs
assessment budget allows enough time for properly analyzing existing data.

**Task 2 – Parent and Community Member Focus Groups**

Parent and community focus groups will provide diverse perspectives and detailed accounts of
parent and community needs. To gain a better understanding for why parents are choosing or not
choosing IPS, the focus groups will aim to include both IPS and non-IPS parents to better
understand their perspectives. These focus groups will interview parents and community
members separately, to allow data to emerge in light of their respective roles and experiences.
Separate focus group guides, which will include instructions on facilitating focus groups and a
list of questions, will be developed to ensure that the focus group conversations are relevant to
each audience. The consultant will develop and coordinate these focus group guides in
conjunction with IPS leadership to ensure strategic and thoughtful engagement occurs. The
consultant will facilitate the focus groups in areas within the boundaries of IPS with the highest
amount of socioeconomic hardship, as determined by Task 1 and through communication with
IPS staff. Consultants will facilitate four community member focus groups and eight parent focus
groups, although this composition is subject to change. Following the focus groups, the
consultant in partnership with IPS will analyze the feedback to distill key themes and quotes that
emerge. It is anticipated that this will highlight facets of the district’s socioeconomic isolation,
grounded in the experiences of parents and community members.

**Task 3 – Survey Development and Analysis**

Following the review of the existing data and the information gleaned from the focus groups, the
consultants and IPS may choose to develop and distribute an additional survey to capture
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additional information. The consultant will work with IPS to create a survey that will occur in conjunction with IPS’s existing survey research activities, as to avoid survey fatigue of participants and duplication of effort. The content of the survey will be determined after IPS’s existing data has undergone formal analysis for the needs analysis. This will allow the consultant to develop a survey instrument that will collect adequate data to round out the needs analysis. Surveys will be geared toward gaining additional understanding of the socioeconomic isolation within the boundaries of IPS. This will be distributed to a sample of families living within IPS district boundaries; the population will include those families who choose to send their children to IPS schools and those who choose to send their children to non-IPS schools.

Task 4 – Needs Analysis Report

The needs analysis report will be the culmination of Tasks 1 through 3. Data from all sources will be synthesized in this final report, providing an overall portrait of the socioeconomic isolation and hardship within the district. It will identify the district’s neighborhoods and schools experiencing the highest and lowest levels of need. This report will guide the direction of existing and future efforts designed to alleviate poverty and reduce socioeconomic isolation.

Task 5- Best Practices Research

IPS has identified the significance and importance of addressing socioeconomic diversity within their schools prior to submitting this application. During the development of the blueprint, IPS leaders will work to further understand these issues and identify evidence-based best practices to inform the blueprint and meet the rigorous standards of the Department of Education. Through identification of schools implementing positive change and effective strategies addressing socioeconomic disparities, IPS will travel to other school districts that have developed and/or
implemented identified best practices, potentially to places like Omaha or Louisville as identified earlier in this document. The site visits will provide space and time for IPS leaders to observe the programs firsthand and to gain a better understanding of the strengths and challenges for implementing these programs through hands-on experiences and conversations with those implementing them. These observations and conversations will help IPS identify the most promising activities to pilot in IPS and the resources necessary for successful implementation. Upon conclusion of the desktop research and onsite visits, IPS will compile findings into a document to prepare for the development of blueprint and the implementation plan.

**Task 6- Evaluation and Consideration of Existing Programs**

IPS will compile a list of current programs influencing enrollment and engagement strategies to utilize during the development of the blueprint. Activities already identified are the racial equity pilot, Innovation Network School development, communication strategies, and creating more autonomy for schools within the IPS system.

**Task 7-Blueprint Development**

Once IPS is able to compile the information collected in the needs analysis, evaluation of current practices, and the best practices research, IPS will work with a consultant to write and develop the blueprint. The blueprint will include identification of schools impacted, number of students impacted, and goals moving forward into the 2025-2026 school years. Once the plan is completed, IPS leadership will present it to the Board of Commissioners at a board meeting. Once approved, IPS will submit the report to the Department of Education.

**Task 8- Implementation Plan Development**
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IPS will utilize information gathered throughout process listed above, particularly the best practices research, to understand how other school districts have implemented their strategies. IPS will create an implementation plan for the execution of their blueprint. The implementation plan will include a strategy on management, the identified schools, identification of students served, and a communications strategy for implementing the blueprint. IPS will make the blueprint available to DOE and other schools looking for more information on socioeconomic diversity strategies. Additionally, IPS understands that their work will serve as a model for other school districts and looks forward to creating evidence-based reports to share their strategies and challenges and successes with others. Through the development of the implementation plan, IPS will utilize current communication strategies and consider how to share their findings with other school districts in Indiana and across the country.

**Building upon current programs.**

IPS has implemented positive change through the system by developing different strategies and initiatives, and as part of the activities identified, IPS will evaluate the current strategies and consider how to build on positive existing programs. Additional programs, strategies, and activities to consider and evaluate for the blueprint include:

**Showcase of Schools:** IPS produces this annual outreach program to engage with parents and community members. The event includes representatives from every school and kick off the application window for Choice (magnet) school applications. Materials about and for this event are created in English and Spanish to meet the needs of the diverse population of families served within the IPS LEA. This is a way to inform parents, but also gather valuable feedback on what
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is most important to them in the schools, and how IPS can support those goals through the
development of this blueprint.

**Racial Equity Pilot:** To prepare employees to meet the needs of students, IPS has embarked on
an initiative around racial equity. Through partnership with the Racial Equity Institute, IPS
receives the training and guidance needed to increase knowledge, shift thinking, and elevate
understanding. The mission is to lead a collaboration of community members who will partner
with IPS to improve outcomes for all students by eliminating racial disproportionality and
disparity. IPS has already initiated work with several pilot schools within the LEA and will
continue to work and strengthen schools. Again, while the focus of the blueprint is addressing
the socioeconomic diversity of schools, there is a strong connection to race and poverty in
Indiana, so this program will provide sensitivity and consideration in development of the
blueprint and implementation plan to ensure that there is not intentional or unintentional isolation
of race or socioeconomic standing.

**Lottery Logic:** In support of this idea and to increase diversity in many forms, including
socioeconomic diversity, IPS has implemented a new lottery model, Lottery Logic, for its 26
Choice (magnet) schools -- their highest demand schools -- this year\(^24\). Components of this
system shrunk neighborhood boundaries in the school districts around Choice schools, as the
larger boundaries tended to favor higher income families. The measure also increased the
application period in order to give families more time to apply--this extended application period
will allow families who were previously unaware of the lottery system greater opportunity to learn
about and engage in the lottery process. These new guidelines expect to increase access to high
demand magnet and charter schools for lower income families, with the hope that it will help to
contribute to more socioeconomically integrated schools. IPS contracts with School Mint to
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manage the applications and data of the lottery logic system. The logic includes the following
priorities: Students who have siblings at the Choice Program are offered seats first, then students
who live in close proximity to the school, then students who applied to the same program last
year, but did not get in, then students of IPS employees. Remaining applicants with the lowest
(randomly generated) number are offered seats until the program is full. To ensure all students
have equitable access to exceptional educational options, district administrators complete annual
reports on Choice program demographic data with the opportunity to address any disparities that
may be identified within the lottery process. IPS is committed to making this process as user-
friendly as possible for families and recently presented a new online service to families
submitting applications. Right now, the lottery logic is only happening with choice schools,
because they are in high demand. Part of the blueprint development will be helping to better
understand why those schools are in high demand, and how IPS can create more demand in the
lower performing schools with high poverty rates.

**Innovation School:** One major change in academic and operational opportunities for IPS schools
was a result of Indiana state legislative change in 2014, which allows schools districts to create
Innovation Network Schools. Innovation Network Schools are able to work independently in
their choices for academic and operations, but still operate within the IPS LEA, and must meet
agreed upon student outcomes. This shift allows school leadership to be more adaptive to student
needs. This Innovation Network Schools is also relevant to addressing the socioeconomic
diversity and academic outcomes, as oftentimes the schools transitioning to an Innovation
Network School are those that are SIG eligible and are in need of an intervention of some kind.
Additionally, IPS will continue to explore the work the office of Innovation is doing within the
LEA and consider their potential opportunities to grow the number of Innovation Network
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Schools as another strategy to change outcomes for students by building a student population from socioeconomically diverse families. The integration of these two ideas is critical, as the development of autonomous schools is growing in the region and parents need to stay current on the different opportunities for their children²⁵.

**Communication Strategies:** IPS has a strong public relations team that has created communications toolkits for each school and principal with both school-specific and district-wide news. Within the toolkit, there are sample scripts for principals, PowerPoint presentations for staff, text message templates, tweets, and additional materials to print and send home with students. The public relations team also prepares materials in Spanish to accommodate non-native speakers within the region. The consideration of language and platform of delivery ensure that IPS makes the information as accessible as possible.

**Autonomy:** Within the IPS Strategic Plan 2015, autonomy for schools was identified as a priority. In March 2015, the IPS Board of School Commissioners unanimously approved Core Commitments and Beliefs that include moving toward an academic model where teachers and school leaders control and are responsible for what happens in their schools. In this framework, each school will make instructional and operational decisions that are in the best interest of the students they serve. This is not an immediate change, as the initiation of the transformation began with the 2016-17 school year. IPS refers to the autonomy of schools on a continuum, as all schools are responsible to the IPS Board of Commissioners; however, Innovation Network Schools are very autonomous, while traditional schools are less autonomous. IPS would like to eventually see all schools become autonomous. This will be an important consideration for the blueprint because it will require strategies that empower the schools to make adjustments to meet the needs of their students and families.
IPS will utilize the evaluation of current strategies and tools as listed above, in combination with the findings from the Needs Analysis and additional best practice research to fully develop a blueprint addressing SIG schools. IPS needs to include a holistic approach to best assess and plan for future programming.

**Partnerships**

IPS will rely on support from several existing partners ensuring success of the blueprint development.

- **Innovation Network Schools.** In 2014, state legislators approved a law that gave school districts across the state the authority to create Innovation Network Schools. These schools are able to operate with the authority to make decisions about all aspects of their school—both academic and operational—and are held accountable by the school district for agreed upon student outcomes. The purpose of innovation schools is to allow the district, and schools within the district, the flexibility to make decisions based on the specific needs of a school’s student body. Since 2014, the IPS Innovation Network has grown to include 10 schools including the Global Preparatory Academy, Kindezi Academy, and the Phalen Leadership Academy.

- **School Mint.** The School Mint manages the lottery logic software, and could potentially become engaged into the plan if IPS decides to expand the Lottery Logic.

- **Racial Equity Institute.** IPS partners with the Racial Equity Institute for the racial equity pilot to provide guidance on development of effective and ethical strategies addressing racial driven issues in the schools.
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- **Mind Trust.** The Mind Trust created an Innovation Network fellowship in 2014 in partnership with IPS and the Indianapolis Mayor’s Office of Education Innovation, to launch Innovation Network Schools within the city’s largest district. Fellows have the unprecedented opportunity to launch schools that have the freedoms and flexibilities of charter schools and the financial support and services of a district school, including a school building at little to no cost.

- **City of Indianapolis.** IPS partners with the Indianapolis Mayor’s Office on several initiatives. Chief among them is an extensive 18-month effort to brand Indianapolis’s unique educational landscape, which features several public school options for families: innovation, autonomous, choice, and traditional. Some of the goals of this joint effort are: 1) to ensure all families are informed about wide-ranging educational offerings; 2) to ensure that all students have access to high-quality schools; and 3) to promote Indianapolis as a hallmark for educational innovation and choice.

IPS anticipates that other partners will be identified and included in design as appropriate.

**Parent Involvement**

IPS has created systems to engage parents in very meaningful ways. For example, IPS has created Parental Involvement Educators (PIEs) to establish, maintain, and cultivate relationships with parents, teachers, and community partners to heighten the academic success of all students. IPS also has created are Parent Resource Centers (PRCs) to provide information and resources for parents and students as well as house copies of the school’s current approved School Improvement Plan for parents to read, review, and add comments using the state-approved rubrics. Finally, IPS is as transparent as possible with parents and routinely solicits their
Student Success through Socioeconomic Diversity feedback. IPS hosts monthly meetings and workshops, distributes newsletters, flyers, social media posts, and uses other forms of technology-supported communication to support outreach efforts. Parent engagement and interaction is very important to IPS and to student success. Through activities listed above, IPS plans to garner valuable insights through focus groups, surveys, and outreach initiatives like the Showcase of Schools.

**Quality of the Project Personnel**

IPS will utilize members of their leadership team to execute the blueprint and strategy.

**Mr. Patrick Herrel – IPS Enrollment Director.** Mr. Herrel will be the Project Director for this grant. In his role as Director of Enrollment and Options for IPS, Mr. Herrel provides leadership for the daily enrollment of new and transfer students. He assists families with the school choice process, inter-district transfers, school transfers, school lottery and outreach to students and families. In addition, Mr. Herrel maintains the integrity of the school choice student placement database, collects enrollment data, and monitors enrollment trends. Before joining IPS he was the founding CEO of the Accelerate Great Schools. He also was Vice President of Education Initiatives at the Mind Trust. Prior to his time at IPS, Patrick has been a leader through development of two incubator programs through an Innovation School Fellowship and charter school. Patrick is invested in the industry, starting his career with Teach for America Corps.

**Ms. Bridgette Robinson - Director of Federal and Special Programs.** Ms. Robinson has nearly twenty years of experience in human resources, accounting, and other administrative qualifications. Bridgette has been with the school system since 2006. She will support the Program Director, Patrick, with all of the administrative follow up for managing this grant. In her current role she provides leadership and coordination of Federal and Special Programs, performs
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a variety of supervisory and administrative tasks in developing and administering the operations
of federal grants according to federal, state, and local guidelines.

Other Key Personnel

Dr. Lewis Ferebee – Superintendent. Dr. Ferebee joined the IPS team in 2013 as the
Superintendent. Prior to this, the 16-year education veteran served as Chief of Staff for Durham
Public Schools in Durham, North Carolina. Dr. Ferebee’s extensive experience in attenuating the
impact of poverty on academic achievement boasts strategic turnaround for struggling Title I
schools, double-digit gains in End of Course Assessments (ECA) for Biology, Algebra and
English, and aggressive reductions in the dropout rate with concurrent increases in the graduation
rate as compared to state performance.

Dr. Wanda Legrand - Deputy Superintendent for Academics. Dr. Legrand has been working
in the education industry in a variety of capacities since 1990. During her time with IPS she has
helped implement new and innovative strategies supporting all students, including increasing the
graduation rates from 67% to 76% by installing a graduation success plan. Another
accomplishment included the cost savings acquired through the Academic Division for greater
efficiency and effectiveness saving IPS $557,000. Through her leadership, she has also placed
Parent Involvement Educators (PIE) in schools to increase parent involvement and engagement.
She also developed a racial equity initiative addressing the district’s racial achievement gap and
disproportionality.

Ms. Krista Turnage - Special Projects Manager. Ms. Turnage recently joined IPS as a Broad
Resident, a leadership development program aimed at improving public education by leveraging
management experiences from the private sector. Prior to joining IPS, Krista served 12 years in
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business management and strategic marketing. She has a proven track record of managing complex projects from conception through implementation. She has also led numerous consumer research projects, successfully translating consumer insights into actionable recommendations to drive business growth. Krista will support Patrick in the strategic and tactical management of the grant.

Ms. Aleesia Johnson – Director of Innovation Schools. Ms. Johnson joined the IPS team in 2015 where she has been leading the Innovation Schools, a group of schools with the autonomy to determine their academic and operational decisions in greater capacity than traditional IPS schools. She facilitates the development of systems of accountability and evaluation to best track their progress and development. Aleesia has 14 years of experience in education, with 6 years in the classroom and 7 in educational leadership. Assisting low-income communities and underserved students has been the primary focus of her professional career. Previously, she has held a variety of roles at KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory and Teach for America.

Ms. Jamie Van DeWalle - Director of Innovation Strategy. Ms. Van DeWalle joined IPS in early 2016, where she oversees and facilitates support services for Innovation Schools. Prior to IPS, Jamie spent 14 years in the education sector, with Teach for America and KIPP Delta Public Schools, where she was a founding director. She’s fulfilled a variety of roles in the classroom and in administrative capacities such as directing special projects and human resources.

Ms. Kristian Stricklen, Public Information Director. Ms. Stricklen has more than 20 years of communications experience. She joined the IPS team as public information director at the beginning of this year, helping inform executive level policy discussions, then taking those decisions and communicating them effectively to all stakeholders. Prior to joining IPS, Ms.
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Stricklen ran her own communications firm that provided public relations and communications strategy to the Indianapolis City-County Council among other clients. She also previously led communications efforts at the United Way of Central Indiana and gained invaluable crisis communications and marketing experience while working at one of the most prominent public relations firms in Indianapolis.

Consultant Support

IPS will engage with Thomas P. Miller and Associates (TPMA), an Indianapolis-based consulting firm, for support with various phases of this application. Founded in 1989, TPMA envisions a world that thinks strategically, works collaboratively, and acts sustainably. In keeping with that vision, we empower organizations and communities through strategic partnerships and informed solutions that create positive, sustainable change. TPMA has more than 27 years of experience in preparing regional and local economic development strategies. TPMA couples this experience with expertise in research and evaluation, workforce development, education, and philanthropic services. This provides a well-rounded, comprehensive approach to our work, moving items from ideas to goals to tangible results.

TPMA views their clients as partners and take pride in working with them to move items from ideas to written goals to tangible results. TPMA excels at translating completed research, analysis, and planning efforts into implementation activities tailored to the assets and opportunities of each client. TPMA has worked with numerous nonprofit, economic development, workforce development, and education organizations in more than 40 states across the United States. TPMA’s 65 professionals include several experts in research and evaluation
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who also assist clients with the creation of data gathering tools to help track outcomes and adjust strategies for the most impact.

**Quality of Management Plan**

IPS has a history of managing federal and state funded grants including SIG grants and Titles I, II, and III grants. IPS has managed around $298M over 13 years. Fiscal monitoring of federal grants, are done on a daily, monthly, and quarterly basis, to ensure expenditures are used appropriately. Established processes and reporting platforms are in place to assist in the delivery of this approach. The Office of Federal and Special Programs works in concert with the district’s financial mainframe system (Munis Tyler) as well as a real time system, called Crystal XI reporting. Both systems are used to assist the department with checks and balances, internal controls, and reporting financial data. Additionally, IPS has staffing and monitoring processes to ensure that all grant dollars are properly expended and monitored.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

Mr. Patrick Herrel, IPS Enrollment Director, will be the program manager for all activities funded through this grant. Ms. Bridgette Y. Robinson, Director of Federal & Special Programs, will be the primary person responsible for monitoring compliance and financial activities within this grant. Additionally, they will be able to lean on resources in the IPS office to:

- Monitor and track spending (accounting);
- Ensure all activities and expenditures are in line with grant requirements (compliance);
- Engage parents in grant related programs and feedback sessions (Parent Involvement Coordinators at the district and school level);
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- Reach out to families living in IPS district boundaries, but choosing not to send their children to an IPS school (Non-public School Coordinator); and

- Provide streamlined information to all schools—principals, teachers, and parents—regarding all activities related to this funding (Director of Communication).

For all research needs, IPS plans to contract with a vendor who has experience working with and knowledge of the school district.

IPS provides DOE with the assurances that they will follow and execute best practices, create a blueprint, and meet the requirements of the evaluation requests of the DOE. IPS understands that this may be in the form of presentations to DOE, as well as submitting annual performance reports, and a final report.

**Timeline and Milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Launch</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director attend National Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Program Management Team- set up administratively for the grant period</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Analysis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Existing Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/ Community Member Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Development and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Best Practice Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional desktop best practice research- to meet evidence based criteria of DOE</td>
<td>** **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit to schools implementing best practice research</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile findings from additional best practice research and site visits</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation of Programs and current Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess Innovation Network Schools goals and plans addressing restarts and transformation schools</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine schools to be served under the blueprint</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of potential cost savings through strategies implemented</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile findings</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Write blueprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop goals for outcomes</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write the strategy and Blueprint</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare the blueprint for Board Approval</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit blueprint to DOE</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Write Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write the strategy and management plan</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare the plan for Board Approval</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Success through Socioeconomic Diversity
Submit blueprint to DOE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comply with DOE evaluation requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Performance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Final Performance Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPS works extensively to engage parents with transitions and opportunities. IPS consistently engages in both broad and target market research and community outreach activities to gauge stakeholder pulse, identify important trends, and respond to process improvement opportunities. White board strategy sessions to help plan widespread engagement for our most impactful change initiatives include subject matter experts, community leaders, and influencers. Focus group sessions include representatives from a myriad of stakeholder groups to beta test new and revised concepts, and marketing approaches. Annual, semi-annual, and quarterly surveys engage our parents and the community at large in opportunities to share opinions on district initiatives, activities, offerings, customer service and more. Town hall, working group, speakers’ bureau, and other public meeting formats allow district leaders to engage in meaningful and informative dialogue with stakeholders. Comprehensive communication toolkits are provided to schools for school leadership and parent involvement coordinators to disseminate information – including key messages and intended outcomes – to families in the most preferred modes and languages, and solicit their critical feedback. The aforementioned and several other engagement tactics enable IPS to formulate brand strategy and increase awareness, assess and respond to stakeholder affinity and dismay, and promote a proactive and authentic relationship with those whom we proudly serve. Through the cultivation of information gathered, and the current forms of
Student Success through Socioeconomic Diversity communication, IPS strives to make sure that everyone in the community is invited and encourage to engage with feedback and support of the work IPS does.

**Adequacy of Resources**

IPS has extensive experience in managing federal funds, and has developed a realistic budget in order to support the activities discussed in this application. This blueprint is an extensive and comprehensive approach to addressing issues across the over 60 schools within the LEA.

The costs identified within the proposal align with typical IPS budgeting practices. Proposed contract prices also include budget estimates from consultants to help estimate pricing for needs analysis activities. IPS believes this is a reasonable request based on the desire to focus on evaluating as much of the district as possible, which serves over 30,000 students annually.

IPS also has strong partnership relationships allowing for successful development and advancement. Outside of the general funds IPS also pursues funding opportunities, such as this one to support further development of programs, initiatives, and technical assistance support.

Innovation schools in IPS buildings receive the same quality level of service from our Facilities Management Division (FMD) as all other IPS schools. Building maintenance, cleaning, and needed capital projects are prioritized and acted upon by FMD. Two additional operational services, Food Services and Transportation, are contracted specifically with each school and are outlined within their respective Innovation Agreements; for schools choosing to utilize our services, IPS prioritizes and delivers these services in the same fashion as to all other IPS schools. Other funding opportunities, such as this grants, will assist Innovation Schools and IPS in offsetting initial startup costs for needs and wants, then to assist in transition costs over the next months or years for programmatic changes that may involve facility changes and upgrades.


5. IPS Planning Department. [Data file]. Retrieved February 8, 2017.


7. SAVI. (2017). *SAVI Community Profiles: Indianapolis Public Schools – Marion County*. See Appendix A.
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PATRICK HERREL

EXPERIENCE

Accelerate Great Schools

Founding Chief Executive Officer

July 2015 - November 2016

- Founding leader for new, Cincinnati-based education organization: a $25M nonprofit education fund ($18.25M raised to date) committed to growing the number of excellent schools serving all students in Cincinnati by investing in teacher and school leader pipelines; kickstarting new district, charter and private schools; aligning statewide policies to support excellent schools; and engaging parents and families.

- Oversaw initial investments to create 1,200 seats out of 4,800 five-year seat creation goal:
  - $1.3M investment to expand the successful Seton Education Partners and Cincinnati Archdiocese collaboration to transform two low-performing schools - St. Francis De Sales in Walnut Hills and St. Cecilia in Oakley, which will create 600 high-quality seats (launched in 2016).
  - $2.55M investment to launch the first of a network of Phalen Leadership Academies (PLA) schools in Cincinnati; fostered a ground-breaking partnership between PLA and Cincinnati Public Schools (CPS) that will launch a new, high-performing school in Price Hill and will help address CPS’s overcrowding challenges by serving 600 students (will launch in 2017).

- Developed community, funder, policy and education partnerships, hired a highly-qualified, diverse and locally-connected staff of four, and built a governing board of funders and civic and community leaders.

The Mind Trust

Vice President of Education Initiatives

July 2011 - May 2015

- Served on senior leadership team:
  - Offered critical direction in shaping The Mind Trust’s long-term strategy and direction as member of the five-person organizational leadership team with duties including development of strategy and policy work of The Mind Trust.

- Developed, launched and lead two school incubators – Innovation School Fellowship and Charter School Incubator:
  - Developed and lead first-ever recruitment, selection, accountability and support protocols for the nationally unique Incubator, through which The Mind Trust awards $250,000-$1,000,000 prizes to leadership teams establishing networks of charter schools in Indianapolis, and Fellowship through which The Mind Trust awards up to $150,000 and a year of planning and support to educators who will launch autonomous schools with Indianapolis Public School buildings.
  - Directed selection process and support and accountability systems for first four Charter School Incubator winners – KIPP: Indianapolis, Phalen Leadership Academies, Christel House International, and Tindley Charter Schools – which will launch 22 new charter schools over seven years serving more than 12,000 students, and led selection process for first two Innovation School Fellowship winners.

- Oversaw new nonprofit incubator – Education Entrepreneur Fellowship:
  - Oversaw signature Education Entrepreneur Fellowship including recruitment, selection, accountability and all Fellowship programming for multiple $250,000 awards, allowing an education innovator to launch a new organization in Indianapolis.
  - Supported and managed alumnus Fellow Jesse Hahnel, who successfully launched FosterEd, which combats the academic achievement gap among foster children by providing them with
trained experts to serve as education advocates and was adopted and fully funded as a statewide initiative in the summer of 2012 because of its success, and
  - Selected, supported and managed alumna Fellow Nicole Fulgham, who launched The Expectations project, an organization that mobilizes communities of faith to advocate for improved education outcomes; also selected, support and manage Fellow Mariama Carson, who is launching a dual language immersion charter school in 2016.

Teach For America
Senior Recruitment Director  
June 2008-April 2011
  - One of eight Recruitment Directors promoted from a class of more than 120 to manage a 13-person team. Led team to achieve a 25% growth in overall applicants; 51% growth in exceptional applicants; 34% growth among applicants of color; and 30% growth among low-income applicants.
  - Founded Recruitment Team’s Native American Diversity Initiative yielding 78% growth in applications among Native Americans and 110% growth in admissions,
  - Chosen among 1,500+ staff to serve on 50-person team evaluating borderline applicants, and
  - Led staff hiring and professional development cycles for the Midwest region staff.

Recruitment Director  
June 2007-June 2008
  - Aggressively recruited top college students to apply for and join the teaching corps, and
  - Drove 35% growth in portfolio applications in single year while producing the largest number of Hispanic corps members on the entire recruitment team from a single school.

West Charlotte High School
Teacher; Teach For America Corps Member, 10th Grade Civics and Economics  
July 2005-June 2007
  - Participated in a highly-selective corps of young college graduates who teach in struggling schools, and
  - Moved students from lowest performing in district (27% end-of-course passing rate) to 3rd highest (68% passing rate) and worked collaboratively on a team that increased end-of-course passing rate by 20 points, the largest growth in the state.

LEADERSHIP, PRESENTATIONS, ACTIVITIES, and HONORS

30 Under 30: Education, Forbes Magazine  
Recognized nationally by Forbes Magazine as one of 30 “millennials overhauling education”

Expert Reviewer, Community Education Building, Wilmington, DE

Featured Panelist, National Association of Charter School Authorizers conference, Amelia Island, FL

Panelist, CEE-Trust and Fordham Foundation school incubation televised discussion, Washington, D.C.

Political Candidate, Lakeview High School Council, Chicago, IL

Chief Justice, Honor Council, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA

Successfully completed 5 half marathons, avid alpine and telemark skier, tennis and platform tennis player

EDUCATION

The College of William and Mary in Virginia  
August 2001-May 2005

Leadership and achievement scholarships and awards: Parents’ Association Junior of the Year Scholarship, Jost Scholarship (given to one student annually), Dudley Memorial Scholarship (given to one student annually), Ewell Award (given to 30 seniors annually).
Summary of Qualifications
Confident, innovative, and highly qualified Accounting professional with over 19 years of experience in diverse markets. Possessing an MBA as well as a solid background that encompasses accounting procedures, payroll functions and Human Resource management. Resourceful individual who excels in planning and developing budgets. Maintains the ability to execute sound decisions while managing various projects adhering to time and financial restraints. Proven track record in consistently and effectively delivering accounting services that enhance the company's purpose and profitability. Proficient in ensuring that appropriate internal controls are maintained and that checks and balances are in place.

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

ACCOUNTING EXPERIENCE:
• Fixed Asset Management
• Fiscal Audit and Accountability
• Financial Reporting and Analysis
• Knowledge of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)
• Knowledge of General Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)
• Monitoring and Reviewing Accounting Reports
• Internal Controls
• Administering Payroll Functions
• Accounts Receivables and Accounts Payables
• Planning and Developing Budgets
• Project Management
• Grant and Contract Management
• Forecasting and Report Generation

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE:
• Maintaining Employee Files
• Employee Benefit Administration
• Recruiting, Hiring and Terminating
• Employee Handbook Management
• Employee Relations
• HRIS/FRIS Mainframe Systems

OFFICE MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE:
• Supervision of Employees
• Departmental Procedures and Policies Development
• Microsoft Office applications
• Dreamweaver CS5
• Crystal Reports
• Munis/Tyler Systems
• EPIC Procurement Software
EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

*Indianapolis Public Schools*, Indianapolis, IN

**Director of Federal and Special Programs**
Provide leadership and coordination of Federal and Special Programs. Performs a variety of supervisory and administrative tasks in developing and administering the operations of federal grants according to federal, state, and local guidelines. Directs and coordinates the implementation of the Title I program by providing help to eligible schools in preparing their plans, maintaining appropriate documentation, maintaining their budget, and ensuring adherence to federal, state and local policies and procedures. The Director also directs and coordinates the implementation of Title IIA, School Improvement grants and other related federal programs.

*Indianapolis Public Schools*, Indianapolis, IN

**Accounting Coordinator**
Plan, monitor and execute accounting functions including maintaining and safeguarding the accounting records, analysis data, audit preparation, and data reporting. Provide support to the Title I Director in the development of the grant application. Oversee fiscal activities related to post award funding of grant accounts. Develop proposal budgets as well as review and compile submission documents for state and federal requirements. Manage all aspects of contract management. Oversee all Human Resource documentation, staffing database, expenditure reports, and purchase order reports. Review and monitor financial transactions ensuring integrity and accountability. Ensure that expenses are reasonable, necessary and allowable in accordance with grant guidelines. Stay abreast of the latest developments and techniques with respect to general accounting practices, state and federal guidelines.

*IUPUI - Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, Indianapolis, IN

**Administrative Coordinator**
Served as the Account Manager for CMG accounts within the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. Responsibilities included various business and accounting operations such as purchasing, billing, and serving as back up for approval authority for department purchases. Forecasted and budgeted reporting, and managed both travel and inventory. Developed short and long term budgets for the center by analyzing trends, cost, revenues and financial commitments. Assisted center with personnel and grant preparation, and provided administrative support for CMG faculty and labs, including communication with various external providers and users of the Center.

*Ivy Tech State College*, Indianapolis, IN

**Coordinator of Office Services and Financial Projects**, 08/01 to 04/05
Duties included maintaining the College’s Information Technology Services budget, hardware and software contracts, licenses, and maintenance agreements. Prepared and processed associated records and expenditures, disseminated reports to Director of Contracts, and appropriated college staff. Maintained reports, renewals and termination of contracts as well as licenses and agreements in accordance with college policies. Maintained all files, records and inventory.
Human Resource Assistant, 05/98 to 06/00
Administered various Human Resource responsibilities including updating, maintaining and distributing the employee handbook. Processed workers compensation and liability claims, administered benefits, and managed employee relations. Provided information and assistance to central office and regional employees regarding Human Resources activities, processes, policies, and procedures. Prepared various correspondences and memorandum. Performed a variety of tasks utilizing Page Maker software and FRIS and HRIS mainframe systems. Possessed a working knowledge of HR laws such as FMLA, FLSA, and OSHA.

Administrative Service Clerk, 08/95 to 05/98
Responsibilities included responding to request for information from the public or employees by answering the phone, greeting the public, mailing program information, and making referrals. Picked up, received, opened, date stamped, and delivered mail and/or other materials. Updated files, and maintained a variety of records such as addresses, telephone numbers, vacation schedules, attendance and timesheets, numerical logs, ledgers, and client files. Performed complex data entry tasks for which there was a moderate variation of formats and procedures and with general instructions for coding and entering data. Checked and corrected entry for input errors. Assisted clients and co-workers by explaining steps, appropriated forms, procedures and program requirements for transactions, services and other program activities.

IndyParks, City of Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN 12/00 to 08/01
Payroll Technician
Duties included ensuring the accuracy of payroll reports, time sheets, spreadsheets, funds distribution, and other payroll related documents. Responded to inquiries and/or requests for data and reports. Provided timely and accurate payroll production and maintained confidential employee records. Communicated with a variety of internal and external customers for the purpose of ensuring accurate payroll administration. Compiled data from a wide variety of sources for the purpose of analyzing issues, ensuring compliance with mandated requirements, and/or monitoring program components. Prepared a variety of payroll related documents for the use of documenting activities and issues. Met compliance requirements, and provided audit references. Processed documents and materials to be used for the dissemination of information to appropriate parties.

Adam’s Mark Airport Hotel, Indianapolis, IN 06/00 to 12/00
Personnel Specialist
Responsibilities included the recruitment of all hourly positions, coordination of benefits for entire facility, and the preparation of weekly audits. Managed and maintained employee files and provided customer service to all applicants. Provided office coordination and administered correspondence for the department. Performed accounting duties including purchasing, and payables and receivables. Served as the representative for planning committee, and handled all reports regarding hiring and terminations.

EDUCATION & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Indiana Wesleyan University, Indianapolis, IN 12/2009
Masters Business Administration: Human Resource Management

Marian College, Indianapolis, IN 05/2008
Bachelor of Science (Cum Laude): Business Administration

IVY Tech State College, Indianapolis, IN 05/2002
Associate of Science: Business Administration
Curriculum Vitae

East Carolina University
Doctorate of Education, Educational Leadership, 2010

The George Washington University
Master of Arts, School Administration and Supervision, 2000

North Carolina Central University
Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education, 1997 (cum laude)

Professional Vitae

Superintendent, 2013-Present
Indianapolis Public Schools | Indianapolis, IN | 30,000 students

Chief executive officer and instructional leader for the largest and most diverse school corporation in the state of Indiana. Indianapolis, the 13th largest city in the U.S. is home to the Indianapolis Public Schools corporation, which encompasses over 60 campuses and employs over 5,000 educators and staff with a budget in excess of $502 million. Ensures the development of high performance standards in educational achievement. Strategically aligns and develops personnel to achieve desired outcomes. Maintains service leadership, public responsibility, and operating efficiency throughout the district. Develops long-range plans consistent with population trends, cultural needs, and the appropriate use of district facilities and other resources; ensures that such plans are consistent with Board goals. Cultivates positive relationships with other school districts, the State Education Department, colleges and universities, the U.S. Department of Education, local businesses and community agencies.

Notable Accomplishments

- Bargained one of the most innovative teacher contracts in the nation establishing a 3-year trend of over $20 million in compensation and teacher leadership investments.
- Created a new compensation system for teachers that rewards effectiveness, creates new leadership opportunities for high-performing teachers and enables strong teachers to earn more.
- Led transformational legislation focused on eradicating chronically low-performing schools by providing greater school autonomy and agility.
- Downsized the district’s central office and shifted resources to schools while simultaneously increasing district leadership capacity in critical functions.
- Implemented a nationally recognized entry plan catalyzing the development of the district’s comprehensive strategic plan.
- Founded the Indianapolis Public Schools Business Alliance – an active membership including Fortune 100 and Fortune 500 companies – to advance strategic priorities, workforce development and corporate partnerships.
- Designed implementation process for Student-Based Budgeting, which will enable schools to create innovative school designs that meet the unique needs of their students, while also creating new levels of transparency and improving equity in how resources are distributed across the system.
- Established Innovation and Autonomous schools, which have additional flexibilities in how they re-organize school-level resources for maximum benefit to students.
- Established an intensive Priority School model serving the district’s lowest performing schools and a strategic Transformation Zones school design plan addressing feeder patterns of persistently underperforming schools.
- Developed and launched IPS Strategic Plan 2015, a 98-component, 3-year directional guide for district improvement through School Autonomy and Accountability, Efficient and Streamlined Business Practices, Leadership and Talent Development, and providing a Storefront of Support Services for the Community.
Outcomes
Exit from state designated “F” status after three consecutive years (2014-2015)
Reduced the number schools rated as failing by 56% (2014-2015)
Earned the district’s highest graduation rate (2014-2015)
Reduced at-risk absences (10-17 days) by 17% (2015-2016)
Reduced out-of-school suspensions by 41%, expulsions by 83% and arrests by 57% (2014-2015)
Twenty-four of the district’s 59 schools (or 41%) increased their accountability letter grade by one or more grades within two years (2013-2015)
Increased African-American male 4-year graduation rate by 7 percentage points (2013-2015)
Increased scholarship dollars by 60% (2015-2016)
Increased professional internships for students by 33% (2015-2016)
Increased professional certifications earned by students by 18% (2015-2016)

Chief of Staff, 2010-2013
Durham Public Schools  Durham, NC  33,000 students

Chief officer for academics and operations for a district of 56 schools employing over 4,600 licensed staff members with a budget in excess of $451 million. Instructional visionary and leader responsible for directing, supervising, and evaluating area superintendents who oversee the implementation of all education programs, support services, and business and compliance functions for all schools. Leadership facilitator for area superintendents and assistant superintendents to develop organizational capacity for focused continuous improvement plans and instructional systems designed for high student achievement. Lead strategist for functions related to curriculum, instruction, assessment, research and evaluation, student assignment, federal programs, grants, exceptional children and magnet programs.

Notable Accomplishments
- Established area support teams under the direction of the area superintendents that provide direct and specific support to schools focused on job-embedded coaching and fostering Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).
- Supported the Superintendent on the development and implementation of the district’s first comprehensive strategic plan.
- Aligned support for teaching and learning through a system of timely curriculum coaching and feedback for schools based upon school needs.
- Acquired over $4.8 million in Race to the Top funds to support three schools’ reform efforts.
- Acquired over $5 million in School Improvement Grant funds to support two schools’ reform efforts.
- Facilitated the development and implementation of a robust magnet school plan to utilize school facilities more effectively, provide relevant and high interest program offerings, and expand student-learning opportunities.

Outcomes
Reduced schools designated by the state as low-performing from 5 to none (2011-2012)
Increased district’s 4-year graduation rate from 69.8% to 77% (2011-2012)
Increased elementary math proficiency from 72% to 77% (2012)
Increased elementary and middle school science proficiency from 59.7% to 66.9% (2012)
Increased high school proficiency (Algebra, Biology, English) by an average of 6 percentage points while exceeding the state average increase in proficiency in each content area (2012)
Increased the percent of middle schools meeting Expected Growth Targets to 100% (2012)
Increased the percent of high schools meeting High Growth Targets to 80% (2012)
Increased middle school Algebra I proficiency from 86% to 92% (2011)
Regional Superintendent, 2009-2010
Guilford County Schools | Greensboro, NC | 72,000 students

Superintendent of a region of schools needing intensive support with 864 licensed staff members serving over 7,000 students. The region was comprised of elementary, middle and high schools within shared feeder patterns that were targeted to receive intensive support as a result of a history of persistent under achievement. The operating budget for the region was approximately $44.5 million. All of the schools were eligible for Title I funding. Employed transformation efforts to drive success: differentiated professional learning for teachers, cooperative instructional planning, curriculum coaching and a comprehensive collaborative assessment for learning design to measure and report student mastery to inform instructional practice.

Notable Accomplishments
- Acted as lead architect for the reorganization and decentralization of the district into regions to heighten support and supervision of schools. The regional support structure spawned more responsive central services efforts to promote optimal efficiency and unity of purpose. This structure included five regional offices that provided direct supervision of schools and supplied schools and the community with customized support as needed.
- Served as a member of the Superintendent’s council, in which five executive officers for the organization facilitated the implementation and monitoring of the district’s strategic plan and other district operations.
- Implemented a staff performance management model to heighten accountability in school improvement efforts.
- Empowered school leaders, staff and parents to assume an active role in the turnaround and/or transformation and ongoing support of schools through a vigorous school improvement planning process.
- Designed a regional professional learning model centered on virtual learning communities and peer curriculum coaching.

Outcomes
- Achieved the highest scale score growth on North Carolina End-of-Course assessments among the regions in the district (2010)
- Achieved the highest increase in student proficiency on North Carolina End-of-Grade assessments among the regions in the district (2010)
- Increased math proficiency by an average of 9 percentage points (2010)
- Increased reading proficiency by an average of 7 percentage points (2010)

Instructional Improvement Officer (Area Superintendent), 2007-2009
Guilford County Schools | Greensboro, NC | 72,000 students

Chief instructional leader and manager for a division of 13 middle schools with over 9,500 students, 1,200 licensed staff members and a cumulative operating budget of over $65 million. Several of the schools in the division offered magnet or choice options covering themes such as Performing Arts, Global Studies, Science and Technology, English Language Learning, Over-aged Student Acceleration and Spanish Immersion. Thirty-three percent of the schools served were eligible for Title I funding with a cumulative Title I budget of over $1.5 million.

Notable Accomplishments
- Redesigned the middle school instructional day for expanded professional learning time, greater consistency and extended learning opportunities to better meet students’ needs.
- Established cross-departmental intervention teams to investigate and problem solve specific gaps in student performance. The teams then deployed resources, wrap-around services and supports to address identified needs.
• Launched a blended literacy intervention model in all middle schools. The model leveraged adaptive technology to individualize instruction for students, small group instruction and research proven professional learning.
• Instituted a mastery learning approach to address significant gaps in math achievement. Mastery learning is a concept by which students must capture 80% of the content by providing the appropriate amount of instructional time.
• Introduced and implemented an integrated pre-Advanced Placement (AP) curriculum from CollegeBoard at the middle school level to boost students’ higher-order thinking and college readiness skills.

Outcomes
Led the state in the number of middle schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress among the large urban school districts in North Carolina for two consecutive years
Increased the number of schools achieving the North Carolina School of High Growth Status from 33% to 73% (2008)
Increased the percentage of schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress from 18% to 55% (2007)
Increased the percentage of schools meeting North Carolina Expected Growth status from 27% to 82% (2007)
Improved performance of priority Title I schools by an average of 15 percentage points in Math (2007)

Additional Professional Experience
Principal, Otis L. Hairston Sr. Middle School, Greensboro, NC, 2005-2007
Principal, Fairview Elementary School, High Point, NC, 2001-2005
Assistant Principal, Granville County Schools, Creedmoor, NC, 2000-2001

Enhancement Programs and Organizations
Chiefs for Change, Member, 2016
CollegeBoard, Board of Trustees, 2015-present
Central Indiana Workforce Development Initiative, Member, 2015-present
TeenWorks, Board Member, 2014-present
Communities in Schools of Durham, Board Member, 2010-2013
CollegeBoard, Academic Assembly Council, 2009-2012
Visiting Assistant Professor, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 2007-2009
The Versatile Leader: One-on-One Coaching, 2007-2008
The Strategic Planning Program, The Cambridge Group, 2005
Leadership Development Academy, Center for Creative Leadership, 2002
School Development Program Leadership Academy, Yale University, 2001

Honors and Awards
Education Week, Leader to Learn From, 2016
Featured guest, White House School Discipline Convening, 2015
North Carolina Central University, 40 Under 40 Alumni Award, 2014
40 Leaders Under 40 of the Triad, The Business Journal, 2010
Featured guest, WFMY-FOX8, Regionalization of Guilford County Schools, 2009
Wachovia Principal of the Year, Guilford County Schools, 2006
Outstanding Young Educator Award, Greensboro Jaycees, 2004
Featured in the Wall Street Journal, Results of the No Child Left Behind legislation, 2003
J. William McGuinn Leadership Award, Greater High Point Community in Schools, 2003
PROFESSIONAL PROFILE
Professional trainer/educator with servant leadership style and demonstrated ability to achieve goals on the fast track. Inherent ability to deal with difficult people and produce win-win outcomes. Able to undertake challenges, select and train teams to perform at optimum levels, and develop strategies for success.

EDUCATION
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Doctorate of Education: Educational Leadership, 2005
Master's of School Administration: Educational Leadership, 1998

North Carolina A&T State University
Bachelor of Science: Mathematics Education, summa cum laude

LICENSURE
Indiana and North Carolina licenses:
Superintendent
Principal (Grades K-12)
Mathematics Teacher (Grades 9-12)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
October 2013 – present
Indianapolis Public Schools, Indianapolis, Indiana
DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT FOR ACADEMICS
Central Indiana’s largest and most academically diverse school system with 66 schools, free and reduced rate of approx. 85%, and approximately 30,000 students.

- Implement new instructional programs and develop process to change current ones
- Ensure vertical and horizontal continuity and articulation of the instructional program throughout the District
- Ensure understanding and promotion of the educational objectives of the District
- Lead staff members in the planning, administration, and evaluation of professional development activities which support teaching and learning

Select Accomplishments
- Realized $557,000 in cost savings by reorganizing Academic Division for greater efficiency and effectiveness
- Increased graduation rate from 67% to 76% by installing graduation success planning
- Created a comprehensive strategic grade reconfiguration and magnet school redesign plan
Select Accomplishments Continued

- Instituted college and career readiness plan for all high school students including freshman planning, honors and advanced placement courses, senior support activities, and career exploration
- Opened Newcomer Program for students and families new to the country
- Developed a racial equity initiative to address the district’s racial achievement gap and disproportionality
- Reduced exclusionary practices across the district with professional development, goal establishment, and revised student code of conduct
- Placed Parent Involvement Educators (PIEs) in schools to increase parent involvement and engagement.

**Guilford County Schools**, Greensboro, North Carolina July 2009 – September 2013

**July 2013 – September 2013**

**REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT - Central Region**
Region of the Guilford County School District with 32 schools, free and reduced lunch rate of 64.66%, and 17,186 students.

**July 2010 – June 2013 ENRICHMENT REGION**
Region of the Guilford County School District designed to provide intensive and focused support to 9 schools that were historically high poverty and “high needs” with a free and reduced lunch rate of 86.81%, and 6,226 students.

**Regional Superintendent (July 2012 – June 2013)**
**Executive Director (July 2010 – June 2012)**

**July 2009 – June 2010 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR - High School Curriculum**
Initiated and managed curricular and instructional programs designed to improve instruction and student achievement in each of the district’s 26 high schools

**April 2007- June 2009 American Express**, Greensboro, North Carolina
**SENIOR INSTRUCTION MANAGER**
Coordinated and managed instruction for all US and Asia sites

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR – LEADERSHIP & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**
Coordinated all district level professional development to address the career needs of licensed and unlicensed employees including an annual summer leadership retreat for building principals and central office administrators
Guilford County Schools, Greensboro, North Carolina 1990 - December 2005

2001 – 2004  PRINCIPAL - Southwest Guilford High School
2000 – 2001  PRINCIPAL - Southeast Middle School
1998 - 2000  ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL – Southern Guilford High School
1990 - 1996  MATHEMATICS TEACHER – Eastern Guilford High School
KRISTA L TURNAGE

EXPERIENCE

2016-2017 Broad Resident - 2016 - 2018 Cohort; M. Ed Candidate
07/16-Pres Special Projects Manager, Indianapolis Public Schools

2014-2017 Engineering For Kids® Lake County
06/14-Pres Lake Villa, IL
Owner & Director
- Developed and implemented businesses plans that resulted in 35% territory penetration. Consistently ranked top 10 in franchise sales YTD out of 150 global locations.
- Lead the development and implementation of integrated marketing campaigns, including PR, digital, print, event and social media marketing resulting 30% revenue growth year over year.
- Developed annual forecast of revenue, expenses and profit. Analyzed variances monthly and implemented actions that achieved or exceeded financial goals.
- Recruited, hired and trained a team of 22 teachers to support afterschool and evening classes, in-school field trips, summer camps and workshops in over 35 locations across Lake County.

2013-2014 VALSPAR
07/13-12/14 Chicago, IL
Product Manager, Valspar® Exterior Paint
- Developed Product Innovation Road Map, partnering with Consumer Insights and R&D to identify category white space and nurture technology platforms to capitalize on unmet consumer needs.
- Successful delivery of $50 million in incremental growth via 2 major product launches through rigorous Stage Gate process.
- Owned product positioning in SKU-intensive portfolio, establishing clear benefit progressions that promoted trade-up, competitive advantage, and consistent brand identity. Strengthened product mix, and improved portfolio margin by 20%.
- Managed P&L; Led forecasting, budgeting and inventory activities to support financial goals.

2008-2013 SC JOHNSON
02/12-06/13 Racine, WI
Brand Manager, Glade® Innovation
- Cemented opportunity and formed innovation strategy to penetrate Sanctuary Occasions, an estimated $3B need state, largely untapped by the brand.
- Restructured approach to early ideation by sharpening consumer insights, auditing stranded innovations, and evaluating historic new product performance, resulting in clarity of user, business, and product criteria for a successful Sanctuary product launch.
- Partnered with Seattle based design firm, Teague, and cross functional core team to create a portfolio of new product offerings resulting in a 5-year product roadmap estimated to deliver over $100MM of incremental revenues.
- Assessed profitability and viability of new product opportunities and successfully moved 3 resourced products into development, forming the foundation of Glade’s Specialty innovation pipeline.
- Led 15 member cross-functional team in the conception, development and commercialization of the first Sanctuary product line, which over delivered sales by 25%, achieving $60MM revenue year 1.

12/09-02/12 Brand Manager, Corporate New Ventures
- Devised go-to -market strategy, and managed 6 external agencies in the test market launch of Vecco®, an estimated $150MM new brand and ecommerce based enterprise in Home Decor.
- Analyzed test market performance, and executed refined positioning including target consumer, product offering, pricing, and communication strategy resulting in 150% increase in sales.
- Directed lead agency in the development of a $5MM highly targeted marketing campaign including partnerships with local artist and online bloggers, social media, relevant TV integrations, and local events that supported revised positioning in preparation for National Launch.
- Coached store manager and 4 full time employees in the development of in-store programs that drove traffic and sales conversion, exceeding retail performance goals by 10-20% weekly.
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12/08–12/09  **Associate Brand Manager, Scrubbing Bubbles® Innovation**
- Developed business case to expand Scrubbing Bubbles® into the cream cleanser segment, a $40MM incremental opportunity for the brand; Devised positioning, which surpassed all internal BASES hurdles, resulting in resource approval for development through launch.
- Developed and presented compelling selling story for Scrubbing Bubbles® electric trigger all-purpose cleaner, which achieved early ship commitments from the top 3 customers, and exceeded distribution targets across all classes of trade.
- Analyzed post-launch performance of Scrubbing Bubbles® Toilet Cleaning Gel, resulting in robust recommendations that enabled long-term success.

2005-2008  **KRAFT FOODS**  
4/07-11/08  
**Senior Associate Brand Manager, A.1.®**  
- Improved efficiency of media plan (+25%) by refining selection and placement strategy, and leveraging non-traditional mediums to reach the consumer in a more creative and efficient way.
- Led strategic initiative to extend the brand beyond current business model, resulting in an evolved positioning from “steak only” to “steak and burger” to rejuvenate portfolio growth.

12/05-4/07  **Senior Associate Brand Manager, JELL-O®**  
- Responsible for volume, revenue and profit delivery for JELL-O refrigerated pudding snacks ($200MM growth engine of JELL-O’s $800MM portfolio).
- Repositioned declining businesses, rationalized low margin SKUs and launched 3 new products in the fastest growing category segment, resulting in 20% portfolio growth.
- Presented compelling business case and gained resources to penetrate $90MM Rice Pudding market, which led to a 26% segment share within the first 3 months of launch.
- Led team through historic raw material shortage within the fastest growing product line. Established contingency plans for future risk while pivoting the communication strategy to manage demand, preserve customer relationships and deliver financial commitments to the business.

6/05-12/05  **Associate Brand Manager - Taco Bell Home Originals®**  
- Managed new product development, packaging, consumer programming, and budgeting and forecasting for a complex Portfolio; spanning 32 SKUs in four category segments and manufactured at nine different plants in US and Mexico.

1998-2003  **KIMBERLY CLARK CORPORATION**  
**Research Scientist, Product Development**  
- Developed and implemented product improvements that increased market share for HUGGIES® diapers and PULL-UPS® training pants. Translated exploratory prototypes into commercial product designs that met consumer and business needs.
- Implemented product upgrades that increased consumer appeal and improved quality, cost, and rate of operations for GoodNites® underpants, PULL-UPS® training pants, and HUGGIES® Little Swimmers® swimpants.

**EDUCATION**
**KELLEY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY**  
**Master of Business Administration, Major in Marketing**  
- Fellowship Recipient, Consortium for Graduate Study in Management  
- Bloomingto, IN  
- May 2005

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**  
**Bachelor of Science, Major in Chemical Engineering**  
- Urbana/Champaign, IL  
- December 1998
Aleesia Johnson

Summary: Aleesia has 14 years of experience in education. Six of these years were spent in the classroom as a middle school teacher. The past 7 years have been spent in educational leadership—both in and out of a formal school setting. Aleesia has both a personal and professional passion for working in low-income communities with students who have traditionally been underserved. Aleesia has served as a member of the Indianapolis Public Library Strategic Planning committee. She is also a member of the regional advisory board of Teach For America-Indianapolis and a board member of Enroll Indy.

Experience

Innovation Officer at Indianapolis Public Schools June 2015 - Present

- Serve as the primary manager of the district’s strategy to increase school-level autonomy by developing systems and structures to support school leadership recruitment, selection, authorization, evaluation, and accountability as it relates to current and prospective innovation schools
- Draft and implement district policies that institutionalize best practices in authorization and support of innovation schools
- Support district transition to student-based budgeting financial model
- Lead district efforts to transition the role of the central office to provide services to schools

School Leader at KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory June 2012 - June 2015

- Created and implemented a strategic plan to drive organizational goals and assess progress during year
- Leveraged strong relationships with all relevant stakeholders in order to increase school stability and sustainability in both operational and instructional practices
- Managed a team of 30 staff members in order to maximize effectiveness in classroom instruction
- Achieved staff satisfaction results that meet or exceed KIPP national network average
- Achieved 51% increase in student retention year over year, from 38% to 89%

Assistant School Leader at KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory May 2010 - June 2012

- Created and implemented a strategic plan to drive organizational goals and assess progress during year
- Leveraged strong relationships with all relevant stakeholders in order to increase school stability and sustainability in both operational and instructional practices
- Managed a team of 17 teachers in order to maximize effectiveness in classroom instruction
- Collected and analyzed various school data points to inform decision-making
- Achieved staff satisfaction results that exceeded KIPP national network average
Interim Director, District Strategy at Teach For America October 2008 - June 2010

- Maximized Teach For America impact in Indianapolis by securing additional partnerships to increase placement schools from nine to twenty-seven
- Created strategic plan to drive regional district strategy goals and assess progress to goals
- Designed and facilitated professional development to ensure staff members are equipped to meet district strategy goals
- Communicated key messages to school leaders and district officials to create investment in Teach For America
- Executed matriculation and placement processes to ensure all teachers secure positions at partner schools

Program Director at Teach For America May 2008 - June 2010

- Managed two cohorts of approximately 25 teachers serving in public schools to reach ambitious student achievement goals
- Exceeded achievement goals during 2008-09 and 2009-10 school years with an average of 85% of team accomplishing at least one and a half years of student academic growth
- Assessed qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate teachers’ progress to goals
- Planned and executed rigorous professional development workshops to build targeted instructional skills

Founding Teacher at KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory July 2004 - May 2008

- Advanced students an average of 1.5 years in Reading according to NWEA MAP (Measures of Progress) scores each year as Reading teacher
- Served as a grade level chairperson and English Language Arts department chair
- Created community partnerships to establish extracurricular activities, a student counseling program, community service programs, and high school placement opportunities

Teacher, 6th grade Science and Social Studies at Paterson Public Schools, October 2002-June 2004

- Selected from competitive field to join Teach For America, a national corps of outstanding college graduates who teach in low-income communities
- Achieved grade level annual yearly progress by partnering with Reading teacher to reinforce content area reading strategies
- Nominated for Teacher of the Year by School 26 colleagues

Education

Master of Arts in Teaching, Oakland City University, 2007
Master of Social Work, The University of Michigan, 2001
Bachelor of Arts, Psychology and African-American Studies, 1999

Community Engagement

Board of Directors, member, Enroll Indy
Regional Advisory Board, member, Teach For America-Indianapolis
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Director of Innovation Strategy
Indianapolis Public Schools, February 2016 – present
- Served as district contact for Pilot Autonomy Cohort, working with six schools to explore and enact additional school-based flexibilities.
- Co-lead and facilitated district-wide Student-Based Allocation Working Group, ensuring our distribution of funds is more equitable, more transparent, and comes with great strategic flexibilities for schools.
- Lead team that oversees growth of Innovation Network. Partner with department heads to create various menus of service and standard operating procedures for Innovation Schools.
- Co-lead District Autonomy Transition Working Group, partnering cross-functionally to define the policies, procedures, and accountability structures to position more flexibilities in all IPS schools.

Talent & Human Resources Consultant
KIPP Delta Public Schools, August 2015 – January 2017
- Successfully completed new Chief Operating Officer hire in partnership with search firm.
- Completed annual legal updates to Personnel and Student Policies.

Founding Director, Talent & Human Resources
KIPP Delta Public Schools, June 2013 – August 2015
- Designed selection materials and process for School Leadership candidates aligned to KIPP Leadership Competency Model, resulting in first successful external hires (3) of Assistant Principals to KIPP Delta.
- Led internal and external Fisher/Miles Fellowship recruiting and selection processes, resulting in first external candidate sent to National Selection event for KIPP Delta and two internal candidate fellowships awarded.
- Doubled applicant volume and achieved nearly fully-hired status on first day of school 2015.
- Improved teacher retention from 55% in 2012 school year to 70% in 2013 school year.
- Influenced talent culture in which 93% of staff agreed KIPP Delta was focused on recruiting top talent and 90% agreed that the recruitment process had effectively prepared them for their role.
- 100% staff satisfaction on resolution of payroll inquiries, timely resolution of employee relations matters, full oversight of benefits brokering and administration as well as state and federal HR compliance matters.

Director, Matriculation & Licensure
Teach For America – Delta, July 2010 – June 2013
- Drove campaign to confirm over 1,000 Teach For America applicants to teach in the Delta for at least two years- setting vision, designing materials, and training 30 staff members in order to achieve corps membership goal.
- Determined licensure eligibility and strategic teaching placement based on exams, coursework, state and district rules, and relationships for over 550 corps members annually across two states.

Director, Special Projects
Teach For America – Delta, July 2006 – July 2010
- Designed curriculum and coordinated implementation of New Teacher Support Groups. Included hiring, training, and supporting leaders.
- Managed campaign to grow corps size from projected 100 incoming members to 275 over a period of six months in winter and spring of 2009; matriculated and licensed corps of approximately 80 - 100 incoming members annually for three years.

Program Director
Teach For America – Delta, June 2005 – May 2006
- Coached and empowered a cohort of 35 corps members to be instructional leaders who would enable their students to reach rigorous academic results.

Classroom Teacher/Teach For America Corps Member
West Side Elementary School, June 2002 – June 2005
- Led Arkansas Reading First model classroom, achieving 100% student proficiency on 2004 DIBELS assessment.

EDUCATION

Indiana University: Bachelor of Arts Degree in Anthropology and Communications/Culture, May 2002; Graduated summa cum laude with 3.98 GPA
EXECUTIVE-LEVEL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL

PROFESSIONAL PROFILE

Executive marketing communications professional with 20 years of extensive experience leading marketing and entertainment logistic strategies. Skilled at driving comprehensive internal and external communications strategies and implementation. Proactively collaborates with team members and alliance counterparts to achieve communication goals. Ensures procurement and proper management of external resources to deliver on business objectives. Excellent C-Suite counselor with expertise in national and international media and marketing outreach, public relations agency account management, brand management, and internal and external partnerships. Team leader and player with the ability to multi-task in a fast-paced environment with aggressive deadlines. Senior level influencer experienced in product marketing, production logistics, project management and celebrity communications management. Able to prioritize, make appropriate trade off decisions and stay calm under stress.

AREAS OF EXPERTISE

- Staff management
- Corporate partnerships/sponsorships
- Senior executive communications support
- Advertising campaigns
- Media relations
- Strategic Counsel
- Vendor/agency management/coordination
- Special project management
- Issues management
- Media training
- Non-profit
- Branding
- Contract negotiation
- Community outreach
- Corporate communications
- Special event planning
- Problem solving
- Team player
- Social media
- Conflict management
- Spokesperson
- Strong attention to detail
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Indianapolis Public Schools, Indianapolis, Indiana (1/2017 – Present)
Public Information Director

Consultant
- Provide communications counsel for Indianapolis City-County Council
- Plan and implement statewide and national public awareness campaigns
- Provide client consultation to major accounts. Including sound strategic research, planning, implementation and evaluation
- Execute national media relations outreach for clients
- Create comprehensive public relations plans
- Develop and manage special events from inception to conclusion
- Schedule and execute logistics of press conferences.
- Develop advertising campaigns
- Arrange regional and national media buys
- Manage celebrity relationships for clients
- Create strategic partnership and sponsorship opportunities

Eastern Star Church, Indianapolis, Indiana (4/2014 - 12/2015)
Executive Director, Administration
- Executive director that oversaw Communications, Human Resources and Office Administration for one of the largest churches in the state of Indiana
- Senior communications counselor to CEO and Senior Pastor, Jeffrey A. Johnson, Sr.
- Led rebranding of $12 million dollar church's image that included new logo, signage, and full staffing restructure of over 10 departments and 40 ministries
- Created new communications department to include three communications professionals and six production staffers
- Led all celebrity logistics including review of contracts and onsite management of artists
- Managed all external media relations and advertising
- Serve as key spokesperson for organization
- Lead all major special events
- Serve as crisis communications counsel
- Serve on a four-person executive administration team
- Created new human resource department and revamped 15 year-old policies and procedures
- Developed and managed department budgets
- Reorganized office administration staff
- Led the development of a new and improved 401k program for all employees
- Directed creation of storytelling through video; also created weekly video announcements to share high level ministry activities
- Revamped and rebranded monthly Chronicles newsletter to a comprehensive online magazine
- Developed bi-annual reports and congregational meetings
- Created and implemented the Eastern Star Church app that had over 7,000 downloads within a six month period
• Led e-Giving campaign to encourage members to give online and increased online giving by $2 million dollars within a four month period
• Redeveloped organization’s website that includes three live stream services each week, with over 2,000 online viewers each Sunday
• Website currently reaches worldwide audience with consistent viewers from California to Japan

Community Outreach Manager

- Serve as spokesperson for United Way’s early childhood initiatives
- Create and execute strategic and tactical communications plans, including media relations materials
- Develop and execute social media communications plans for education initiatives
- Lead six-county advertising campaign strategies that focus on supporting United Way’s public policy efforts. 2013 campaign increased public awareness by over 35 percent.
- Promote United Way’s early childhood public policy agenda through coalition-building, media and marketing strategies, and social media outreach
- Manage partnerships in the community with common goals (e.g. media, faith-based organizations, government, educational institutions, United Way agencies
- Manage a $300,000 annual marketing budget
- Conduct, and or assist, in the research and evaluation of communications strategies to promote its early childhood educations efforts
- Direct day-to-day public relations activities for education initiatives including management of the PR agency of record and other vendors
- Work cross-functionally with United Way’s education staff, volunteer resources staff, and major gifts staff to ensure consistent messaging and collaboration
- Provide media training for key internal stakeholders
- Counsel senior staff on crisis communications strategies

Global Public Relations Specialist/Entertainment Outreach/Public Affairs

- Communications liaison for Kiwanis International’s board president, foundation president, board trustees and executive director
- Developed and edited speeches, talking points, press, and other media related materials for Kiwanis International’s executives
- Created international celebrity ambassador program including policy development, research, approaching potential high profile personalities and negotiating opportunities to utilize talent to increase Kiwanis brand awareness
- Responsible for booking talent, audio, stage and lighting, talent flights, hotel and ground transportation and managing contract negotiations for international conventions
- Led annual media training for international board of directors
- Managed all executive and board-related communications
- Developed strategic communications and crisis communications plans for Kiwanis and Key Club International events and partnerships
- Created, managed and executed Kiwanis’ public and media relations initiatives
- programs
- Successfully secured hundreds of global/national media hits for Kiwanis and Kiwanis’ service programs
- Responsible for developing and managing marketing and entertainment budgets
- Managed external agency relationship

MZD Advertising, Indianapolis, Indiana (9/07 – 5/08)
Account Executive – Papa John’s Pizza
- Created and executed strategic marketing plans for northern Indiana and Illinois markets
- Executed major regional projects and campaigns
- Primary contact to media representatives
- Produced monthly presentations for owner/operators
- Developed advertising campaigns. Arrange media buys
- Prepared accurate budgets of over $600,000 in four Midwest markets. Manage projects within budget to ensure profitability
- Primary contact and executor of all client related sponsorships and partnerships.
- Responsible for financial recording in each market
- Supervised promotion execution
- Responsible for ongoing market visits
- Provided guidance to expand promotional opportunities within each market

Bandy Carroll Hellige Advertising, Indianapolis, Indiana (9/05 – 6/07)
Account Supervisor – McDonald’s
- Supervised public relations staff of six in Central Indiana and Louisville, KY
- Developed and oversaw strategic communications plans for McDonald’s restaurants in Central Indiana and Louisville, KY
- Directed execution of regional and national sponsorships and partnerships
- Developed and implemented $500,000 budget for Indianapolis, and $300,000 for Louisville. Manage projects within budget to ensure profitability
- Led monthly promotional presentation development and execution for owner/operators
- Served as spokesperson for Indianapolis and Louisville markets
- Liaison to McDonald’s USA office and their national external agencies
- Managed crisis communications for Central Indiana and Louisville, KY
- Managed celebrity spokespersons relationship
- Directed all day-to-day planning and execution of public relations for Agency’s Indianapolis office
- Successfully led public relations outreach for the 2007 McDonald’s All-American Game
- Provided strategic oversight for the Agency’s Indianapolis office
- Led public relations new business development of the Agency’s Indianapolis office
- Sat on the executive board of the Ronald McDonald House Charities of Indiana
- Led public relations efforts for the Ronald McDonald House of Indiana
- Primary contact to Owner/Operators
- Directed staff to assist with local store marketing initiatives
Borshoff, Indianapolis, Indiana (8/02 – 9/05)
Account Associate
- Planned and oversaw implementation of special events, concerts, promotions, and media relations for clients
- Served as agency’s spokesperson and responded to more than 300 press inquiries each year
- Developed strategic plans to solve clients’ total public relations and marketing communications needs
- Planned and implemented statewide and national public awareness campaigns
- Provided client consultation to major accounts. Including sound strategic research, planning, implementation and evaluation
- Managed celebrity spokespersons relationships
- Supervised account coordinators on assigned accounts
- Prepared and managed budgets to ensure profitability.
- Managed design projects with creative team
- Wrote and edited compelling strategic communications plans, brochures, annual reports, speeches, and other documents in a clear, grammatical and readable manner
- Directed research on clients’ behalf
- Responsible for proofreading documents for self and colleagues
- Contributed creative ideas to a variety of projects
- Coordinated Borshoff’s luncheons with members of the media on a regular basis

Indiana Black Expo, Inc., Indianapolis, Indiana (5/99 – 8/02)
Communications Manager
- Created comprehensive public relations plan for IBE youth programs, organizational activities and special events
- Served as managing editor of the IBE newsletter, EXPOSE®
- Served as an organization spokesperson
- Responsible for coordination and updates of IBE website
- Supervised content for all publications
- Responsible for coordinating grassroots promotional activities including street team vehicle and flyer design, volunteer participation and promotion logistics
- Led scheduling and logistics of press conferences.
- Supervised three communications specialists
- Managed the planning and onsite coordination of special events (Ex. IBE Open House, Women’s Luncheon and movie premieres)
- Arranged regional and national media buys
- Managed marketing collaborations with the Marion County Health Department (Stamp Out Syphilis Coalition, Hoosier Healthwise and Woman to Woman HIV Prevention campaign) and the Indiana State Department of Health (Indiana HIV Testing Day)
- Responsible for all celebrity relationships during IBE national events: Summer Celebration and Circle City Classic

EDUCATION
- Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Indiana
  Major: General Studies (Communications)
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (current and past affiliations)

- Autism Speaks Indianapolis
  - Executive committee

- Jacob’s Ladder for Autism Awareness
  - Founder/President

- Indiana Parents for Applied Behavior Analysis
  - Board of directors/ Vice president

- Community Reach
  - Board of directors

- National Association of Black Journalists
  - Public Relations committee
  - Indianapolis Association of Black Journalists Convention Special Events Chair

- Indiana Black Expo
  - Board of directors/Executive committee

- Public Relations Society of America, Hoosier Chapter
  - Diversity committee chair

- UNCF Indianapolis
  - Public Relations Chair

- NAACP Indianapolis
  - Annual banquet public relations chair


- Center for Leadership Development Achiever’s Nominee 2011

REFERENCES

(b)(6)
ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management, and completion of the project described in this application.

2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.

3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.

4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.

5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).

6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

8. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
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10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.

11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93-523); and (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (P.L. 93-205).


14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.

17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133. All Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.

18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies governing this program.

---
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<tr>
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Indianapolis Public Schools
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CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.
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## Demographics

### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel MSA</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age (2014)</td>
<td>34 +/- 0.100</td>
<td>33 +/- 0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Under Age 5 (2014)</td>
<td>69,365 +/- 122</td>
<td>22,524 +/- 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 5 to 9 (2014)</td>
<td>63,735 +/- 1,392 6.93%</td>
<td>20,338 +/- 972 6.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 10 to 14 (2014)</td>
<td>61,249 +/- 1,416 6.66%</td>
<td>17,360 +/- 862 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 15 to 19 (2014)</td>
<td>58,769 +/- 1,116 6.39%</td>
<td>19,158 +/- 844 6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 18 and Over (2014)</td>
<td>689,677 +/- 1,991 75%</td>
<td>229,795 +/- 3,276 76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 20 to 24 (2014)</td>
<td>69,237 +/- 1,581 7.53%</td>
<td>26,800 +/- 1,115 8.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 21 and Over (2014)</td>
<td>652,911 +/- 2,139 71%</td>
<td>214,371 +/- 3,384 71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 25 to 34 (2014)</td>
<td>149,528 +/- 200 16.3%</td>
<td>51,751 +/- 1,303 17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 35 to 44 (2014)</td>
<td>119,226 +/- 1,821 13%</td>
<td>37,604 +/- 1,219 12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 45 to 54 (2014)</td>
<td>124,295 +/- 21,713 5.5%</td>
<td>41,464 +/- 1,166 13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 55 to 59 (2014)</td>
<td>58,364 +/- 1,102 36.35%</td>
<td>18,758 +/- 768 6.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 60 to 64 (2014)</td>
<td>45,229 +/- 1,212 49.2%</td>
<td>14,193 +/- 655 4.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 62 and Over (2014)</td>
<td>125,661 +/- 1,780 13.7%</td>
<td>37,391 +/- 1,052 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 65 to 74 (2014)</td>
<td>54,740 +/- 1,145 9.05%</td>
<td>17,053 +/- 702 5.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender

Age Pyramid

Indianapolis-Carmel MSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,980 ± 1033.7%</td>
<td>30,539 ± 9503.32%</td>
<td>30,795 ± 9643.35%</td>
<td>29,085 ± 7533.16%</td>
<td>36,197 ± 1,083,94%</td>
<td>40,826 ± 980,44%</td>
<td>36,126 ± 990,393%</td>
<td>30,069 ± 888,327%</td>
<td>30,470 ± 9033.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marion County

| Value          | 11,545 ± 707 3.86%                   | 9,819 ± 668 3.28%                   | 8,656 ± 636 2.89%                   | 9,510 ± 557 3.18%                   | 14,355 ± 775 4.79%                  | 14,307 ± 721 4.78%                  | 12,318 ± 561 4.11%                  | 9,068 ± 621 3.03%                   | 9,436 ± 521 3.15%                   |

Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>154,345 Females</th>
<th>145,147 Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PR Award # S377C370016

http://www.savi.org
| Female Population Age 45 to 49 (2014) | 30,950 \(\pm 0.003\text{.}37\%\) | 10,082 \(\pm 0.49\text{.}0\) 3.37\% |
| Female Population Age 50 to 54 (2014) | 33,233 \(\pm 0.003\text{.}62\%\) | 10,467 \(\pm 0.55\text{.}9\) 3.5\% |
| Female Population Age 55 to 59 (2014) | 30,925 \(\pm 0.017\text{.}36\%\) | 9,774 \(\pm 0.56\text{.}1\) 3.26\% |
| Female Population Age 60 to 64 (2014) | 23,938 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}62\%\) | 7,351 \(\pm 0.47\text{.}5\) 2.45\% |
| Female Population Age 65 to 69 (2014) | 17,215 \(\pm 0.011\text{.}87\%\) | 5,469 \(\pm 0.37\text{.}8\) 1.83\% |
| Female Population Age 70 to 74 (2014) | 13,253 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}44\%\) | 4,265 \(\pm 0.35\text{.}4\) 1.42\% |
| Female Population Age 75 to 79 (2014) | 10,047 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}10\%\) | 2,717 \(\pm 0.31\text{.}4\) 0.90\% |
| Female Population Age 80 to 84 (2014) | 8,700 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}94\%\) | 2,410 \(\pm 0.21\text{.}9\) 0.80\% |
| Female Population Age 85 and Over (2014) | 10,122 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}1\%\) | 2,796 \(\pm 0.30\text{.}5\) 0.93\% |
| Male Population Under Age 5 (2014) | 35,385 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}85\%\) | 10,979 \(\pm 0.61\text{.}4\) 3.67\% |
| Male Population Age 5 to 9 (2014) | 33,196 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}61\%\) | 10,519 \(\pm 0.70\text{.}6\) 3.51\% |
| Male Population Age 10 to 14 (2014) | 30,454 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}31\%\) | 8,704 \(\pm 0.38\text{.}2\) 2.91\% |
| Male Population Age 15 to 19 (2014) | 29,684 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}23\%\) | 9,648 \(\pm 0.63\text{.}4\) 3.22\% |
| Male Population Age 20 to 24 (2014) | 33,040 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}59\%\) | 12,445 \(\pm 0.80\text{.}1\) 4.16\% |
| Male Population Age 25 to 29 (2014) | 37,531 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}08\%\) | 13,599 \(\pm 0.72\text{.}7\) 4.54\% |
| Male Population Age 30 to 34 (2014) | 35,045 \(\pm 0.012\text{.}81\%\) | 11,527 \(\pm 0.57\text{.}9\) 3.85\% |
| Male Population Age 35 to 39 (2014) | 29,665 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}23\%\) | 9,556 \(\pm 0.64\text{.}3\) 3.19\% |
| Male Population Age 40 to 44 (2014) | 29,022 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}16\%\) | 9,544 \(\pm 0.64\text{.}4\) 3.19\% |
| Male Population Age 45 to 49 (2014) | 29,363 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}19\%\) | 10,186 \(\pm 0.59\text{.}5\) 3.4\% |
| Male Population Age 50 to 54 (2014) | 30,749 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}35\%\) | 10,729 \(\pm 0.66\text{.}7\) 3.58\% |
| Male Population Age 55 to 59 (2014) | 27,439 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}09\%\) | 8,984 \(\pm 0.52\text{.}4\) 3\% |
| Male Population Age 60 to 64 (2014) | 21,291 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}29\%\) | 6,842 \(\pm 0.45\text{.}0\) 2.29\% |
| Male Population Age 65 to 69 (2014) | 14,709 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}61\%\) | 4,219 \(\pm 0.38\text{.}0\) 1.41\% |
| Male Population Age 70 to 74 (2014) | 9,563 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}04\%\) | 3,100 \(\pm 0.28\text{.}2\) 1.04\% |
| Male Population Age 75 to 79 (2014) | 7,104 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}73\%\) | 2,154 \(\pm 0.23\text{.}9\) 0.71\% |
| Male Population Age 80 to 84 (2014) | 5,208 \(\pm 0.013\text{.}56\%\) | 1,350 \(\pm 0.16\text{.}7\) 0.45\% |
| Male Population Age 85 and Over (2014) | 4,418 \(\pm 0.014\text{.}81\%\) | 1,062 \(\pm 0.16\text{.}3\) 0.36\% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size (2014)</td>
<td>2.5 (\pm 0.03\text{.}0)</td>
<td>2.4 (\pm 0.03\text{.}0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children (2014)</td>
<td>112,929 (\pm 1\text{,}77\text{.}32%)</td>
<td>33,304 (\pm 8\text{.}89\text{.}9) 28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Seniors (2014)</td>
<td>72,983 (\pm 8\text{.}72\text{.}3%)</td>
<td>22,646 (\pm 5\text{.}44\text{.}9) 19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marital Status

Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Proficiency</th>
<th>Household Language Other than English or Spanish</th>
<th>Household Language of Spanish</th>
<th>Household Language of English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Language Other than English or Spanish (2014)</td>
<td>17,174 ← 9344.75%</td>
<td>3,669 ← 388 3.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Language of English (2014)</td>
<td>316,623 ← 1,98087.6%</td>
<td>105,066 ← 445 88.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Language of Spanish (2014)</td>
<td>27,851 ← 779.7%</td>
<td>10,067 ← 596 8.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital Status

Marital Status
### Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divorced Population</td>
<td>99,073</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Population</td>
<td>308,108</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married Population</td>
<td>278,785</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed Population</td>
<td>39,021</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indianapolis-Carmel MSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

### Race/Ethnicity

#### Race
### Race

- **African American Population**: 38.53%
- **American Indian Population**: 0.33%
- **Asian Population**: 0.96%
- **Caucasian Population**: 52.88%
- **Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Population**: 0.04%
- **Multiple Race Population**: 2.82%
- **Other Race Population**: 4.44%

### Hispanic Population

- **Hispanic Population**: 10.78%
- **Non-Hispanic Population**: 89.22%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Population (2014)</td>
<td>380,737</td>
<td>158,609</td>
<td>267,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are represented with their respective uncertainties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population (2014)</th>
<th>Indianopolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>247,316 +/- 1,51626.9%</td>
<td>115,395</td>
<td>+/- 2,387 38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2,361 +/- 5000.257%</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>+/- 325 0.332%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Population (2014)</td>
<td>20,765 +/- 5302.26%</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>+/- 620 0.957%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>580,939 +/- 2,52563.2%</td>
<td>158,364</td>
<td>+/- 2,917 52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>327 +/- 2060.036%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>+/- 91.0 0.036%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Race</td>
<td>25,771 +/- 1,5202.8%</td>
<td>8,454</td>
<td>+/- 897 2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>41,857 +/- 2,7314.55%</td>
<td>13,309</td>
<td>+/- 1,759 4.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Population (2014)                 | 919,336 +/- 0.000       | 299,492       | +/- 2,807                                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Veteran Status</th>
<th>Indianopolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Military Veterans (2014)</td>
<td>55,617 +/- 1,382</td>
<td>16,481</td>
<td>+/- 745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Economy**

**Commercial Building Permits**

![Pie chart showing commercial building permits]

10.26% **All Commercial Demolition Permits**
89.74% **All Commercial Building Permits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Commercial Demolition</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Commercial Building</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment Statistics**

**Veteran Status**

**Veteran Employment**
Veteran Employment

53.08%  Total Military Veterans Age 18-64 who are Employed
10.89%  Total Military Veterans Age 18-64 who are Unemployed
36.03%  Total Military Veterans Age 18-64 who are not in the Labor Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Military Veterans Age 18-64 who are Employed (2014)</td>
<td>22,509 +/- 1,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Military Veterans Age 18-64 who are Unemployed (2014)</td>
<td>2,852 +/- 407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Military Veterans Age 18-64 who are not in the Labor Force (2014)</td>
<td>8,949 +/- 650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employed

Employment by Industry
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining</td>
<td>1,130 +/- 218</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>+/- 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation and Food</td>
<td>44,429 +/- 1,513</td>
<td>16,171</td>
<td>+/- 843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (2014)</td>
<td>22,856 +/- 1,187</td>
<td>7,466</td>
<td>+/- 582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (2014)</td>
<td>95,460 +/- 2,210</td>
<td>27,096</td>
<td>+/- 1,172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational, Health and Social Services (2014)</td>
<td>28,782 +/- 1,263</td>
<td>7,857</td>
<td>+/- 590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>7,627 +/- 658</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>+/- 306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (2014)</td>
<td>47,242 +/- 1,667</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>+/- 720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (2014)</td>
<td>19,098 +/- 1,116</td>
<td>6,410</td>
<td>+/- 601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (2014)</td>
<td>49,079 +/- 1,505</td>
<td>14,642</td>
<td>+/- 838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, Management, Administrative, and</td>
<td>18,387 +/- 829</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>+/- 417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Mgmt Services (2014)</td>
<td>54,140 +/- 1,796</td>
<td>15,944</td>
<td>+/- 919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (2014)</td>
<td>24,898 +/- 1,161</td>
<td>6,365</td>
<td>+/- 550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade (2014)</td>
<td>2,065 +/- 311</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>+/- 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing (2014)</td>
<td>13,736 +/- 956</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>+/- 387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (2014)</td>
<td>755 +/- 297</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>+/- 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade (2014)</td>
<td>30,698 +/- 1,398</td>
<td>9,838</td>
<td>+/- 686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population with Construction, Extraction and Maintenance</td>
<td>143,797 +/- 2,374</td>
<td>37,532</td>
<td>+/- 1,191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations (2014)</td>
<td>62,265 +/- 1,792</td>
<td>19,548</td>
<td>+/- 853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Material Moving
Occupations (2014)  
Population with Sales and Office Occupations (2014)  
Population with Service Occupations (2014)  
Population with Blue Collar Occupations (2014)  
Population with White Collar Occupations (2014)  
Total Employed Persons, Including Armed Forces (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in the Labor Force, Including Armed Forces (2014)</td>
<td>483,194 +/- 2,963</td>
<td>150,007</td>
<td>+/- 2,147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Not in Labor Force (2014)</td>
<td>229,858 +/- 2,733</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>86,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unemployed Persons (2014)</td>
<td>53,901 +/- 1,751</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>23,906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Education

## Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ Without High School Diploma</td>
<td>21.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With High School Diploma Only</td>
<td>31.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>19.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Bachelor's Degree or Higher</td>
<td>21.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Associate Degree Only</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indianapolis-Carmel MSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropouts (2014)</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>±-403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With High School Diploma or Higher (2014)</td>
<td>506,693</td>
<td>±-2,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Associate Degree or Higher (2014)</td>
<td>207,381</td>
<td>±-2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Graduate or Professional Degree (2014)</td>
<td>57,349</td>
<td>±-1,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Some College, No Degree (2014)</td>
<td>126,571</td>
<td>±-2,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Associate Degree Only (2014)</td>
<td>41,778</td>
<td>±-1,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2014)</td>
<td>165,603</td>
<td>±-2,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Dropouts (2014)</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>±-193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With High School Diploma or Higher (2014)</td>
<td>151,351</td>
<td>±-2,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Associate Degree or Higher (2014)</td>
<td>52,564</td>
<td>±-1,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Bachelor Degree Only (2014)</td>
<td>26,583</td>
<td>±-1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Graduate or Professional Degree (2014)</td>
<td>15,458</td>
<td>±-748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With High School Diploma Only (2014)</td>
<td>60,601</td>
<td>±-1,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Some College, No Degree (2014)</td>
<td>38,186</td>
<td>±-1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Associate Degree Only (2014)</td>
<td>10,523</td>
<td>±-750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+ With Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2014)</td>
<td>42,041</td>
<td>±-1,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment by School Type

Indianapolis-Carmel MSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment (2015)</td>
<td>174,957</td>
<td>53,029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School Enrollment-Total (2015)</td>
<td>21,837</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-Total (2015)</td>
<td>20,739</td>
<td>8,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-Total (2015)</td>
<td>132,381</td>
<td>31,994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charter Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Private School Enrollment</th>
<th>Total School Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian (2015)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (2015)</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian (2015)</td>
<td>8,894</td>
<td>2,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (2015)</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>2,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial (2015)</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades K-5 (2015)</td>
<td>8,557</td>
<td>5,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-8 (2015)</td>
<td>4,704</td>
<td>2,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9-12 (2015)</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>4,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades K-12 (2015)</td>
<td>21,580</td>
<td>12,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Private Enrollment by Grade

PR/Award # S377C170016
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### Private Enrollment by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Grades K-5</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Grades 6-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>38.63%</td>
<td>43.54%</td>
<td>17.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-African American (2010)</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>1,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-American Indian (2010)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-Asian (2010)</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-Caucasian (2010)</td>
<td>13,813</td>
<td>4,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-Hispanic (2010)</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-Multiracial (2010)</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-Grades 6-8 (2015)</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>1,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-Grades 9-12 (2015)</td>
<td>6,763</td>
<td>3,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Enrollment-Grades K-12 (2015)</td>
<td>19,644</td>
<td>7,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Traditional Public

Public Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Category</th>
<th>Number 1</th>
<th>Number 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-African American</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-Asian (2015)</td>
<td>4,383</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-Caucasian (2015)</td>
<td>48,948</td>
<td>6,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-Hispanic (2015)</td>
<td>23,977</td>
<td>7,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-Multiracial (2015)</td>
<td>7,905</td>
<td>1,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-Grades K-5 (2015)</td>
<td>64,122</td>
<td>17,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-Grades 6-8 (2015)</td>
<td>29,561</td>
<td>6,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-Grades 9-12 (2015)</td>
<td>36,668</td>
<td>6,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public School Enrollment-Grades K-12 (2015)</td>
<td>130,351</td>
<td>31,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

- **52%** Total Enrollment-African American
- **28.91%** Total Enrollment-Caucasian
- **13.41%** Total Enrollment-Hispanic
- **5.1%** Total Enrollment-Multiracial

**Total Enrollment by Grade**

PR/Award # S377C170016
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### Total Enrollment by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>55,101</td>
<td>24,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>73,372</td>
<td>13,697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17,545</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>8,855</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-8 (2015)</td>
<td>38,360</td>
<td>10,698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9-12 (2015)</td>
<td>51,750</td>
<td>14,551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades K-12 (2015)</td>
<td>171,575 98.1%</td>
<td>51,510 97.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measures

#### Graduation

**Traditional Public Diploma Types**
Indianapolis-Carmel Msa | Marion County | Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County
--- | --- | ---
Traditional Public School Core 40 Graduates (2012) | 4,138 | 725 |
| | 58.2% | 69.9% |
Traditional Public School Honors Graduates (2012) | 1,821 | 148 |
| | 25.6% | 14.3% |
Traditional Public School Regular Graduates (2012) | 1,145 | 164 |
| | 16.1% | 15.8% |
Traditional Public School Total Graduates (2012) | 7,104 | 1,037 |

Special Program Enrollment
Free/Reduced Lunch Program

Charter Free/Reduced Lunch Program
Charter Free/Reduced Lunch Program

- 74% Charter School Free Lunch Program Students
- 6.92% Charter School Reduced Lunch Program Students
- 19.07% Charter School Paid Lunch Students

Private Free/Reduced Lunch Program

- 19.51% Private School Free Lunch Program Students
- 6.9% Private School Reduced Lunch Program Students
- 73.59% Private School Paid Lunch Students

Traditional Public Free/Reduced Lunch Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>80,012</td>
<td>10,009</td>
<td>88,842</td>
<td>43,539</td>
<td>75,079</td>
<td>13,107</td>
<td>88,186</td>
<td>69,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,713</td>
<td>12,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing

Housing Costs
Owner Occupied

Monthly Costs - Owner Occupied

Housing Value
### Housing Value

![Pie chart showing housing value distribution](image)

### Indianapolis-Carmel MSA vs Marion County vs Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel MSA</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortgaged Owner Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of Less than $200 (2014)</td>
<td>74 (~55.0)</td>
<td>5 (~8.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgaged Owner Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $200 to $299 (2014)</td>
<td>404 (~120)</td>
<td>176 (~70.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgaged Owner Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $300 to $499 (2014)</td>
<td>3,026 (~309)</td>
<td>1,314 (~188)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgaged Owner Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $500 to $699 (2014)</td>
<td>11,400 (~618 5.71%)</td>
<td>5,206 (~335)</td>
<td>9.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgaged Owner Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $700 to $999 (2014)</td>
<td>40,331 (~1,412 20.2%)</td>
<td>12,411 (~646)</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgaged Owner Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $1000 to $1499 (2014)</td>
<td>58,787 (~1,517)</td>
<td>11,267 (~577)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PR/Award #: S377C170016**
### Occupied housing units with monthly housing costs of $1500 or more (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,868 /- 1,236</td>
<td>21,186 /- 1,044</td>
<td>7,181 /- 506</td>
<td>2,998 /- 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,282 /- 434</td>
<td>3,662 /- 326</td>
<td>1,377 /- 196</td>
<td>581 /- 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value Owner Occupied Housing (2014)</td>
<td>117,400 /- 873</td>
<td>80,100 /- 1,171</td>
<td>19,596 /- 864</td>
<td>10,823 /- 559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Housing Units with Value of Less Than $50,000 (2014)</td>
<td>55,896 /- 1,556</td>
<td>24,191 /- 898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Housing Units with Value of $50,000 to $99,999 (2014)</td>
<td>60,361 /- 1,550</td>
<td>6,839 /- 405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Housing Units with Value of $100,000 to $149,999 (2014)</td>
<td>31,161 /- 1,164</td>
<td>5,192 /- 395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Housing Units with Value of $150,000 to $199,999 (2014)</td>
<td>32,799 /- 1,063</td>
<td>7,331 /- 438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Housing Units with Value of $200,000 or More (2014)</td>
<td>18,983 /- 831 9.5%</td>
<td>18,983 /- 831</td>
<td>3,972 /- 325</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Housing Units with Value of $200,000 to $299,999 (2014)</td>
<td>9,390 /- 539 4.7%</td>
<td>9,390 /- 539</td>
<td>2,272 /- 237</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Housing Units with Value of $300,000 to $499,999 (2014)</td>
<td>2,525 /- 304 1.26%</td>
<td>2,525 /- 304</td>
<td>696 /- 131</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Housing Units with Value of $500,000 to $749,999 (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Housing Units with Value of $750,000 to $999,999 (2014)
Owner Occupied
Housing Units with Value of $1,000,000 or More (2014)

---

Renter Occupied

Monthly Costs - Renter Occupied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Costs - Renter Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.53% Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of Less than $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21% Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $200 to $299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.76% Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $300 to $499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.33% Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $500 to $699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.2% Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $700 to $999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.02% Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $1000 to $1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25% Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $1500 to $1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7% Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $2000 or More</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel MSA</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Monthly Rental Housing Costs (2014)</td>
<td>781 +/- 5.00</td>
<td>767 +/- 8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of Less than $200 (2014)</td>
<td>1,706 +/- 342</td>
<td>944 +/- 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $200 to $299 (2014)</td>
<td>3,675 +/- 438 2.27%</td>
<td>1,973 +/- 300 3.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $300 to $499 (2014)</td>
<td>9,304 +/- 714</td>
<td>5,388 +/- 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Housing Units with Monthly Housing Costs of $500 to $699 (2014)</td>
<td>42,038 +/- 1,499 26%</td>
<td>16,819 +/- 856 26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Housing Units Whose Structure Was Built in 1980 to 1989 (2014)
- Indianapolis-Carmel Msa: 47,568
- Marion County: 5,959
- Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County: 5,959

### Number of Housing Units Whose Structure Was Built in 1990 to 1999 (2014)
- Indianapolis-Carmel Msa: 54,820
- Marion County: 5,798
- Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County: 5,798

### Number of Housing Units Whose Structure Was Built in 2000 or Later (2014)
- Indianapolis-Carmel Msa: 44,156
- Marion County: 6,416
- Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County: 6,416

### Owner Occupied Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Units</td>
<td>199,813</td>
<td>54,376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Renter Occupied Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Units</td>
<td>161,835</td>
<td>64,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>418,747</td>
<td>150,935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential Building Permits

Residential Building Permits
Residential Building Permits

14.24% All Residential Demolition Permits 85.76% All Residential Building Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Ms</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Residential Demolition Permits (2014)</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Residential Building Permits (2014)</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taxes

Property Taxes
### Indianapolis-Carmel MSA, Marion County, Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>69,140</td>
<td>68,989</td>
<td>106,170</td>
<td>56,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>42,778</td>
<td>27,208</td>
<td>26,760</td>
<td>12,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Income

Income Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GINI Index of Income</td>
<td>0.47 ±/−0.006</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>±/−0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income Ranges

- **Households with income Less Than $10,000**: 15.89%
- **Households with income $10,000 to $24,999**: 25.08%
- **Households with income $25,000 to $49,999**: 28.83%
- **Households with income $50,000 to $74,999**: 13.92%
- **Households with income $75,000 to $99,999**: 6.94%
- **Households with income $100,000 or More**: 9.35%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Income Less Than $10,000 (2014)</td>
<td>35,152 ±/−1,2849.72%</td>
<td>18,878 ±/−857</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Income $10,000 to $24,999 (2014)</td>
<td>69,711 ±/−1,891</td>
<td>29,794 ±/−1,082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Income $25,000 to $49,999 (2014)</td>
<td>101,242 ±/−2,32028%</td>
<td>34,248 ±/−1,168</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Income $50,000 to $74,999 (2014)</td>
<td>63,910 ±/−1,65417.7%</td>
<td>16,533 ±/−784</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Income $75,000 to $99,999 (2014)</td>
<td>38,469 ±/−1,33810.6%</td>
<td>8,242 ±/−565</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Income $100,000 or More (2014)</td>
<td>53,164 ±/−1,47814.7%</td>
<td>11,107 ±/−593</td>
<td>9.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.savi.org
### Per Capita Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Capita Income (2014)</th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52,317</td>
<td>+/- 749</td>
<td>36,612</td>
<td>+/- 943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42,378</td>
<td>+/- 545</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td>+/- 574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty

#### Living In Poverty

### Poverty by Age

#### Population in Poverty

- 14.09% Population Age 5 and Under Living in Poverty
- 20.78% Population Age 6 to 17 Living in Poverty
- 60.54% Population Age 18 to 64 Living in Poverty
- 4.59% Population Age 65 and Over Living in Poverty
### Population in Poverty

67.79% Population with Income at or Above Poverty Level
32.21% Population Living in Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families in Poverty</td>
<td>35,439</td>
<td>+/- 1,081 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Related Children</td>
<td>29,157</td>
<td>+/- 1,323 13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Age 18 (2014)</td>
<td>27,810</td>
<td>+/- 1,122 34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 6 to 17</td>
<td>42,606</td>
<td>+/- 1,521 29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Poverty</td>
<td>70,416</td>
<td>+/- 1,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Living in Poverty</td>
<td>109,398</td>
<td>+/- 2,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 65 and</td>
<td>9,313</td>
<td>+/- 565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Living in Poverty</td>
<td>189,127</td>
<td>+/- 4,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population with Income</td>
<td>PR/Award # S377C170016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.savi.org
Public Assistance and Non-Wage Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indianapolis-Carmel Msa</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Cash Public Assistance or Food</td>
<td>63,844 ± 1,605</td>
<td>31,611 ± 958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps/SNAP 2014</td>
<td>9,999 ± 992.77%</td>
<td>4,549 ± 380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Public Assistance Income (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Source Providers

Data Sources

U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-year Averages
Department of Code Enforcement (DCE)
Indiana Dept of Education
Indiana Department of Local Government Finance via Indiana Business Research Center

Every effort is made to provide accurate information within the SAVI database, and while the information has been obtained from sources believed to be reliable, the accuracy, completeness, and opinions based thereon, are not guaranteed. As such, SAVI and their data source providers make no warranty about the accuracy of the data and are not responsible for derived products or resulting analysis based on data obtained from SAVI. As always, SAVI and the original data source provider (e.g., US Census Bureau) should be cited when publishing maps or presenting the results of analysis that are based on these data.
session overview

Introduction to IPS

A Groundwater Approach: The Case for Racial Equity Work

Questions and Discussion
IPS vision and mission

**Vision**

IPS will be the flagship in innovative urban education, preparing all students to be successful in the global economy.

**Mission**

The mission of Indianapolis Public Schools is to prepare and empower all students for life.

This commitment is the point of departure for the equity work.
Core Commitment & Belief 1.3

- All IPS students can achieve their full potential, learn at high levels and graduate prepared to succeed in school, career and life.
- It is immoral to allow race, ethnicity or socioeconomic status to limit student achievement.

Logo Explained 2.1–2.3

- Autonomy, Diversity, Equity and Unity
- Two circles represent equity, which IPS embraces in the diverse community we proudly serve.
- Diversity is represented within the two circles by their different sizes and shades of blue.
- Solidifying the theme of unity is the orange crescent, encompassing our diverse and autonomous school communities within IPS.
vision

An IPS community where student outcomes cannot be predicted by race or ethnicity.

mission

To lead a collaboration of community members who will partner with IPS to improve outcomes for all students by eliminating racial disproportionality and disparity.
Indiana

Top 12 Indiana Districts by Total Student Population

Source: IDOE, data from 2015.
Marion County Districts by Total Student Population

Source: IDOE, data from 2015.
student population

african american

Top 12 Indiana Districts by Black Student Population

Source: IDOE, data from 2015.
Top 12 Indiana Districts by Hispanic Student Population

Source: IDOE, data from 2013.
IPS is evenly split male/female and has heaviest enrollment K–6

Source: IDEO, data from 2016.
% of IPS students in key categories, ranked against other 134 Indiana districts with enrollment over 2,000 students

- % Free and Reduced Textbooks: IPS - 76% (8 of 134)
- % Special Education: IPS - 18% (25 of 134)
- % Passing ISTEP+: Grades 3–8: IPS - 53% (131 of 134)
- Graduation Rate: IPS - 72% (131 of 134)

Source: DOE, data as of 2015.
session overview

- Introduction to IPS
- A Groundwater Approach: The Case for Racial Equity Work
- Questions and Discussion
1. Racial inequity looks the same across systems

2. Socio-economic difference does not explain the racial inequity

3. Systems contribute significantly to disparities

4. The systems-level disparities cannot be explained by a few ‘bad apple’ or ill-intentioned gatekeepers

5. Poor outcomes are concentrated in certain geographic communities; usually poor communities and communities of color

6. An analysis that includes race draws starkly different conclusions than an analysis that does not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>Disproportionality</td>
<td>Refers to the proportion of ethnic or racial groups of children in child welfare compared to those groups in the general population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health Disparity</td>
<td>Healthcare disparities refer to differences in access to or availability of facilities and services. Health status disparities refer to the variation in rates of disease occurrence and disabilities between socioeconomic and/or geographically defined population groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>Disproportionate Minority Contact (“DMC”)</td>
<td>Refers to the disproportionate number of minority youth who came into contact with the juvenile justice system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Achievement)</td>
<td>Achievement Gap</td>
<td>When one group of students (such as, students grouped by race/ethnicity, gender) outperforms another group and the difference in average scores for the two groups is statistically significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (SPED)</td>
<td>Disproportionate Representation</td>
<td>Refers to the “overrepresentation” and “underrepresentation” of a particular demographic group in special education programs relative to the presence of this group in the overall student population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Historically Underutilized Businesses</td>
<td>Businesses that are disadvantaged and are deemed in need of assistance to compete successfully in the marketplace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative Rate Index (Times more likely than a white person to have a bad outcome)

Health
- Death from diabetes
- Infant death
- Grade 3 students below grade level

Education
- Drop out of school
- Out of school
- Incarceration rate

Criminal Justice
- Death row
- Referrals to Juvenile Justice
- Children tried as adults
- Children in foster care
- Children living in poverty

Economic
- CPS
- Unemployment

Relate rate index for measures across health, education, criminal justice, juvenile justice, child welfare, and economic well-being in Indiana systems (black as reference)
cross-systems outcomes by race

north carolina systems

Relative rate index for measures across health, education, criminal justice, child welfare and economic well-being in North Carolina

Relative rate index for measures across education, child welfare, juvenile justice, criminal justice and health in Texas

Relative rate index for measures across health, education, criminal justice, juvenile justice, child welfare and economic well-being in Indiana

Sources:
IPS Enrollment by Race 1939–2014

de facto segregation in 1949

High School Enrollment Totals by Race (1964–1965)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Non-Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attucks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Ripple</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>2360</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortridge</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech</td>
<td>3637</td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marion County School Systems by Race for 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech Grove</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedway</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Enrollment | 30,097 | 2,986 | 8,748 | 6,202 | 15,758 | 1,735 | 15,758 | 11,348 | 12,100 | 15,164 | 11,278 |

**Majority White Townships** (Total enrollment: 34,626)

**Majority Non-White Townships** (Total enrollment: 65,648)

Source: doe.in.gov
Marion County Students by Race and Type of School for 2015

54% of Marion County Whites in Private or White Township Schools...

...compared to only 8% of Blacks...

...and 17% of Hispanics

Source: SavL.org and DOE Compass
Students in IPS Who Attend Schools That Are >50%, >40% and >30% White

White Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Students in School Who are White</th>
<th># of White Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All White Students</td>
<td>(6,232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50% White</td>
<td>(2,003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40% White</td>
<td>(15,134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30% White</td>
<td>(434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30% White</td>
<td>(1,441)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>(2,013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Students in School Who are White</th>
<th># of Black Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Black Students</td>
<td>(1389)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50% White</td>
<td>(461)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40% White</td>
<td>(85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30% White</td>
<td>(12,850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30% White</td>
<td>(434)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: doe.in.gov, REI Analysis
Scatter Plot Comparing % Student in a School Who are White with % of Students in a School Who are Passing

\[ y = 0.388x + 0.4563 \]

- % Passing ECA English (2014)  
- % Passing Both Math and ELA ISTEP+ (2015)

Source: doe.in.gov, REI Analysis, 'IPS System Analysis v2'
Scatter Plot Comparing % Student in a School Who are White with % of Students in a School Who are Passing

Source: doe.in.gov, REI Analysis, 'IPS System Analysis v2'
Scatter Plot Comparing % Student in a School Who are White with % of Students in a School Who are Passing

High Performing Non-white Schools tend to have high Non-black populations [% Non-black, Non-white population noted in "()"

Source: doe.in.gov, REI Analysis, ‘IPS System Analysis v2’
IPS racial gaps

Student Placement, Need, Performance and Discipline by Race Across IPS

Notes: 1) HA reflects 2014 district totals based on 2397 identified students 2) SPED data from ‘505152byRaceGender.xls’ 3) FRT data from eSchool, 2016 4) IREAD-3 data for 2014–2015

Sources: IPS, REI Analysis
IPS racial gaps

% of Students Passing ISTEP+
English/Language Arts by Race

% Passing

Year

2013 2014 2015

69.9% 63.5% 64.2%
72.5% 58.0%
52.9% 53.5%
45.4%
35.7%

White Hispanic Black

% of Students Passing ISTEP+
Math by Race

% Passing

Year

2013 2014 2015

76.2% 73.6% 58.8%
76.9% 71.0%
57.4%
42.1%
28.8%

White Hispanic Black

*New assessments given for 2014–2015

Source: Indianapolis Public Schools
Indiana (including Hispanics)

Relative rate index for measures across child welfare, health, education, criminal justice, child welfare and economic well-being in Indiana

Hispanics fall generally between Blacks and whites, supporting hypothesis of racial hierarchy, but pattern is somewhat inconsistent, likely due to inconsistency in classification, significant recent immigration, and other factors.
Cross-systems outcome by race

North Carolina (including Hispanics)

Relative rate index for measures across child welfare, health, education, criminal justice, child welfare, and economic well-being in North Carolina

cross-systems outcome by race
texas (including hispanics)

Relative rate index for measures across child welfare, health, education, criminal justice, child welfare and economic well-being in Indiana

Odds of Having a Chronic Disease for Recent Immigrant, Long-Term Immigrant and U.S. Born for Mexicans and Central Americans

indiana hispanic population

Growth of Indiana Hispanic Population

4x population growth since 1990

Over one-third of 2011 population is foreign born

34% Foreign Born

66% US Born

## Two Measures of “Race”
How Usually Classified by Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Self-Identify</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian Indian Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White 26,373</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black 5,246</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic 1,528</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

identity and health

General health status, by self-identified and socially-assigned “race,” 2004

How to interpret x-axis labels: Hispanic-Hispanic connotes identify as Hispanic and are viewed as Hispanic, etc.

### Latinos by County of Origin and Racial Identification on American Community Survey 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominicans</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadorans</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalans</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hondurans</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Ricans</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivians</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombians</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuelans</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chileans</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubans</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentines</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 PUMS (Public Use Microdata) 5% Sample. Compiled by Eduardo Bonilla-Silva in *Racism without Racists*. 
Interrace marriage

Interrace marriage Rates by Race and Ethnicity:
Percentage of Newlyweds Married to Someone of a Different Race/Ethnicity 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interrace marriage Types:
Newly Married Couples, 2008

- Hispanic/White: 41%
- Asian/White: 15%
- Other: 17%
- Black/White: 11%
- Both Non-White: 16%

Interrace marriage with Caucasians likely increases the number of Latinos who self-identify as white and who are seen by others as Caucasians

Projected US Population by Race

- Other: 5.5%
- Asian, PI: 9.3%
- Black: 13.0%
- Hispanic: 28.6%
- White: 43.6%

Notes: Multiple race, American Indian included in other. All Hispanic included in other. Sources: Census.gov
Projected US Population by Race Modified to Classify Half of Hispanics as White

- White, 57.9%
- Asian, PI, 9.3%
- Black, 13.0%
- Hispanic, 14.3%
- Other, 5.5%

Source: Census.gov, REI analysis
**U.S. Census Racial Classifications for Select Years 1790–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Free White Females and Males</td>
<td>Black and White Have Never Moved from Position as 'Bookends'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mexican was added in 1930 and removed in 1940, largely because LULAC, Mexican Government, and others argued that Mexicans were 'White' and had associated rights. A 'Latino' category was re-added in 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Chinese; Filipino; Hindu; Japanese; Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Chinese; Filipino; Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Asian Indian; Chinese; Filipino; Japanese; Korean; Vietnamese; Other Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian, Guamanian or Chamorro; Samoan; Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin; Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicana; Puerto Rican; Cuban; Another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)*
1. Racial inequity looks the same across systems

2. Socio-economic difference does not explain the racial inequity

3. Systems contribute significantly to disparities

4. The systems-level disparities cannot be explained by a few ‘bad apple’ or ill-intentioned gatekeepers

5. Poor outcomes are concentrated in certain geographic communities; usually poor communities and communities of color

6. An analysis that includes race draws starkly different conclusions than an analysis that does not

Additional detail on observations 4–6 available in extended presentation
cross-systems outcomes by race

indiana systems (black as reference)

Relative rate index for measures across health, education, criminal justice, juvenile justice, child welfare and economic well-being in Indiana

About the Health United States Annual Report

"Health, United States, 2006 is the 30th report on the health status of the Nation and is submitted by the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to the President and Congress of the United States in compliance with Section 308 of the Public Health Service Act.

This report was compiled by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics served in a review capacity."

The 2006 report included infant mortality by mother's education level and race.
birth outcomes

Infants Deaths by Mother's Race and Education Level

- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Hispanic or Latino
- Non-Hispanic White

Less than high school
High school
College +

Infant deaths per 1000 live births (2003)

Infants Deaths by Mother's Race and Education Level

- Less than high school
- High school
- College +

Race and ethnicity of mother

- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Hispanic or Latino
- Non-Hispanic White

Source: National Center for Health Statistics, Health, United States, 2006; with Chartbook on Trends in the Health of Americans, Hyattsville, MD: 2006
Infants Deaths by Mother's Race and Education Level

- Less than high school
- High school
- College +

Source: National Center for Health Statistics, Health, United States, 2006; With Chartbook on Trends in the Health of Americans, Hyattsville, MD: 2006
Infants Deaths by Mother's Race and Education Level

- Less than high school
- High school
- College +

Infants Deaths by Mother's Race and Education Level

McKinsey & Company’s Social Sector Practice:

“While independent racial and income achievement gaps exist, whites significantly outperform Black and Latino students at each income level.

Using regression analysis, both income and race independently influence a student’s achievement score, as well as factors not explained by demographics.”
Educational Longitudinal Study Cognitive Tests for Grade 10 by Family Income and Race (2002)

Educational Longitudinal Study Cognitive Tests for Grade 10 by Family Income and Race (2002)

Educational Longitudinal Study Cognitive Tests for Grade 10 by Family Income and Race (2002)

Educational Longitudinal Study Cognitive Tests for Grade 10 by Family Income and Race (2002)

Educational Longitudinal Study Cognitive Tests for Grade 10 by Family Income and Race (2002)

PR/Award # S377G170016

Race, Wealth and Incarceration: Results from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth

- National Longitudinal Survey of Youth
- 12,686 men and women first interviewed at 14–22 years old in 1979
- Grouped students by race and household wealth (decile) in 1985
- Tracked to see which youth ended up doing time in prison between 1979 and 2012
Rich black kids are more likely to go to prison than poor white kids

Share of people born between 1957 and 1965 who eventually went to prison or jail, by how much wealth they had as of 1985, when they were between 20 and 28 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BLACKS</th>
<th>HISPANICS</th>
<th>WHITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WAPO.ST/WONKBLOG
Note: Rates may be understated, as those incarcerated for brief periods between surveys are not included.
Are Emily and Greg More Employable than LaKisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination
labor market discrimination

Responded to ~1,300 employment ads

- Employment opportunities in sales, administrative support, clerical, and customer services job categories

Submitted ~5,000 resumes

- Variation in experience and job history

Randomly assigned very White-sounding names and very Black-sounding names

- Used frequency data from MA birth certificates between 1974 and 1979
  - White examples: Emily Walsh or Greg Baker
  - African-American examples: Lakisha Washington or Jamal Jones
callback rates

Callback Rates by “Race of Name” and Resume Quality

 Callback Rate

10% 8% 6% 4% 2% 0%

White Names  Black Names

High-quality Resumes  Low-quality Resumes
additional findings
“Discrimination in the Credential Society: An Audit Study of Race and College Selectivity in the Labor Market”
disparity and higher education

Additional Findings

- Federal contractors and employers who listed Equal Opportunity Employer in their ad discriminated as much as other employers.
- “These results suggest that racial discrimination is still a prominent feature of the labor market.”
- The amount of discrimination was uniform across occupations and industries.
- “We find little evidence that our results are driven by employers inferring something other than race, such as social class, from the names.”

Study from NBER, Harvard and UChicago shows that race actually, in part, determines income
Submitted 2016 resumes to 1008 employment ads

- Jobs included administrative assistant, analyst, clerical, customer service, HR, managerial, sales
- Variance by elite universities (Harvard, Stanford, Duke) and less elite universities (UMASS Amherst, UC Riverside, UNCG)

Randomly assigned very black-sounding and very white-sounding names

- Use frequency data from NY birth certificates from early 2000s, avoiding immigrant or Muslim names, selecting upper, middle and lower class based on mothers SES\(^1\)
- Black examples: Jalen, Lamar, DaQuan, Nia, Ebony, Shanice
- White examples: Caleb, Charlie, Ronny, Aubrey, Erica, Lesly
Percentage of Applicants Receiving Call-Backs by Race and College Selectivity

White
- Elite Schools: 15%
- State Schools: 10%

Black
- Elite Schools: 12%
- State Schools: 7%
Percentage of Applicants Receiving Call-Backs by Race and College Selectivity

- **White**:
  - Elite Schools: 17.5%
  - State Schools: 11.4%

- **Black**:
  - Elite Schools: 12.9%
  - State Schools: 6.5%
Percentage of Total Job Offers That Are for High Value Jobs (High Salary, High Education Requirements) by Race

- White: 25%
- Black: 15%
racial gap within groups in IPS

Free and Reduced Textbook Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>% of Sub-population</th>
<th>% Disciplinary Actions Resulting in Loss of Instructional Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High Ability Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>% of Sub-population</th>
<th>% Disciplinary Actions Resulting in Loss of Instructional Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Education Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>% of Sub-population</th>
<th>% Disciplinary Actions Resulting in Loss of Instructional Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td><img src="chart5.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td><img src="chart6.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discipline here defined only as discipline resulting in loss of instructional time.

Source: Indianapolis Public Schools, REI Analytics
Disciplinary Actions per # of Students is Whitest / Blackest Schools

Students Receiving Discipline in Whitest / Blackest Schools
1. Racial inequity looks the same across systems

2. Socio-economic difference does not explain the racial inequity

3. Systems contribute significantly to disparities

4. The systems-level disparities cannot be explained by a few ‘bad apple’ or ill-intentioned gatekeepers

5. Poor outcomes are concentrated in certain geographic communities; usually poor communities and communities of color

6. An analysis that includes race draws starkly different conclusions than an analysis that does not

Additional detail on observations 4–6 available in extended presentation
Sample included 928,940 Texas Students

Multivariate analysis of 83 factors, including:
- Student demographics
- Student attributes
- Academic performance
- Discipline contact
- Campus measures
- Cohort measures
- County measures

Controlling for 83 factors, white students 31% less likely to receive discretionary discipline.

"Multivariate analyses, which enabled researchers to **control for 83 different variables in isolating the effect of race alone** on disciplinary actions, found that African American students had a 31 percent higher likelihood of a school discretionary action, compared to otherwise identical white and Hispanic students."

---

**TABLE 1: Probability of School Discipline Involvement in 9th Grade by Race**

(Controlling for All Other Measurable Student and Campus Attributes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chance of</th>
<th>DISCRETIONARY</th>
<th>MANDATORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disciplinary action in 9th grade</td>
<td>disciplinary action in 9th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For students who are...</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>31.1% higher</td>
<td>23.3% lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Equal chance</td>
<td>16.4% higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preschool Suspensions

Figures are for one-time, out-of-school suspensions. Numbers do not total 100 due to rounding.

Data from more than 1 million public schools, representing 99% of those that have preschoolers.

Excerpts from Institute of Medicine’s “Unequal Treatment”

“...research indicates that minorities are less likely than whites to receive services, including clinically necessary procedures, even after correcting for access-related factors, such as insurance status.”

“Aspects of health systems—such as the ways in which systems are organized and financed, and the availability of services—may exert different effects on patient care, particularly for racial and ethnic minorities.”

“...research to date has demonstrated that health care providers' diagnostic and treatment decisions, as well as their feelings about patients, are influenced by patients' race or ethnicity and stereotypes associated with them...

...[stereotypes] are held even by people who truly believe that they do not judge others based on social categories.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countrywide</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.5M mortgages, 2004–2008</td>
<td>Whites have 2–8x lower odds of getting subprime mortgage</td>
<td>$335M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLS FARGO</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Analysis of nationwide lending 2004–2009</td>
<td>Whites more than 4x less likely to get subprime mortgage than Blacks and more than 3x less likely than Hispanics</td>
<td>$175M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunTrust</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Analysis of 850,000 loans 2005–2009</td>
<td>Whites charged 1.9%–2.6% less for APR than Blacks</td>
<td>$21M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNC</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Analysis of 850,000 Nat’l City Bank loans 2002–2008</td>
<td>Whites charged $228 less than Blacks in annual fees and $125 less than Hispanics</td>
<td>$35M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson City Bank</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Analysis of 2004–2010 lending in NYC, Northern NJ and Philadelphia</td>
<td>New Hudson opened 92–95% of new branches and broker relationships in white communities</td>
<td>$33M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPS staffing

overall

IPS Students and Staff by Race (2015 and 2016)

by job title

Race of IPS Staff (%) by Job Type (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Type</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work Support</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and ROTC</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Management</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach / Music</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker / Nurse / Psychologist</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Maintenance</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IPS staffing

by job and salary

Average Salary by Job Type and Race

- District Management
- School Management
- Business Operations
- Facilities and Maintenance
- Social Worker / Nurse / Psychologist
- Teacher
- Police and ROTC
- Tech
- Transportation
- Coach / Music
- Library
- Custodian
- Clerical
- Education and Social Work Support
- Food Service
- Teaching Assistant
- Board
- All Workers

Sources: IPS Munic, Accessed Jan 20, 2016

On average, a Black worker in IPS makes 75 cents for each $1.00 made by a white IPS worker.
salary expenditures

Total Salary Expenditures by Employee Race

Collectively, whites receive \( \sim 2x \) as much in IPS salary revenue as all others combined.

Sources: IPS Munis, Accessed Jan 20, 2016
elgible contract expenditures


- FY 2014:
  - Total: 39.8M (100%)
  - White Men Owned: 35.7M (90%)
  - White Women Owned: 2.1M (5.1%)
  - Minority Owned: 2.0M (5.0%)

- FY 2015:
  - Total: 37.9M (100%)
  - White Men Owned: 33.9M (90%)
  - White Women Owned: 2.1M (5.6%)
  - Minority Owned: 1.9M (5.0%)

Both years, whites received ~19x as much in contract revenue.

Analysis assumes businesses owned by minority women are counted as minority-owned only.
eligible IPS contracts

### Total 2014–2015 IPS Enrollment by Race

- Total Students: 30.1K
- White: 23.9K (79%)
- Non-White: 6.2K (21%)

### Total 2015 Spend by Race ($230M, Contract and Salary)

- Total Spend: $230M
- White: 162M (70%)
- Non-White: 68M (30%)

### Total 2015 Spend per Student by Race

- Per student, IPS spent ~9x as much in white communities in 2015

---

Sources: IPS Supplier Diversity Report, January 26, 2016; IPS Munis, Accessed Jan 20, 2016; REI Analysis
Socioeconomic Status and Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analytic Review of Research
Published in Review of Educational Research, 2005

Meta-analysis reviewed the literature on socioeconomic status (SES) and academic achievement in journal articles published between 1990 and 2000. The sample included 101,157 students, 6,871 schools, and 128 school districts gathered from 74 independent samples.

“This review’s overall finding, therefore, suggests that parents’ location in the socioeconomic structure has a strong impact on students’ academic achievement.

Family SES sets the stage for students’ academic performance both by directly providing resources at home and by indirectly providing the social capital that is necessary to succeed in school. Family SES also helps to determine the kind of school and classroom environment to which the student has access.”
IPS in regional economy

20 Largest Employers in 9-County Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. St. Vincent Health</td>
<td>17,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IU Health</td>
<td>11,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eli Lilly and Company</td>
<td>10,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community Health</td>
<td>10,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wal-Mart</td>
<td>8,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Marsh Supermarkets</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. IN University-Purdue</td>
<td>7,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. City of Indianapolis/Marion County</td>
<td>7,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kroger</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. FedEx Express</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Roche Diagnostics</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Indianapolis Public Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,356</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Rolls-Royce</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Anthem</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Franciscan St. Francis Health</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. AT&amp;T</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Defense Finance &amp; Accounting Service</td>
<td>3,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Eskenazi Health</td>
<td>3,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Archdiocese of Indianapolis</td>
<td>2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Meijer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 9-county Indianapolis Region includes Boone, Hamilton, Hancock, Hendricks, Johnson, Madison, Marion, Morgan and Shelby County

IPS employees added as if IPS were separate employer - likely already counted in #8 “City of Indianapolis/Marion County”

Sources: Indianapolis Business Journal, Reference USA, Indy Chamber, Indy Partnership, 2014-2015 IPS.
groundwater approach

1. Racial inequity looks the same across systems
2. Socio-economic difference does not explain the racial inequity
3. Systems contribute significantly to disparities
4. The systems-level disparities cannot be explained by a few ‘bad apple’ or ill-intentioned gatekeepers
5. Poor outcomes are concentrated in certain geographic communities; usually poor communities and communities of color
6. An analysis that includes race draws starkly different conclusions than an analysis that does not

Additional detail on observations 4–6 available in extended presentation
session overview

Introduction to IPS

A Groundwater Approach: The Case for Racial Equity Work

Questions and Discussion
questions and discussion

framing: 4 elements to change

- Get Proximate to the Problem
- Change the Narrative
- Maintain Hope
- Be Willing to Be Uncomfortable
### framing: adaptive challenges

#### Technical Problems
- Easy to identify
- Often lend themselves to quick and easy (cut-and-dried) solutions
- Often can be solved by an authority or expert
- Require change in just one or a few places, often contained within organizational boundaries
- People are generally receptive to technical solutions and solutions can often be implemented quickly (even by edict)

#### Adaptive Challenges
- Difficult to identify (easy to deny)
- Require changes in values, beliefs, roles, relationships and approaches to work
- People with the problem do the work of solving it
- Require change in numerous places; usually cross organizational boundaries
- People often resist even acknowledging adaptive challenges; therefore, solutions require experiments and new discoveries; they can take a long time to implement and cannot be implemented by edict

---

IPS racial gaps

% of Students Passing ISTEP+ (Both English/Language Arts and Math) by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multiracial</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Am. Indian</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indianapolis Public Schools
IPS racial equity team

Team Members:
Mike Akers, Principal
Taeven Barnes, Parent Involvement Educator
Deborah Black, Parent Involvement Ed. Coordinator
Annmarie Byers, Office of Racial Equity
Jessica Dunn Feeser, ESL Coordinator
Corye Franklin, Elementary Principal
Tricia Frye, Planning Supervisor
Patsy Hall, Teacher Literacy Support Specialist
Rita Hogan, Parent Involvement Educator
Sarah Hutchison, ESL Specialist
Naplio Johnson, Parent Involvement Educator
Tina Naugles, Parent Involvement Educator
Greg Newlin, Enrollment and Options Officer
Patricia Payne, Coordinator, Office of Racial Equity
Tracy Pruitt, Coordinator of Support Services
Arturo Rodriguez, ESL Specialist
Constance Tardy, Administrative Associate
 Desmond Williams, Behavioral Specialist

Pilot Schools

Charles W. Fairbanks School 105
George Washington High School
Rousseau McClellan School 91
Clarence Farrington School 61
Frances W. Parker School 56
George W. Fisher School 93
Daniel Webster School 46
Eleanor Skillen School 34
Stephen Foster School 67
Joe Gramelspacher

CHOICE ENROLLMENT PROPOSAL

myIPS
Diversity

IPs Recognizes The Educational And Social Value Of Human Differences And Their Various Forms. We Are Committed To Creating A Comprehensive, Family-Friendly And Transparent Enrollment And Choice Application Process That Includes Excellent Customer Service To Families.

Statement

3.1.1

3.4

Schools are diverse, vibrant and welcoming. Providing many school choice options helps families find the school best matched to their child’s talents, needs, interests & unique learning styles.

Guiding Principles
Note: Students currently attending choice programs will not have their enrollment affected by any proposed changes.

1. Narrow & uniform proximity zones
2. Multiple-round application process
3. Strategic marketing & targeted recruitment

proposed actions
If employee application results in multiple locations, then the logic below is executed for each school geographic filter determines lottery entry for programs with application.
Round 3
- Waitlist begins
- April 17 lottery week
- April 21 Round 2
- March 13 - April 21
- 10% of seats

Round 2
- March 6 lottery week
- Response deadline
- March 3 Round 1
- Jan 16 - March 3
- 20% of seats

Round 1
- Jan 9 lottery week
- Nov 19 - Jan 6
- 70% of seats

Key Points
- Repeat application permitted without risk
- Single offer per applicant
- Gradual release of seats (Grades KG, 7th & 8th only)
- Waitlist begins after Round 3

(proposed)
multiple round application process
Accelerated filling seats
Response deadline will school is in session
critical dates occur while
Round opening (execute
1-week between closure &
(6-8 weeks)
comparable length windows

International dates

multiple round rationale & benefits
Identify satellite sites for spring enrollment events

Conduct pre-K family outreach

Enlist credible community partners as advocates

Employ grassroots marketing in target geographies

Identity demographic & geographic targets

myIPS

Strategic Marketing (proposed)
evolve and continuously refine and execute targeted marketing plans.

Communicate changes to stakeholders.

Present changes for board action.

Ensure board support.
It is important to ensure that race is used to the least extent needed to workably serve your compelling interest.

If you continue to need to consider the race of individual students to achieve your compelling interest(s), you may then consider approaches that take into account the race of individual students. When doing so, evaluate each student as an individual and do not make the race-neutral and generalized race-based approaches workable to achieve your goals.

Implementing Your Plan

Evaluate how you will know when your compelling interest has been achieved.

Identifying the Reason for Your Plan

Key Steps for Implementing Programs to Achieve Diversity or Avoid Racial Isolation

USDOE/DOJ Guidance
may arise about the basis for your decisions.

To avoid racial isolation, the ways in which your chosen approach helps to achieve diversity or avoid racial isolation, and the process your institution has followed in arriving at your decisions, including alternatives you would be helpful to maintain documents that describe your compelling interest, and the

Your district’s process for students or parents to raise concerns about school assignments or
diversity or avoid racial isolation and modify them if needed.

decreased demand at school sites, you should also examine your practices to achieve attendance issues. As you review these factors in light of changes, such as increased or
decisions, such as current and projected student enrollment, travel times, and staffing.

General Considerations

DOE/DOJ Guidance (continued)
2016-17 William Bell Program applicants myIPS
2016-17 K-6/K-8 Single Site Applicants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>K-6 Single Site</th>
<th>2016-17 ADM</th>
<th>2015-16 ADM</th>
<th>Waitlist</th>
<th>Offered + Accepted</th>
<th>Applications in Proposed Prox</th>
<th>Applications in Old Prox</th>
<th>Sibling</th>
<th>Sear's Offered</th>
<th>Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applications:**
- SY 2016-17 ADM
- SY 2015-16 ADM
- Waitlist
- Offered + Accepted
- Applications in Proposed Prox
- Applications in Old Prox
- Sibling
- Sear's Offered

**K-6 Total**

**Applications:**
- SY 2016-17 ADM
- SY 2015-16 ADM
- Waitlist
- Offered + Accepted
- Applications in Proposed Prox
- Applications in Old Prox
- Sibling
- Sear's Offered

**Applications:**
- K-6 Total

**Applications:**
- KC 1 2 3 4 5 6 Total

**Proximity change data:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SY 2016-17 ADM</th>
<th>SY 2015-16 ADM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montessori/Program</td>
<td>Montessori/Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>97 70 81 63 55 44 20</td>
<td>167 11 7 14 9 12 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>11 9 12 4 1 2</td>
<td>43 14 9 12 11 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>68 52 71 47 50 49 31</td>
<td>115 10 12 20 15 15 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>10 7 6 9 8 3 13</td>
<td>68 22 19 7 6 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>10 7 6 9 8 3 13</td>
<td>68 22 19 7 6 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>24 8 4 1 2 4 2 0</td>
<td>24 8 4 1 2 4 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>180 15 20 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>180 15 20 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 48 90 39 39 40 96 56 62 57 175</td>
<td>51 48 90 39 39 40 96 56 62 57 175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CFI Program</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>125 136 135 139 132 105 109</td>
<td>125 136 135 139 132 105 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>60 63 69 49 18</td>
<td>82 45 74 60 63 58 60 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>11 23 13 37 40 39 40 11</td>
<td>72 14 60 5 10 5 14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>72 14 60 5 10 5 14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>20 12 19 22 32 42 22 13</td>
<td>188 27 29 32 42 22 13 42 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>2 0 7 3 2 6 2 4 4</td>
<td>72 14 60 5 10 5 14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>46 43 50 54 60 10 6</td>
<td>176 46 43 50 54 60 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96 39 126 118 118 83 93 83 125 19 1186</td>
<td>96 39 126 118 118 83 93 83 125 19 1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 5 6 7 4 1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

proximity change data
between a school's race/ethnicity proportion and the IPS ADM proportion

aggregate disproportionality is the sum of the absolute value of the difference

\[
\text{Aggregate Disproportionality} = \sum |\frac{O-E}{E}|
\]
3: Program Geographies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-Time Applicants</th>
<th>Late Applicants</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>3,73%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.06%</td>
<td>20.06%</td>
<td>20.03%</td>
<td>19.98%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.46%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.41%</td>
<td>51.41%</td>
<td>51.41%</td>
<td>51.41%</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>4,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

myIPS

data - timely applications

mypics

data - timely applications

51% 49%

51% 49%

2033, 1947

Yes

No
Income quartile on-time vs. late KC applications by

Late applicants:
- 21% 3
- 22% 2
- 34% 4

Timely applicants:
- 53% 1
- 12% 4
- 25% 2
- 10% 3

4 = Lowest income quartile
1 = Highest income quartile
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Personnel

Fringe Benefits

Travel
100,000- IPS will travel to other school districts that have developed and/or implemented identified best practice as it relates to diverse populations in school systems. The visits will contribute to IPS collection of data on existing challenges and solutions as it relates to socioeconomic diversity within various school districts. School visits may include but not limited to places like Omaha or Louisville as identified in Task 5. The cost will cover school visits, for 4 IPS leaders to visit 10 school locations throughout the US. The projected cost of each school visit is $2,500 per person to include: Air fare (round-trip) $600, Per Diem (food) of $40 per day ($120), Ground Transportation (taxi, bus, etc.) $200, Luggage check $50, and Hotel for 3 -4 days $1,530.

3,000 – The cost is designated for the Project Director to visit the Department of Education for a share out meeting to discuss program implementation and strategies related to the grant. Air fare (round-trip) $600, Per Diem (food) of $40 per day ($200), Ground Transportation (taxi, bus, etc.) $300, Luggage check $50, and Hotel for 5 days $1,850.
Equipment
Supplies
Contractual

$200,000 - The district will engage with local highly-regarded firms for subject matter expertise and additional manpower to direct the following critical communications task associated with major, complex initiatives. $125K will be used for research strategies: white board session, focus groups, phone interviews, social media survey, community research, media audit, marketing inventory and $75K will be used for strategy development & phase 1 grassroots campaign launch in which target market identification, collateral development and community conversations & outreach.

In addition to this services mentioned above. IPS will request the services and contract with Thomas P. Miller & Associates (TPMA) to supplement activities conducted during this grant period. IPS has an existing relationship with TPMA to support various endeavors to provide professional services for the district. IPS will follow their procurement process in selecting TPMA and additional consultants to support the following activities below:

Task 1 - Analysis of Existing Data $12,900 – Consultant will be hired, to work closely with IPS leadership. Review existing data previously collected through surveys, focus groups, existing demographic data, specifically considering comparison of SIG schools and the student enrollment for the district to determine projected needs for future focus groups, survey delivery, and data collection. These exercises will help IPS better identify the schools to target for its plan implementation. It is vital to understand current demographics and stakeholder perceptions to develop a comprehensive plan, as well as to identify the correct targeted outcomes for the plan and to ensure that the plan is in harmony with stakeholder needs.
Task 2- Parent and Community Member Focus Groups $18,800 – Consultant will be hired to work closely with IPS to facilitate focus groups. Discussion will highlight the district’s socioeconomic isolation. These focus groups and interviews will allow IPS to get critical feedback from stakeholders who are often left out of the planning phase in developing a project such as this blueprint. Stakeholders will include parents, community members, and teachers, individuals who play a crucial role in the success of students but who often do not get the chance to weigh in with their concerns and suggestions for improvement. The focus groups and interviews will allow these stakeholders to provide feedback and will ensure that they feel that they are part of the plan (that it is being done with and for them, not “to” them).

Task 3- Survey and Data Analysis $9,450 – Consultant will be hired to develop and distribute surveys to the focus group. They will capture additional information needed for the needs assessment. This will allow IPS to obtain additional feedback from those who are not able to participate in focus groups. Casting a wide net to various groups of stakeholders is important. However, not all constituents are available for focus groups and interviews. Surveys allow individuals to participate in a confidential manner at a time that is convenient to them. The survey data rounds out the information gleaned through the focus groups and interviews.

Task 4- Needs Assessment Report $12,200 – Covers the cost of a consultant to gather data from sources (Task 1-3). This information will be used to develop a portfolio of the socioeconomic isolation and hardships within the district. Assessing community data allows for richer context in the needs assessment. There is a vast array of publicly available data that, coupled with the qualitative information obtained directly from stakeholders such as parents, teachers, community members, and others, will allow for a more thorough understanding of the IPS community as a whole. Without reviewing data, such as demographic information,
educational attainment, poverty, income, employment, key industries and occupations, etc., it is not possible to have a holistic understand of the community’s needs.

**Task 5-Best Practice Research $9,400** - Consultant will research additional best practice research that meets the required standard of effectiveness according to the Department of Education Standards and to inform site selection in order to compile data of the school visits that IPS leadership formulates. This information will be used to assist in the creation of the blueprint.

**Task 6- Evaluation and Consideration of Existing Programs $23,400** – A consultant will evaluate current and existing programs through the following activities: interviews with IPS leadership, further document and data analysis and assessment, develop a report of findings, analyze costs and benefits. This task provides accountability for the plan. Rather than just creating a plan and implementing it without identifying, throughout implementation, whether it is actually achieving its desired results, building in an evaluation component (which includes both formative and summative review) will allow IPS to identify the extent to which the project is rolling out according to plan, as well as whether and how the plan is achieving its desired outcomes. The cost-benefit analysis specifically allows IPS, stakeholders, and taxpayers to identify the extent to which the plan is saving money and delivering return on investment.

**Task 7- Blueprint Development $21,800** – Consultant will be hired to compile all information collected through the needs analysis, surveys and best practice research to develop the blueprint for IPS. The consultants will facilitate meetings to determine goals, and outcomes for the plan.

**Task 8- Implementation Plan Development $13,100** – The implementation strategy will be developed through the support of a consultant. The consultant will complete a funding scan to
help identify additional resources for revenue to include in sustainability planning, facilitate meetings around the implementation of the blueprint and write the plan.

Construction
Not Applicable.

Other $25,000 - Cost will cover supplies, materials, printing and binding, and facility rental to host meetings to support focus group meetings.

Total Direct Costs $449,050.00

Indirect Costs $0.00
IPS will not apply indirect cost to this grant.

Total Costs $449,050