



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0104MI-1 for Educational Achievement Authority of Michigan

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The EAA proposal is comprehensive in the way it sets out a vision for a system that is highly personalized, student-centered learning program, supporting and supported by highly effective teachers who have the flexibility to meet the needs of all students.

Strengths:

- The Jaylin scenario captures the vision of a highly individualized, highly supported classroom experience that may or may not actually occur within the walls of a traditional classroom setting. The instructional program is built to support students in gaining 21st century skills, to be college and career “next generation” ready.
- The proposal is composed of 5 Connections projects. Each of the first 4 projects addresses at least one of the core assurance areas. The fifth project addresses in more detail components of the Competitive Preference Priority.

Weaknesses:

- All appendices are missing from the application. The high-quality plan referenced in the narrative is not included and therefore cannot be verified.

This section is scored a [8]. Scoring reflects an inability to verify a timeline and key personnel responsible for implementation. The EEA-MI have initiated alignment of curriculum to rigorous standards (state, Common Core State Standards, and international). Performance task have been required, providing students experience with in-depth, cognitively challenging work, and revisions have been accomplished to the innovative teaching and learning platforms (BUZZ). New Student-Information and HR systems have been launched and are articulated with the teaching and learning platforms to provide a comprehensive data warehouse. Partnerships have been established with both IHEs and industry. The EAA-MI has a proven record of success, showing a majority of students achieving two or more year’s growth (section (B)(1)(a)).

(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The EAA-MI is an LEA with the authority to reinvent Michigan’s Priority Schools (persistently low-achieving). The EAA-MI was established with the mandate to radically change the educational experience for students.

Strengths:

- The EAA was formed in 2012 to serve 15 of the lowest achieving schools in the state. 12 of these will participate in the grant, and are characterized as persistently low-achieving.
- A rubric, or scorecard, has been developed and provides a data-driven process to identify the schools with the greatest number of risk factors. Although the Rubric is not available for review, the indicators that comprise the score card are described in the narrative.

Weaknesses:

- All appendices are missing from the application. The Rubric for Selecting Schools/Score Card referenced in the narrative is not included and therefore cannot be verified.

This section is scored an [9]. The selection process used by EAA-MI provides in-depth understanding of each site’s

student performance record, demographic and facility make-up. The 12 project schools are clearly identified, as are the number of teachers and students to be served. 100% of the students are identified as high-need and as low-income.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The EAA was specifically formed by the state (specifically the governor's platform) to create innovative educational programs that are to be used as a scalable model of personalized learning.

Strengths:

- The five pillars for personalized system of teaching and learning clearly articulate a plan for meaningful reform that will be scalable across other districts both in state and "out state". Students are grouped by ability, not grade; students create learning and success paths; they work at their own pace; students provide evidence of mastery; and they are provided continuous feedback.
- The EAA Logic Model provides clear identification of issues, strategies to address the needs, the inputs to be applied, and the expected results that is used to formulate the five projects that will improve student learning by building capacity, connecting tools to teaching and learning, instituting information and data systems, providing students with 21st century tools and skills, and connecting school to home and community.

Weaknesses:

- All appendices are missing from the application. The EAA Strategic Plan and the RTT-D High Quality Plan referenced in the narrative is not included and therefore cannot be verified.

The proposal reflects the EAA mandate to create innovative educational opportunities so that, using personalized learning, digital platforms, and 21st century skills and training, the model can be scaled across districts. Although the EAA Strategic Plan and the RTT-D High Quality Plan are not available, the narrative does provide identification of key goals, a listing of activities to be undertaken and their rationale. This section is scored a [6]. It is not possible to review the timeline or key personnel responsible for the various action steps included in the plan and the score for this section reflects this omission.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The rate of improvement indicated in the performance measures over the life of the grant reflects realistic and achievable expectations for outcomes. Under Decreasing Achievement Gaps data, subgroup values do not show significant gap when compared the Overall: the demographic and relative achievement le This section is scored a [6]. The applicant did not include state-comparison data that would demonstrate the rate of improvement as compared to state levels related to decreasing achievement gaps. This information or an explanation may be included in the Appendix, but it is not possible to review these in order to validate data analysis.

Graduation rates will improve 6% points Overall, and while 4 of the 6 sites show rates that exceed the Overall, all sites show graduation rates that fall below the expected State rate by post-grant. These values to do provide evidence that the vision reflects ambitious annual goals that are equal or exceed State ESEA targets. It is not possible to ascertain if explanation or guidance was provided in the Appendix A.4 or other appendix section.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In the short time of its existence, evidence provided on EAA improvements in achievement by special needs students in both mathematics and reading, with 10 of 12 schools posting special needs students outperforming their counterparts. While data on performance by other subgroups is not provided, evidence provided that overall Individual Student Growth in

reading and math shows significant improvements of 1.5 or more years, and for those attaining 2+ years of growth. Students and parents are able to access performance data through the technology device provided to each student or via an app on their phone.

Extensive information is provided on the administrative team to demonstrate a track record and evidence of successful reform implementations, as the EAA has only been in existence since 2011. Data from turnaround work achieved in Kansas City, Missouri, by the chancellor and deputy chancellor, is provided to demonstrate capacity to lead reform. Profiles on remaining leadership team members provided to demonstrate full coverage by the leadership team of fiscal and evaluation functions. The length of tenure of the chancellor's work in Kansas City is not clear in the narrative. It is not clear if his tenure was one year, or if his work was started in 2008. This section is scored a [12]. Without the documentation contained in the appendices, it is not possible to verify dates and data, which calls into question the claims made, and the score for this section reflects this omission.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
---	----------	----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The EAA employs a single, user-friendly searchable financial data website that can be accessed by the public, containing all state and local funding for school-level expenditures. This section is scored a [3]. Although Appendix B is not available for review, the actual citations showing legal requirements that govern the district are included in the narrative and are evidence the EAA must provide extensive levels of transparency by providing on-line, on-time, and free public access, of all activities and operations of the EAA, including reports from auditors or other investigations. All social media, performance dashboards, and other digital communications technologies are also to be readily available and known.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
--	-----------	-----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Evidence of successful conditions and sufficient authority to implement personalized learning environments are intricately tied to the legal authority of EAA to constitute an LEA. State law was passed to establish the EAA. Inter-local agreement between the Regents and Detroit Public Schools provides the powers and authorities of the EAA, and the Standard Operating Procedures of the EAA set out the change reform centered on providing a personalized approach and the chancellor's ability to implement a student-centered system of teaching and learning. This section is scored a [10].

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	12
--	-----------	-----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The parent community and community at large were allowed access to the process to determine the strategic plan to realize the reform vision set out by EAA charter. Participants were able to rank the most valued elements for 21st century learning, used for planning and were included in the EAA strategic plan. Surveys were conducted of both parents and students to capture recommendations and feedback on the draft application. The narrative does not provide clear transition to explain the discussion on statewide meetings, a statewide gathering of high school students for a strategic planning retreat, or for the upcoming follow-up retreat for students and teachers and how these activities relate back to decisions for Detroit-area schools. The narrative indicates 98% teacher support, as well as significant agency, educational, and private support for EAA efforts. This section is scored a [12]. The various appendices referenced in the narrative are not included and therefore cannot be verified and the score for this section reflects this omission.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The EAA proposal is squarely focused on a vision providing students with highest need a rigorous personalized program for learning, including several options by which to explore multiple career pathways. Students are provided access to college and career readiness standards through concurrent enrollment programs. The project proposes a mastery-learning program. Teachers and students will work collaboratively to develop learning plans. Learning targets within the plans are

organized into five domains, with the practice and application domains providing activities like project-based learning, and the reflect domain allowing students in regular intervals to recognize growth while providing time to adjust pathway choices based on feedback from teachers as well as peers.

The project includes technology as an integral part of the instructional program. The web-based platform provides supplement and support via virtual instruction, tutoring, 21st century skill building, differentiation based on need, as well as enrichment. Technology will also be used to expand student horizons toward global perspectives. The EAA proposal lays out a blueprint that includes traditional subjects with in-demand skills development (innovation, creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving). Students in their senior year will complete a Next Generation Readiness Portfolio, showing they have acquired the core competencies required of a college student, while also demonstrating they have completed an internship, learning to use data to make informed decisions about their futures. A reverse inclusion model is currently being used as a special education technique to allow access to students not typically assigned to traditional classrooms to work with their peers. SIOP, a newcomers program, Imagine Learning, and other products with an ESL component, are currently employed to assist English language learners.

This section is scored a [17]. Although the high-quality plan is not available for review, many of its components are included in the narrative. Scoring reflects an inability to verify a timeline and key personnel responsible for implementation. While a comprehensive student program has been mapped, the proposal would have been strengthened with more discussion in how the program for students of high-need (ELL, special education, socio-economically disadvantaged) will be interwoven into the EAA project in ways that establishes confidence that these students will have their needs addressed as part of a unified program and not as an addendum to the regular program. The proposal did not adequately address how staff will be supported in incorporating these programs and techniques within the regular classroom experience, or more specifically, how or if their inclusion would be incorporated and used within the web-based platform.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In the EAA proposal, students are provided access to college and career readiness standards through rigorous coursework. The EAA project includes 4 weeks of professional development, providing teachers an opportunity to understand what is needed to conduct classrooms with a student-centered approach (both management and instructional strategies). The professional development is structured to model the learning process for students. This is to allow teachers time to gain skills in establishing learning communities with students, to learn how to assess resources, how to provide feedback on assessments in order to monitor progression toward mastery of content, as well in use of the various technology tools. As discussed in section (C)(1), teachers and students will work collaboratively to develop learning plans. Learning targets within the plans are organized to allow students to recognize growth in regular intervals while providing time to adjust pathway choices based on feedback from teachers.

Teachers are already participating in multiple Professional Learning Communities, and these PLCs and the tools available to these teams will be expanded to encourage teachers to network beyond the scope of the EAA schools and connect with other educators world-wide to interact and share best-practices: on-demand videos will individualize how educators access professional development relevant to instructional needs of students. Scaling will be accomplished through a menu of options: nested professional development, use of teaching and learning coaches, in-class cameras, enhanced electronic portfolios, and on-demand video library.

The EAA proposal sets out a unique plan for a talent pipeline to build leadership capacity within the EAA. A 6-month internship will be specifically designed to address scaling up leadership personnel and their skills. A creative incentive model based on teacher effectiveness is currently being used in the EAA and it will be leveraged to provide teacher and principal evaluation. The Buzz platform will provide administrators the ability to develop individualized professional development and learning for teachers based on need and career choices. Administrators will use the Results Dashboard and a Focus Objective Folder to tailor professional development around particular areas of focus for a team of teachers or for an entire staff. The EAA proposal also includes use of a system to encourage motivation and reward excellence (HCMS).

This section is scored a [15]. Although the high-quality plan is not available for review, many of its components are included in the narrative. Scoring reflects an inability to verify a timeline and key personnel responsible for implementation. The proposal would have been strengthened with more discussion as to how low-performing schools would recruit and/or select teachers to access the various expansion methods outlined in section (C)(2)(d). The narrative does not make it evident that the proposed methods will lead to increased number so effective and/or highly effective teachers or principals.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	13
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The EAA was established by state legislative action as an LEA with autonomy to create personalized learning systems for all students. The Authority has sufficient flexibility to develop a system of higher expectations for students and educators, expanding the adaptability for student learning models and styles, stimulating innovative teaching methods, and, facilitating extension of technology and online learning. Policy supports also contain autonomy and flexibility at the school building level. School Re-Invention Teams operationalize human and financial resources, curricular and technology resources and tools, and best-practices that create personalized, student-centered systems. The Michigan Department of Education has granted a seat-time waiver and the capacity to use a standards-based grading system, thereby releasing students from the traditional model of seat-time requirements to a system where grades are based on mastery. Standards-based grading allows credit to be given when and where learning occurs. Resources are provided for English Language Learners (SIOP, ESL, newcomers program, various technology programs including Mango Languages). The section is scored a [13]. It is not possible to review the artifacts submitted as evidence in the appendices (which were not included), and as such, the score for this section reflects this omission.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The EAA proposal articulates a personalized learning system, where content tools and other learning resources are made available to all students. Students can access a newly created web-based learning platform, which makes available a library of various media and print resources. Students must select from a set of required activities and from a set of “elective” activities, all partnered with and facilitated by a teacher. In order to ensure accessibility, free internet is provided to students enrolled in 100% virtual classes, and a subsidized rate is provided for families to gain home internet access. Technical supports exist in the form of videos and reference guides for all stakeholders. Teachers and students have access to coaches and peer networks, and students also have access to intervention teachers in both push-in and pull-out programs. Teachers also have access to Skype networking sessions and virtual tutors used as teacher coaching options.</p> <p>All data can be collected and extracted for use, downloadable in PDF or Excel files. The EAA will utilize data warehouses and dashboard technologies to integrate data from the web-based platform and other data systems (Human Resources, Budget and Finance, and Student Information System). The proposal establishes an eTranscript system to allow information to freely flow between K-12 schools and upward to higher education schools. The EAA will develop a standard exchange to provide information when students move states, or move within state. The exchange to include the eTranscript, data standards, and also creating GIS mapping. This section is scored an [8]. It is not possible to review the artifacts submitted as evidence in the appendices (which were not included), and as such, the score for this section reflects this omission.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The EAA proposal establishes evaluation on two levels: process evaluation to determine effectiveness of implementation; and, outcome evaluation to determine teacher and principal effectiveness as well as student achievement toward college- and career-readiness. The EAA is currently participating in, and will continue with the Next Generation Learning Evaluation, as well as its own internally designed, evaluation process. Within these two proposed systems, 7 studies are</p>		

to be conducted to ensure rigorous, continuous improvement and timely feedback. Ten ongoing performance metrics will track data on student performance, college and career readiness, staff effectiveness, and use of best practices. The Criteria for Classifying Designs of MSP Evaluations will be used to gauge student academic performance outcomes. This section is scored a [12]. While the proposal includes the sharing of student achievement/progress with parents via website and web-based platform access, the application would have been strengthened with discussion regarding how the project intends to share with parents and the public information on its investments in professional development, staff, and technology. The high-quality plan referenced in the narrative is not included and therefore cannot be verified. It is not possible to review the timeline or key personnel responsible for the various action steps included in the plan and the score for this section reflects this omission.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The EAA proposal narrative includes an outline of key personnel and their roles related to the pursuit of ongoing communications and engagement with stakeholders. Project committees will provide regular review to monitor project work as defined by project goals and objectives (i.e., technology implementation, and student achievement progress). The School Re-Invention Team and Administrative Leadership Team will meet regularly (monthly at a minimum) to produce communication and engagement strategies, information on district operations and overall transparencies in publishing school reform progress. The chancellor will also conduct monthly open houses to engage in strategic conversations with community stakeholders, both sharing information and seeking feedback for continuous improvement input. This section is scored a [3], and although the project's high-quality plan is not available for review, many of its components are included in the narrative. Scoring reflects an inability to verify a timeline and key personnel responsible for implementation.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The EAA proposal identifies 19 performance measures, spanning elementary through high school age- and grade-levels. Each measure is framed by rationale directly tying to programs already initiated or those that will be implemented under this proposal. Expected rates of improvement to the number of young students (ages 6-8) achieving "on track" status in reading do not appear realistic (100% by post grant), given these measures encompass all participating students (all subgroups), with no acknowledgement of baselines for any subgroups or subsequent target values. This section is scored a [4]. While the performance measures appear achievable and ambitious, the actual enrollment numbers by grade-/age-level are not provided, making it impossible to determine whether or not the measures are in fact ambitious and achievable.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The EAA proposal demonstrates a scaling up of the project is reflected in the performance measure Grades 4-8 – a). The narrative alludes to the use of Coburn's five dimensions of Scale, use of Teacher Evaluation as a secondary source of information for continuous feedback via the Teacher Incentive Fund, Pay for Excellent Performance, as well as Teacher Evaluation Ratings. The section is scored a [4]. The high-quality plan referenced in the narrative is not included and therefore cannot be verified. It is not possible to review the timeline or key personnel responsible for the various action steps included in the plan and the score for this section reflects this omission.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The project identifies reasonable and sufficient funding for personnel (inverse scaling of number of coaches so as to have high number initially, to be consolidated toward the final year of implementation, technology, and infrastructure needs to address the 5 EAA project areas, providing reasonable rationale for said expenditures. This section is scored a [8]. The EAA proposal shows significant amounts of funding from other sources to support the project (\$32.5 million), with these

matches exceeding the Race to the Top-District request. While grant matches show vast investments toward project actualization, there is no specific detail provided to differentiate what the EAA project considers ongoing from one-time costs within the budget narratives for any of the 5 EAA project areas. Reference is made in section (F)(2), but the designations are not clearly identified.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

8

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The EAA proposal narrative includes reference to continuing work with state, philanthropic, and business community agencies and members in continuously monitoring and making revisions to policy, goals, and/or project objectives in order to guarantee project sustainability post grant. This section is scored a [8]. A high-quality plan referenced in the narrative but is not included and therefore cannot be verified. It is not possible to review details on specific criteria and the alignment with the strategic goals, objectives, activities, timelines, deliverables, or key personnel responsible for the post grant sustainability.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The EAA proposal includes a scaling up of its partnership with the Detroit Parent Network, a community outreach project with three years of successful community interactions. The proposal is to grow the network from the current 8 Parent Empowerment Centers to 20 centers across the state, in alignment with Project 5 in its Race to the Top-District application. DPN/PEC successes are demonstrated in moving from chronically low parent involvement to usage measuring 2,125 contacts on average per site in year 1 (over 17,000 total contacts), to 3,625 contacts on average per site in year 2 (over 29,000 contacts). These centers are chartered to provide support for both human-service needs and for academic programs (aligned to the 5 pillars of student-centered teaching and learning) to help students to be successful both in and out of school. Parents are encouraged to attend parent nights, workshops and seminars, engage with school staff via family nights, as well by classroom visits to gain understandings in how to coach and/or reinforce students' work. A dashboard will be created (via Project 4 in its Race to the Top-District application) to track the 10 population-level desired results indicators in real time. Data will be gathered and shared with appropriate schools and communities, identifying trends in progress toward meeting project indicators. Projected targets are in line with past results (186% increase to parent workshop attendance; 6.5% increase from Year 2 to Year 3 in PRC visits; and 25% increase in parent meeting attendance) and are ambitious in view of the projected levels of expansion. The Competitive Preference Priority would be strengthened by inclusion of more explicit discussion on how the centers will address families of students with special needs or for families of non-native speakers.

This section is scored an [8]. Although the high-quality plan is not available for review, many of its components are included in the narrative. Scoring reflects an inability to verify activities to realize scaling of the PECs, timelines and key personnel responsible for implementation.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The EAA proposal provides a clear vision for students. The learning program for a fictitious student and the professional development for, and instructional program of, a teacher are used to illustrate the work of the EAA, illustrating how the EAA will facilitate a personalized learning environment for all students. The EAA was formed by state charter and the objective and vision for the charter align to each of the four core educational assurance areas. Increasing student engagement, improving achievement performance, creating personalized learning programs that address a myriad of student needs, and building highly qualified educators are threads that create the fabric of the proposal. The results show

tht the EAA project has been effective in decreasing achievement gaps across student groups.

Total	210	166
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0104MI-2 for Educational Achievement Authority of Michigan

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a high score based on (a) the project’s alignment with the four core educational areas as outlined in this section to include the table linking the proposal goals and projects with specific RTT-D core educational assurances; (b) the clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement through personalized student support as reflected in the five pillars (student grouping by readiness; personalized learning and success paths; blending delivery systems designed for individualized pacing; evidence of mastery; and continuous feedback) of personalized learning; and (c) the opening statement’s snapshot of what a student (and staff members) experience would be like in the proposed personalized learning environment.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicants approach received a high score based on it’s potential to support high quality implementation as all twelve schools are a part of the “direct-run” model being employed by the state to turnaround the lowest performing schools in the state through the Education Achievement Authority of Michigan. Schools were selected based on their low performance across multiple indicators that placed all twelve participating schools amongst the lowest performing in the State. Each of the participating schools were listed including a demographic break down of each site that met the specific criteria outlined in this section.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a medium-low score because the reference to both the EEA’s Strategic Plan and the RTT-D high quality plan in Appendix A could not be found (Appendices were not included in the application). The applicant identified that the high quality plan addresses the criteria with specific detail about the alignment of strategic goals, objectives, activities, timelines, deliverables and person’s responsible. Had the plan been included, this section would have been stronger.</p> <p>The establishment of the EEA and the proposed project lends itself to being scaled to other parts of the state and to other schools as the EEA has been created to support turning around low performing schools. Thus, the proposed project could be scaled across other districts and schools.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant received a medium score based on the proposed goals for improved student outcomes provided in the application. The applicant did not propose a reduction in the achievement gap between SPED students and all students. Furthermore, the goals for increases in ACT scores at the high school level are not realistic based on the proposed projects and implementation timelines. As such, the applicant received a medium score. The following articulates how the applicant addressed each of the sub-criteria:</p>		
<p>(a) The applicant identifies performance measures on summative assessments for grades 2 through 10 in both reading and writing. The growth in achievement appears to be both ambitious and achievable. The ACT measure for the high school does not clearly identify the score represents. Assuming it is a composite score, the articulated growth is certainly ambitious yet may not be achievable considering the baseline level of students currently in high school. These aspirational goals may be possible, yet the timeline for achieving them may need to be longer.</p>		
<p>(b) The proposed achievement gap reduction modeled in this section does not align with the average score from the Global Scholars Performance Series presented in the summative assessment section. In this section, all students and each subgroup are projected to grow equally in terms of their score across every grade and each skill area (Reading and Math). This includes SPED students growing at the same rate as all students – thus maintaining the achievement gap between SPED and all students.</p>		
<p>(c) The potential impact of the project as reflected in changes in graduation rates does not represent an ambitious set of goals. The incremental gain (1% per year) from year to year represents the same growth demonstrated between the two baseline years provided (2011-12 and 2012-13). Furthermore, the lack of subgroup graduation rates made it difficult to ascertain potential gaps in high school completion and the potential reduction in those gaps.</p>		
<p>(d) The college enrollment rates presented reflect ambitious goals that may be achievable with the implementation of the project. As with the ACT scores discussed in this section, the actual achievement of the post-grant goals for college enrollment may take longer than articulated in this proposal.</p>		

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	9
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant received a medium score based on the evidence supporting a track record of success provided. The applicant did not provide sufficient data from the work described in Kansas City to present a clear record of success, reducing the overall score. Furthermore, the applicant relies on the credentials of key staff as evidence of success that does not support the specific criteria outlined for this section. The following provide specific information per sub-criteria:</p>		
<p>(a) The applicant did provide evidence of the impact of the implemented program based on data from the initial implementation year. The data from the Performance Series by Scantron reflected impressive growth in the first year. Considering the limited ability of the applicant to demonstrate a track record of success, the growth seen in the first year provides a level of evidence specific to the potential of the project to have sustained impact.</p>		
<p>Furthermore, the growth across 10 of the 12 schools was greater for students with special needs as compared to all students. This would reflect that the efforts had a positive impact on the achievement gap seen between SPED students involved in the project and their non-disabled peers.</p>		
<p>The applicant included details specific to the original development of this proposals approach in the Kansas City school system. The data provided included data from the first year of implementation. While the first year data reflected growth within the KC system, it was not clear what the overall impact of this approach would be over time. It would have been helpful to include the achievement of the KC system in subsequent years to include 2011 and 2012. The one-year of data provided is not sufficient in providing clear and compelling evidence of a track record of success.</p>		
<p>(b) As described in (a), the initial evidence of success is promising and is data from all 12 schools that have all been</p>		

identified as persistently low performing. The evidence cited linking the proposed model's success is less convincing as a track record of success has yet to be realized.

(c) The digital platform described and parent access to student information in real time is on of the stronger elements of the proposal and this particular section. The reference to a document in the appendix did not support this particular section as the appendices were not attached.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a high score based on the articulated practices that already exist within the LEA – EEA. The applicant articulates practices and processes that represent a high level of transparency across all of it's component systems to include school-level expenditures. The applicant states that all four required categories of school level expenditures are provided to the public through a single, searchable financial data website.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a high score based on the following: The development of the EEA is a direct result of the State creating a context in support of implementation of this proposal. The EEA's connection to the Governor's education platform for supporting the lowest performing schools and the inter-local agreement with Detroit Public Schools and Eastern Michigan University represent the necessary conditions, include autonomy, to ensure a supportive context for successful implementation.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)

15

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a low score based primarily on the lack of evidence cited. Specifically, the applicant identified evidence of support provided in Appendices J, K and G. Overall, the described input processes represent efforts to engage a range of stakeholders to include parents, teachers and the community. However, the primary means of demonstrating support were to be included in appendices that were not included with the application. This made it difficult to ascertain the level of support and engagement from the broad spectrum of stakeholders. Including these documents as part of the full proposal would have significantly increased the score for this section.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a medium score as the applicant provides only partial elements of a high quality plan (strategic goals and strategies) specific to activities, deliverables, person responsible and project timelines are not included. The referenced Appendix A was not included with the application. Therefore, the applicant has not provided evidence that a high quality plan specific to improving teaching and learning exists.

The following provides specific evidence linked to each subsection within this category:

ai) The applicant identifies individual learning and success plans as the primary means of supporting students in their understanding of learning as a key to success in accomplishing their goals. These activities, nested in the applicant's concept of developing student-centered classrooms, will support students understanding that what they are learning is key to accomplishing their goals.

- a) The applicant identifies the curriculum and instructional materials are linked to CCR standards and references the connection with Eastern Michigan University as a founding partner in the development of the overall program.
- a) The applicant provides a progression of instructional/learning activities to include learn, practice, apply, assess, and reflect that suggest the instructional framework being employed supports deep learning. The inclusion of technology within a blended instructional environment will support deeper learning and will allow student interests to be a critical component of the instructional model.
- a) The applicant identifies the role technology will play in connecting to a variety of cultures, contexts and perspectives, though including more tangible examples of how the EEA will ensure exposure beyond the potential of technology would have strengthened this particular sub-criterion.
- a) The applicant identifies the development of a Next Generation Readiness Portfolio as a critical assessment for students completing their secondary school experience and evidence of an expectation for students in relation to 21st Century skills. However, the applicant does not provide specific instructional or curricular practices that will lead to the development of these skills. Including specific practices and strategies would have strengthened this particular sub-criterion.
- b) The applicant further articulates the role of a student-centered model in supporting individualized sequencing of instructional content and skill development. Specifically, the applicant cites the role blended learning, flexible instructional grouping, and self-paced instruction will play in supporting students on their own individual growth progression.
- b) The applicant provides a statement to the instructional philosophy/pedagogy being employed by the project (student-centered schools), yet does not provide specific examples of a variety of high-quality instruction approaches and environments. Specific reference to various instructional methodologies would have strengthened this sub-criterion.
- b) The Buzz learning platform as described supports the applicant meeting this particular criteria - though the lack of specific examples in the referenced appendices made it difficult to fully understand the potential of the learning platform. This section does reference alignment with Common Core standards of individual student progressions or maps that will support students as they move toward becoming college and career ready.
- b) The applicant articulates the learning platform (BUZZ) ability to provide updated individual data and the potential interface with personalized learning recommendations based on student development. This is a significant strength of this proposal.
- b) The applicant provides specific examples of how students with special needs and English Learners will be supported in a student-centered model. The examples supplement the universal program design and present several instructional models that blend technology supported learning with more traditional face-to-face models.
- c) The applicant has intentional support for students to ensure they understand how to use the resources available to manage their learning.

While more details and specific examples would have been helpful in this section, the overall score was low because the applicant did not include a high quality plan in the appendices as referenced at the beginning and end of this particular section. Many of the sub-criteria described above were strong and would have warranted a much higher score if the referenced high quality plan had been included.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a high score by providing ample evidence in support of a high quality plan to improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment for all students. This section did not receive all of the possible points as the applicant did not include the high quality plan referenced at the end of the section. This section received a high score based on the quality of the responses to each of the following:

- (a) (i, ii) The applicant has identified a four week summer training specific to student-centered design, organizational strategies for an effective classroom as well as blended classroom instructional strategies. The applicant further identifies how support will be provided within the school year, utilizing both traditional methods of professional development as well as technology supported opportunities (via BUZZ). The range, type, and frequency of the professional development offered through the project support the effective implementation of personalized environment and strategies as well as supporting teachers ability to adapt content and instruction.
- (iii) The applicant has built a platform that enables educators to frequently measure student progress and use the

information to inform actions specific to individual students. The BUZZ system has been intentionally designed to incorporate teacher feedback as well as other measures of student performance that ultimately directs individual student learning plans. The inherent design of the system and the professional development provided to staff provide an innovative means for measuring student progress and using the data to inform individual student acceleration.

(iv) The applicant has designed the learning platform BUZZ to be utilized as part of the evaluation system so that administrators and instructional coaches can effectively monitor teacher performance and provide professional development opportunities that exist within the BUZZ system. This tool and how it is incorporated in the evaluation process is both creative and innovative and is one of the strongest, most unique aspects of this proposal.

(b) The applicant has provided many examples of the tools, data and resources teachers will have access to in support of student learning. The feedback provided thus far illustrate access to actionable information, high quality learning resources to include digital content and assessments via BUZZ, and both processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources or approaches.

(c) The applicant has identified the training, policies, tools, data and resources that will allow them to structure effective learning environments to meet the student-centered approach articulated throughout their proposal. This includes information from the evaluation system and incorporated into their Pay for Excellent Performance (PEP) model coupled with the information and resources from the BUZZ system. Furthermore, the technology systems have been designed to inform continuous improvement practices at the individual level as well as the school as a whole level. The applicant identifies how school teams (SRTs) will utilize the tools to make critical decisions in support of successful implementation and action.

(d) The applicant identifies two primary means for increasing the number of highly effective teachers – (1) developing teachers via the innovative means articulated throughout this section and (2) aggressively recruiting highly effective teachers to work in all of the schools. Both articulated strategies yield the potential to meet this sub-criterion.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The overall score for this section is high based on the applicant meeting specific criteria as reflected in each subsection:</p> <p>D1a) The EEA was designed to support innovative approaches and has been structured to support participating schools in employing the innovation. The governance structure is clear.</p> <p>D1b) The model would suggest that each school site has sufficient autonomy and flexibility assuming the schools work within the 5 Pillars supporting the overall program concept (student-centered classrooms).</p> <p>D1c) The entire student-centered model is built on a proficiency or mastery framework - thus supporting this particular criteria.</p> <p>D1d) Again, the entire model is build around mastery learning and providing students the opportunity to progress at their own rate. This approach lends itself to providing students with multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery at multiple times.</p> <p>D1e) The applicant provides details specific to supporting English Learners utilizing SIOP strategies and implementing an ESL program and a Newcomer's program. This provides sufficient evidence specific to this criteria of offering learning resources and instructional practices that are accessible to English learners.</p> <p>The score for this specific criteria and this section as a whole was a 12 based on the the lack of specific strategies and programs supporting students with special needs. The reference in this particular section to all students being high needs and thus all practices and policies are designed to support all students by providing what they need is not sufficient. The lack of specific examples of instructional approaches and programs utilized to support students with special needs caused the overall score to be reduced.</p> <p>As with previous sections, references made to materials in the appendices were not available.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a perfect score in this section. The applicant identifies a variety of web-based resources provided to students and families and that digital devices are provided for all students to have access at school and at home. In addition, the applicant articulates how students, parents and teachers are supported with an appropriate level of technical support to include a help desk system that is available until 9:00 PM each evening. Finally, the information technology systems provide parents and students the flexibility required in this criteria as well as ensuring the schools use interoperable data systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall score was medium based on the lack of any discussion specific to school level improvement processes and the lack of a coherent and clear plan. As with previous criteria, reference to information contained in a high quality plan (Appendix A) was not included, nor was other appendices referenced in this particular section.</p> <p>This section provides evidence that a process for evaluation and improvement has been developed for the project as a whole and specifically for the EEA's approach. What is not apparent is a plan for rigorous continuing improvement processes at the school level. There is no mention within this section specific to the processes individual schools will use to engage in a continuous improvement cycle.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant does not provide specific details necessary to constitute a high quality plan for implementing a rigorous improvement process.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides sufficient evidence of a high quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The proposal clearly articulates specific structures and regularly scheduled activities that will support ongoing communication and engagement activities.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a medium score for this section as the applicant provided the required measures as reflected in this particular criteria and sufficient rationale for each. The applicant did not provide information specific to how it will review and adjust the measures over time if measures are deemed insufficient in gauging implementation progress. Including this information would have enhanced this particular section.</p> <p>One other issue in this section is the actual growth targets provided. Specifically, the application is built upon a model that was developed and implemented in another state. While the implementation and information provided in this application was from the first year only, the relative impact in terms of change in student outcomes presented does not warrant the anticipated growth over time reflected in this section. This growth is ambitious, yet may not be achievable.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides some evidence supporting a high quality plan for evaluating the effectiveness of investments. However, the referenced appendices were not included and could not be used to develop a clear understanding of the high quality plan. Thus, the applicant received a low score for this particular criteria.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a high score for this particular section based on the clarity of investments and the specific links made between expenditures and component parts of the plan. The following identifies specific strengths and concerns with each sub-criterion:</p> <p>(a) The applicant identifies a variety of funds in section F to include state supported, federal entitlement, private foundation investments, and other competitive grants (TIF) that will support the project.</p> <p>(b) The expenditures articulated are both reasonable and sufficient in supporting the development and implementation of the proposal to include a reasonable balance between initial investments that will cost less over time (upfront instructional coaching) and ongoing costs that will need to be factored into a sustainability plan (i.e technology replacement cycles - high cost initially as one time with lower cost replacement in subsequent years).</p> <p>(c) The proposal provides a clear rational for the investments within each of the five project areas to include identification of one-time or "up front" investments and those costs that will be recurring beyond the duration of the grant.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a medium score for this section based on the lack of a clear and coherent sustainability plan.</p> <p>The plan for maintaining on-going operational costs include potential funding from the state (assuming schools turnaround), leveraging of private and non-profit relationships, increased Title I and II funding as more schools are added to the EEA, increased state support as more schools are added to the EEA, and future competitive federal grants. The potential funding streams, coupled with the stated intent to grow the EEA by 15-20 schools per year seem to contradict themselves in relation to sustainability. Specifically, it is assumed the on-going costs of this project will need to be not only sustained for the first 12 schools but will need to be applied against the new 15-20 schools added to the EEA.</p> <p>Another issue with the applicant's response to this section is that a three-year, post-grant budget was not provided. The lack of a post-grant budget makes it difficult to assess the high quality plan for sustainability.</p> <p>As with previous sections, the reference to a high quality plan in Appendix A does not support this section as the appendix was not included in the proposal.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a medium score for the competitive preference priority. The concept of Parent Empowerment Centers (PECs) is great and generated the points awarded in this section. The primary issue with this particular section centers around the limited role PECs would have in terms of integrating public and private resources to augment school's abilities to address social, emotional, or behavioral needs of students. The applicant stated the PECs will (1) develop parent leaders; (2) provide academic support strategy workshops; (3) provide trainings specific to parenting skills; and (4) create networking opportunities for parents. While the PEC concept is inherently good, it does not fit the competitive criteria expectation of integrated services in support of social, emotional and behavioral needs of students. The following provides specific feedback to each sub-criterion in this particular section:</p>		

- (1) The applicant describes several intended programs with associated support organizations that will partner with EEA and DPN to support the PECs. This particular section would have been stronger had it aligned more directly with the established criteria for the competitive priority and if it had further expanded on the partnerships linked to the programs listed.
- (2) The majority of the measures proposed were specific to parent and family engagement with two of the measures specific to student achievement. Again, the lack of social, emotional, or behavioral measures does not align with the competitive preference priority.
- (3) The applicant described how the indicators would be tracked and ultimately used to target resources and to design programs for parents and families. The applicant also provided a description of how DPN has scaled the model in other schools.
- (4) The applicant provided a description of quality family and parent engagement opportunities. However, the link between these activities and the integration of other services (specific to addressing social-emotional, behavioral, or acculturation for immigrants) was not addressed.
- (5 and 6) The applicant did not address these criteria.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant met the criteria for Absolute Priority 1. While the proposal provides evidence of a comprehensive set of strategies, tools and supports, the lack of a high quality plan for implementation at the LEA or school level made it difficult to ascertain the coherence of the overall proposal. This concern is illustrated in several sub-sections within the overall proposal. Evidence of meeting this criterion can be found within the various sub-sections of the proposal with the majority of evidence being found in subsections C (1) and C (2).</p>		

Total	210	154
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0104MI-3 for Educational Achievement Authority of Michigan

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Educational Achievement Authority of Michigan scores in the high category for articulating a coherent reform vision. There is not evidence of the four core educational assurances however there are five projects clearly defined. These projects include Connecting Capacity, Connecting Tools to Teaching and Learning, Connecting Information and Data, Connecting Next Generation Learners to Future Opportunities and Connecting the School Home and Community. These projects have the ability to provide a core and purpose for the project. There is clear evidence of a credible approach to accelerating</p>		

student achievement by allowing students to work by ability not by grade. This vision allows students to accelerate at their own pace in their own personalized learning environment. There is clear evidence of the classroom experience from both the teacher perspective and the student perspective through a narrative of what a typical day might look like for the student and teacher. Although this plan provides many opportunities for students to succeed in a personal learning environment there is not reference to how the proposal builds on the four core educational assurances resulting in a loss of points.

(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
--	-----------	-----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 Educational Achievement Authority scores in the high category for approach to implementation. There is evidence of a clear process to select schools to participate in this grant. The use of quantitative and qualitative data is present in this approach. Educational Achievement Authority will be targeting 12 of the lowest achieving schools. There is reference to the school names that will participate in the project as well as a chart to identify the total number of students participating in the grant. 100% of these students are identified as high needs. There is a clear description of the process used to identify which schools will participate in the grant, a list of participating school and total number of students participating resulting in full points in this category.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 Educational Achievement Authority scores high in LEA-wide reform and change. Educational Achievement Authority provides a plan to provide meaningful reform in their district. This plan will include depth-deep consequential change in classroom practice, sustainability- maintaining the consequential changes over substantial periods of time, spread- diffusion of the innovation to large numbers of classrooms and schools and shift- districts, schools, and teachers assume ownership of the innovation that deepens, sustains and spreads the impact. This plan will be executed by an Administrative team who will also monitor and track the progress of the grant. This team is made up of principals, teachers, parents and students. This plan is taking what already exists and brings it to the next level to best meet personal student needs. This plan will bring meaningful reform with the use of student centered classrooms, individualized learning plans, students following regular rituals and routines, students producing evidence of mastery and seamless technology to support blended learning. The applicant appears to provide a high-quality plan that is credible to meet its goals because EAA is using a multitude of resources to best meet students learning needs, this plan allows flexibility and provides students the opportunity to rapidly accelerate learning thus keeping their interest in school, however there is not a clear timeline to this plan resulting in a loss of points. A key component to a high quality plan is the timeline and this is missing resulting in a loss of points.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 Educational Achievement Authority scores high in LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes. There is evidence of achievable annual goals as a baseline is set and achievable goals are set for each year of the grant. There is evidence of decreasing achievement gaps, however this decrease does not seem high enough to deem ambitious. When looking at graduation rates, the data is hard to understand making it difficult to interpret whether the goals are ambitious or achievable resulting in a loss of points. Educational Achievement Authority proposes goals to increase college enrollment rates which shows a commitment to college readiness. Because of the data is hard to read for increasing graduation rates in this category Educational Achievement Authority receives a score of 7.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 Educational Achievement Authority scores medium to high for demonstrating a clear track record of success. There is evidence of programs that were successful however the graduation rates and college enrollment data is not present. There is also not evidence to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in these schools. It is admirable the gains that were made in just one year. Since they have been in existence for just one year, they have been successful in the programs they have put in place. There is clear evidence that student performance data is available to students to self-assess, teachers to monitor students, administrators to supervise teaching. This information is available to all families even if the

family does not have a computer. This approach allows better monitoring than traditional six or nine week progress reports. Educational Achievement Authority receives a score of 10 in this category for showing admirable gains in learning in just one year and making student performance data available to stakeholders,

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Educational Achievement Authority scores high in this category for having a financial data website in place to show all school salaries and expenditures in a transparent way. Records on this site can be accessed for five years. This is a clear demonstration of a high level of transparency. Educational Achievement appears to have intended to provide evidence of this criteria in the referenced appendix. However, the appendix was not produced, thereby making it impossible to evaluate the evidence and resulting in a loss of a point in this category.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Educational Achievement Authority is in a unique situation where they stand alone. This unique situation, EAA, was launched by the governor to improve the quality of education in the lowest performing schools. The governor established an inter-local agreement between the Detroit Public Schools and the Regents of Eastern Michigan University to radically change the approach to education for students served in low performing schools. Because of this unique situation, they have the ability to make necessary changes to implement a personalized learning environment for all students. Educational Achievement Authority describes a three step approach to this category. State law has granted authority for the creation of the EAA, the inter-local agreement between the Regents of Eastern Michigan and the Detroit Public School outlines the powers and authorities of the EAA and the EAA's standard operating procedures reinforce the personalized approach to learning. There is not evidence of this plan, just an explanation of what each level is thus resulting in a loss of points. The explanation of this plan is in the three levels of state, inter-local agreement and the Standard Operating Procedures. With such a unique situation, a clear plan should be outlined with a timeline or explanation as to how the personalized learning environments will be achieved with sufficient authority for the district to implement this plan to better understand the intentions.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)

15

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Educational Achievement authority had an innovative plan to gather buy in and stakeholder feedback for this project. They held formal and informal gatherings as well as conducted surveys. In addition summer institutes and open houses were held to garner feedback from stakeholders. A specific activity is explained where participants were divided into groups and given a deck of cards and Monopoly money and were asked to value the most valued elements of 21st century public schooling. The outcome became the five pillars that would under-gird the proposed student centered system.

It is stated that 98% of teachers wrote letters of support however none of these letters were provided in the application resulting in a loss of points.

It is stated there are letters of support from key stakeholders, however, there are no letters of support in the application resulting in a loss of points.

The applicant presents a highly thoughtful and inclusive approach to stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal. It is clear that multiple stakeholder groups were involved and that the proposal directly integrated stakeholder feedback. Unfortunately, the reviewer was not able to evaluate the level of stakeholder support given that the referenced letters in the appendix were not included, resulting in a medium score for this criterion.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Educational Achievement Authority has an aggressive plan to ensure learning is taking place. From the very beginning parents, students and teachers collectively formulate a plan to best meet the students needs. These plans focus on

college and career readiness and have measurable outcomes. There is a partnership with Eastern Michigan University to support college and career readiness. Students will be involved in deep learning experiences because they will take an investment inventory at the beginning of the year which allows teachers to tune into the students strengths and interests. This will also make available various digital assets and projects for students to make learning meaningful. In order to have access to diverse cultures and deep meaningful experience, Educational Achievement Authority will participate in the International Studies Schools Network. This will allow every student to be involved in language study and students will understand the rigorous challenge of a college preparatory program. Students will have the opportunity to master content and be required to participate in a Workplace Learning Experience which will best prepare them to problem solve, achieve academically, persevere and think critically which are all essential components of high quality teaching and learning. The student centered readiness approach separates this idea from others. This gives students the best opportunity to achieve his or her learning goals while helping others reach theirs. The concept of a variety of high-quality instruction approaches is present with students moving at their own pace and teachers meeting those needs. A high quality digital approach is present through Buzz. This is true personalized learning and allows students and teachers access literally at anytime. Buzz gives teachers the ability to front load content, curriculum mapping, assessment tool and a standards tool. Buzz gives students multi media interactive stimulation, games, projects and practical tools to engage and support learning. Buzz can also be accessed from an array of media devices. There are five high quality approaches to meet the accommodations of high need students. Due to the fact that there are different options shows the commitment to meet the needs of these learners. Examples include Face to Face Driver, Flex and Self Blend. Students are empowered to self assess, set goals, use technology navigate Buzz, assume responsibility for their learning and a scheduler. This approach gives students the training and support they need to understand how the program works and how to manage their learning. Educational Achievement Authority scores high in this category for providing all evidence of a high quality plan for college and career readiness. As compelling as this plan seems, there is specific reference to Appendix A and this is not provided, resulting in a loss of points. Appendix A should provide the supporting evidence of documentation of this plan and it is not available.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

20

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Educational Authority has an aggressive approach to meet professional development needs and to retain high quality teachers. Educational Authority will offer a four week summer training for teachers to receive support in best practices. After this training teachers receive support one on one, in pairs and small groups. There is evidence of continuous monitoring of teachers training needs through Buzz. There is continuous monitoring of curriculum and strategies for teamwork and professional communities as well as full inclusion of special needs students. Teachers use these reports to make a learning platform meaningful to students and plan interventions where needed. This is a high quality approach to keeping students interested and engaged. Training videos and Professional Learning Communities allow teachers to maximize best practice in the classroom. The use of a Teaching and Learning Coach provides support to teachers to best meet students individual needs. The use of Swivel in Class Cameras provides teachers the opportunity to record lectures, classroom observations, share best practices, document PLC and capture student success. In addition students can use this to demonstrate understanding and communicate with peers which focuses on 21st century skills. This integration of technology is proof of a high quality approach to teaching and learning. Students create their own learning path and are placed in three categories. Within each category is a variety of ways to meet the students needs. Resources are then tagged for students to choose or teachers to recommend to best meet learning needs. This offers variety to students and breaks the mold of traditional seat time learning. Students progress is frequently measured. There is a Student Productivity Metric used to measure productivity. This naturally encourages students to always achieve high standards and assess if their learning needs are being met. There is clear evidence of a strong training and support program designed for teachers and administrators to provide the necessary tools to be successful. This also includes a rigorous evaluation system. Buzz will be used to monitor and individualize professional development. This system allows observations to be held and teachers are not just rated but also prescribed professional development to build them into better teachers. All information is housed in Buzz and can be monitored. Within the students personalized learning model, students are able to rate activities they complete with a 5 star rating system. They also discuss this with their teacher during conference time. This shows an optimal approach to respond to individual student needs and feedback. School leaders and leadership teams can view a students dashboard at anytime to monitor and assess learning. This gives the ability to continuously improve and close achievement gaps when necessary. There is a high quality plan to ensure students receive instruction from high quality teachers. This includes multi classroom leadership, time technology swaps and remote teaching. Remote teaching is a very impressive example of how to best utilize resources when not having enough high qualified teachers on campus. All evidence in this category shows a high quality plan for teaching and learning in a personalized learning environment resulting in full points in this category.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	11
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Educational Achievement Authority scores medium for LEA practices, policies and rules. Educational Achievement Authority provides organizational charts to show support for all schools. There is a list of 16 objectives that tie to the RTT-D assurances and acts as evidence of a high quality plan to implement this project. Examples are preparing public school students to compete globally, professional development opportunities and facilitating the extension of technology and online learning. Schools have ability to structure school day as they wish once the budget is approved. There is not an example of how or what this will look like resulting in a loss of points. School personnel decisions are left up to individual school and the traditional approach to staffing is eliminated. There is not evidence of school personnel decisions and staffing models or roles and responsibilities for educators and non educators resulting in a loss of points. A seat time waiver is used in regard to the amount of time spent on a topic. This is an innovative approach to keeping students focused and allowing students to demonstrate mastery to move to another concept when they are ready not when the teacher is ready. A standards based grading system is used to demonstrate mastery which will allow students multiple opportunities to be successful on a concept. Students have the option of both blended and virtual classrooms to earn academic credit which is an innovative way to reach students and make curriculum fully available. Students have the flexibility to complete courses at their own time and skills are assessed in multiple ways at multiple times however this process is not clearly explained resulting in a loss of points. Evidence is provided for learning resources for students with disabilities and English learners are present. These programs include Mango for students and parents and the SIOP model. Students also have available an inclusion model, paraprofessionals and bilingual tutors available in the classroom. This is a high quality plan for LEA practices, policies and rules, however there is some lacking evidence on what this learning will look like as students approach a blended virtual model with students showing mastery of concepts resulting in a loss of points.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Educational Achievement Authority scores high for LEA policy and infrastructure. Educational Achievement Authority will ensure all stakeholders have access to the learning platform Buzz which is their personalized learning system as well as Quest pacts which are used to encourage literacy. The students have access to digital devices to learn anytime and anywhere. Free internet is provided for students taking 100% virtual classes and internet access is available for a nominal fee should students need it regardless of income. This allows all students an equal opportunity to the necessary content and tools to be successful. There is evidence of multiple means of technical support for stakeholders. This includes videos and quick reference guides, teaching and learning coaches are available, teacher Skype sessions and virtual tutors are also available. There are peer networks for students and teachers as well as a help desk to support technical assistance. There is evidence of using technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information to support the USDOE's My Data initiative however it is not explained how this information is then pulled into different programs to make recommendations for learning supports resulting in a loss of points. There will be the use of inter operable data systems for Budget and finance, Human Resources and student information. There is a plan to expand this into programs such as eTranscripts, Data standards and creating GIS mapping which shows a strong commitment to being able to report and share information with stakeholders. Educational Achievement Authority scores an 8 for providing the necessary information on LEA policy and infrastructure due to the lack of evidence to support how exporting data to another learning system to provide additional recommendations and learning supports for students.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Educational Achievement Academy scores in the medium to low category for continuous improvement process. There is a plan to assess the grant and provide continuous improvement however this is not a high quality plan. The questions provided are general and do not show how improvements will be made. There is not evidence of how often this plan will be monitored or how this information will be shared once it is collected. Educational Achievement Authority receives a scores of 7 for providing the tools to evaluate the plan however there is not enough evidence s to what they will do with</p>		

this information and how improvements will be made.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Educational Achievement Authority provides a high quality plan for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders. This includes monthly meetings with designated committee members which will then share this information on district websites, wiki's, progress reports and monthly open houses. This process will ensure two way communication and ongoing progress monitoring.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Educational Achievement Academy scores high on performance measures. Educational Achievement Authority provides a rationale for each goal. They show an ambitious plan to assessing students four times a year to provide necessary feedback and tailor learning to students needs. There are 14 performance measures to address reachable goals which focus on both academic as well as social emotional well being. There is a focus on college and career readiness as right now, no eighth grade student is on track for college or career readiness. The fact that this is stated and a plan is in place shows dedication to seeing this program work. Charts are present with subgroup information and reachable goals are set for each subgroup. These goals have a rationale and achievable measurable goal for each grade level. The projected increase by year is both ambitious and reachable resulting in a high score for this category.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Educational Achievement Authority has a clear plan to evaluate the effectiveness of RTT-D, however, there is not evidence of how or what changes can or might take place. There is a reference to the appendix, however, an appendix is not included to see how this will take place. The five dimensions of scale as well as the Teacher Evaluation and Pay for Excellent Performance are excellent ideas to ensure the program is successful. Because this section is not complete, there is a loss of points.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Educational Achievement Authority provides a clear budget for this project. Each item is clearly defined as a one time cost or ongoing cost and cost is listed. A thoughtful rationale is provided for the budget, however in Project 5 there is \$100,000 designated for a mentoring program. This is a great idea but it is not explained how this will benefit the program or how this will work resulting in a loss of points.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Educational Achievement Authority does not show a high quality plan to sustain the goal's of the project after the term of the grant. There is a plan in place however, the funds set aside to sustain the project do not seem enough. There is reference of philanthropic funds, Title I and Title II funds which will sustain some of the project but it is not reasonable to assume it will fund it all.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Educational Achievement Authority has an amazing plan to incorporate public resources into the school. By working with the Detroit Parent Network, parents will be empowered to take charge and work hand in hand with their child. The creation of Parent Empowerment Centers will give parents the power they need to help their children be successful. There is evidence that centers like this work with 17,000 parents utilizing the resources in the first year and 29,000 parents utilizing the resources in year two. These centers will serve as hubs where parents can congregate, share and receive information, meet with key school personnel and engage in workshops. This will only empower parents to be the key piece to their child's success in the classroom. The Detroit Parent Network will act as a liaison for parents to the school. This model is designed to reach students with special needs. There are also programs outlined to increase social emotional health and behavioral needs with programs such as Family Literacy and Kids Grow Up Great. There is also a plan to have a dashboard page to connect data. This shows an invested interest in making strong partners with the community and ensuring student success.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Educational Achievement Authority meets Absolute Priority one by offering students a personalized approach to learning. With the use of a virtual and traditional classroom setting students are preparing for college and careers on a daily basis. Supports are built into the program for students, parent and teachers to make a smooth transition to this approach to blended learning. Since the traditional classroom is taken out of this plan, student can excel at their own pace to meet their own learning goals. Students are engaged with this approach as their programs are tailored specifically to meet their needs with activities and projects which peak their interest. There is a clear plan to increase educator effectiveness with ongoing training and support to encourage best practices. This plan will close achievement gaps and increase rates in which students are college and career ready.

Total	210	158
--------------	------------	------------