



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0090OH-1 for Horizon Educational Services, Inc. (Horizon Science Academy Cleveland HS)

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Horizons sufficiently sets forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that includes how the organization will build on work in the four core educational assurance areas, a clear and credible approach, along with a description of what classroom experiences will look like for teachers and students.

- The vision includes how the applicant will build on a proven school design that includes a college preparatory curriculum focusing on mathematics, science, technology and engineering.
- Evidence of a successful track record is provided by an extensive list of accomplishments such as awards for closing the achievement gap, highest state accountability ratings, and National Blue Ribbon Award.
- The approach to accelerating student achievement is clearly delineated and includes alignment with rigorous standards. Both Common Core standards and Ohio State standards are fully adopted.
- The applicant fully describes how their approach will address personalized student support and includes STEM focus, student engagement, college readiness for all, and longer school days and school year, among other areas.
- The classroom experience for students and teachers is clearly articulated and also includes diagrams of what classrooms will look like on designated Lab days. The proposed approach will include grouping according to academic needs, not age, which is a major strength of this experience.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to support high-quality and school-level implementation of their approach evidenced by the following:

- The process for selection was to include the 19 Horizon schools across Ohio only and include all students in K-12 Horizon schools. A total of 6,944 students and 806 educators will participate. The applicant chose to implement in all 19 Horizon schools in Ohio, including all students in K-12 because they originally started their first charter school in Ohio in 1999. Ohio is also a RTT state that has made tremendous strides in adopting State and National standards, along with exceptional support for charter schools.
- Charts provided indicate school required demographics for each of the participating schools, including both raw data and percentages.
- The applicant indicates they will start with all schools in Ohio but scale up with their charter network schools in other States.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly addresses how the reform proposal will be scaled up beyond participating schools in the network.

- The Concept School network constituents were included in the design phase of the proposal and will be partners in the scale up. This early inclusion in each phase of proposal development contributes to a stronger Charter Network and outcomes can be shared with both charters and other public schools in Ohio.
- The applicant suggests that results will be translated into meaningful reform through ongoing evaluations during years 2 and 3 as outcome data becomes available. The timing and sharing of early results is critical for replicating

positive results and outcomes. Replicating positive results in scale-up schools will also further validate and support the applicant's outcomes goals.

- The applicant's theory of change is clearly delineated and focuses on changing course content, changing how teachers teach and sharing the curriculum to create stronger pipelines from elementary schools to post secondary attainment. This approach considers the feeder pattern that often goes unaddressed when elementary, middle, and high school teachers and administrators fail to provide opportunities to share their theories of change with each other in order to improve student learning outcomes for all students as they matriculate through each transition point.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Horizon's vision includes goals which address improved student learning and increased equity. The goals are ambitious yet achievable and exceed ESEA targets.

- Performance and summative assessments will be addressed through the OAA Standardized Test and the OGT assessment (only acronyms are provided). These assessments are standardized tests and combined, measure proficiency and growth in Reading, Mathematics, Science, Writing and Social Studies. The applicant will implement a Lab Day that will provide an opportunity to provide individualized instruction in the early grades. This approach to improving student learning is likely to improve performance for all participating students because of the small student-teacher ratio and small group approach to delivery of instruction.
- The applicant intends to decrease achievement gaps in all subject areas and across all grade levels. The main focus for closing the gap is mathematics since data indicate this is the area in which the greatest gap exists. The Algebra Project is innovative and will be implemented in middle grades. The applicant provides a convincing rationale for the Algebra Project and beginning in middle grades is justified by data presented in the charts provided.
- The applicant intends to increase graduation rates from 71.6% to 100% by using the Career Academies Model and the Horizon College Summit. There is significant research to support the positive impact of the Academy approach on high school graduation rates. The Horizon College Summit is innovative and will likely impact high school graduation rates, however, evidence to support the reasonableness of 100% is not clear based on the information provided.
- The applicant intends to increase the college enrollment rate from 87.8% to 95%. The Career Academies Model and Horizon College Summit will also contribute to achieving this reasonable goal. The applicant has demonstrated through prior work the ability to achieve the designated goal.
- The alumni initiative and college mentor program will support postsecondary degree attainment. Both approaches are unique and will provide the support needed for college retention and completion.
- The applicant provides evidence of baseline data, annual targets overall for grade levels for summative assessments, decreasing achievement gaps, graduation rates, and college enrollment, but not other subgroups as required.
- Annual targets are set for tracking postsecondary degree attainment overall for each school, but is not broken down by other subgroups.

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:

Horizon has demonstrated significant improvements and provides clear evidence of past successes.

- Data is provided for the 19 Horizon schools throughout Ohio. The new value-added assessment system used in Ohio includes student growth measure results; school improvement using an interactive website tool; transparency of results used in the Accountability System and transparency of results most likely used for future educator evaluations. The letter grade provided by the state assessment system, (A-F) allows Horizon to determine their success over time. Letter grades are provided for each participating school and range from A-D. Horizons percentage of schools receiving the A grade is 53% and the highest among the peer charters or public schools is 33% which is evidence of a clear record of success in the last four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching.
- Specific achievement data, graduation rates and college enrollment is not provided in this section.
- Horizon indicates its greatest area of growth in the most recent assessment was middle school years, however

- specific evidence of this progress was not provided in this section.
- There is evidence that Horizon is performing better than their charter peers and other public schools through charts provided. These data support a successful track record of achieving ambitious and significant reforms, especially for high need students in persistently low-achieving and low-performing schools and supports its ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in these schools.
 - Three sources of evidence are listed for making performance data available to students, educators and parents. They include the Ohio Department of Education reports, local media, and the Horizon Schools Charter network website. Horizon provides a thorough description of efforts to communicate with stakeholders in an ongoing and consistent manner, including local meetings to discuss strengths and weaknesses of student performances, along with steps needed to make improvements. A major strength of the database provided by the applicant is the information available to stakeholders, which includes student performance on a daily basis and a comprehensive list of other data used to inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Transparency is clearly a part of the mission of Horizons and is evidenced of their intent and ability to maintain ongoing communication with stakeholders.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Horizon Schools provide evidence of a high level of transparency in processes, practices, and investments.

- Schools have independent school boards who make hiring decisions and compensation for teachers, administrators and staff.
- Open meetings are evidence of transparency related to five year budget forecasts presented to schools' sponsors and the Ohio Department of Education. The applicant does not indicate what information is included in the budget forecast and the extent to which it delineates the four categories of school level expenditures from State and local funds.
- The applicant already makes available the actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff through various state websites and upon public request.
- The applicant does not specifically address non-personnel expenditures at the school level.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
--	-----------	----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strong evidence that successful conditions exists for Horizon to implement the personalized learning environments described in the proposal.

- Evidence of successful conditions include State adoption of Common Core Standards and a model curriculum that aligns with College and Career Ready Standards. Horizon's plan clearly links with Ohio's new learning standards and efforts to improve performance for all students through its focus on Lab Days for elementary schools, Algebra for middle schools, and building a strong foundation through coursework and mentorship for college work at the high school level.
- The applicant provides evidence of the State's strong commitment to Charter Schools as demonstrated through the funding that is now allocated, in addition to increased funding based on the number of students served from the poorest districts, including students with disabilities and students from low-income families. This is significant considering the population Horizon is committed to serving and based of their student demographics.
- Though Horizon is a charter school, which brings with it a certain level of autonomy, the applicant does not discuss their ability as a charter, to make changes and use other innovative approaches as they move through various stages of implementing the personalized learning environments described in their proposal.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Horizons includes a comprehensive description, along with evidence of a high level of stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal. Stakeholder support is evidenced by the expansive number of letters of support from a community of believers.

- The applicant used surveys to ask stakeholders for their input on ideas for the high quality plan. Questions included on the survey are provided and are appropriate for determine the input the applicant was seeking. The receipt of over 240 responses demonstrates the effectiveness of this approach, regardless of the overall number who could

have responded. Including middle and high school students was an excellent effort to hear the voices of students in the development of the plan.

- Parent approval at 92% is convincing and evidence of the level of parent involvement and investment in the Horizon schools.
- 91% approval from teachers across the 19 schools from 82% to 96% is evidence of a strong approval rating and support for the proposal.
- The applicant provides additional evidence of engagement and support by including a snapshot of survey results.
- The applicant indicates that survey results were used in the final revision of the proposal and is further verified by the high approval rates of both parents and teachers.
- Letters of support from a wide range of stakeholders provide strong evidence of partnership engagement and support.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	19

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Horizon provides a comprehensive plan that addresses personalizing the learning environment to support all student to graduate college and career ready across participating schools.

- Though the applicant describes Horizon's plan to ensure college and career success for each student through targeted support and scaffolding, it is unclear how students and parents will be engaged in the process of gaining the understanding that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals.
- Horizon has an excellent track record for preparing low-income, minority students, however, there is insufficient evidence provided to determine how students take responsibility for their learning and understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals and how to stay attuned to their progress toward these goals.
- Evidence for deep learning experiences for students in specific areas of academic interest includes a STEM based curriculum that involves network competitions. Project Lead the Way, Gateways to Technology and Robotics are strong initiatives that give students the opportunity to explore and gravitate toward academic areas in which they are most interested while participating in deep learning experiences. The option for Non-AP students to drive their own selections from one of the four academies based on their interest and motivation is a major strength of the proposal.
- Horizons will address access and exposure to diverse cultures, context, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning through a multicultural education emphasis throughout the schools. Evidence of this effort includes world studies courses, world literature, Spanish and Turkish as a foreign language that includes language immersion programs in Spain and Turkey. Internships, work-study, and shadowing are components of the proposal and will provide excellent opportunities for students to access diverse cultures and perspectives.
- Student will have multiple opportunities to master critical academic content and develop skill and traits such as goal setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity and problem solving. Evidence of these opportunities include real world internships and work study programs and dual credit courses through Google Chrome books. Integration of online instruction and individualized instruction is additional evidence of opportunities for student to master academic content at their own pace.
- Evidence of a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development include various component of a small school design. Some of the most effective components included in the applicant's plan include small group advisement, mentoring, home visits, response to intervention model (RTI), and tracking student data to make instructional decisions.
- High quality instructional approaches are innovative and clearly delineated. Examples include flexible scheduling, matching individual students with teachers' strengths on Lab Day, which involves students working in small groups to address their academic needs.
- There is strong evidence of high quality content, including digital learning content aligned with college and career ready standards. Evidence includes a system wide approach toward the use of digital technology for teachers and students, training modules, and integration of simulation labs and software in the career academies.
- There is significant evidence of frequent feedback and personalized learning recommendations through daily grade level meeting, weekly school wide meetings and other regular scheduled meetings. Providing teachers with the time for meetings is challenging in most schools, making it a major strength of this proposal.
- The applicant currently has in-school for assessment modifications and accommodations and will also integrate

- social and emotional standards, which is strong evidence of commitment for ensure all students on progressing toward college and career ready graduation standards.
- The applicant provides strong evidence of mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students to use tools and resources. Evidence includes creating ePortfolios which is a major undertaking for high school students, but can be accomplished.
 - Key goals, activities and rationale for activities, the timeline, the deliverables and parties responsible for implementation are adequately addressed in the application.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Horizon schools provides a comprehensive plan for how they will help educators to improve instruction and support student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards.

- The in-house professional development approach used by the applicant provides clear evidence of how educators will be supported. Professional development on-site is considered one of the most effective approaches to delivery of training, particularly for new reform efforts. The use of instructional coaches is also highly successful across progressive urban school districts throughout the country. Another innovation aspect of the delivery of professional development is the frequency which includes daily in each grade and weekly at the school level.
- The Summer Institute is evidence of an opportunity for all educators from all participating school to come together for a week to receive additional training to ensure educators have the skills to adapt content and instruction, along with using data to make informed decision about student progress. This training format will also provide teachers with the opportunity to interact with a larger community of educators who are focused on the same outcomes for students. The Institute will likely benefit all participants in meeting their individual and collective needs going forward.
- A well developed training chart is provided and includes a timeline, goals and objectives, and faculty involved.
- The applicant also includes a detailed timeline for all initiatives in the proposal. The timeline provides cohesiveness and clarity to the project startup and progression throughout the grant cycle.
- A current teacher evaluation system which adheres to the Ohio State Department of Education's requirements is in use in Horizon schools. The evaluation system will be revised to incorporate the components of the applicant's plan in consideration of each new initiative and will provide evidence of the applicant's efforts to include frequent feedback and supports for teachers. A major strength of this effort is the inclusion of teachers and leaders in the revision process.
- The applicant provides significant evidence that all educators have the tools and resources they need to successfully implement the initiatives in the proposal. Examples of evidence include a system to regularly assess the progress of individual students, review of curriculum alignment and regular communication with parents.
- The intent to use real time data assessments from Lab Days and the Algebra Project will further support teachers in meeting the needs of students with the training, data, and tools they can access for decision making and continuous improvement.
- The applicant demonstrates strong support for recruiting and retaining effective and highly effective teachers and principals to serve high need students. Examples of evidence include paying tuition for educators who are enrolled in graduate level courses and recruiting educators from abroad to ensure hard to staff STEM positions are filled. This is further evidence of the applicant's plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals in hard-to-staff schools, STEM fields, and specialty areas.
- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are formed in Horizon schools for teachers and leaders and is an excellent platform to bring teachers and leaders together to discuss dilemmas and use protocols to find solutions. Research results has indicated that PLCs have positive impact on teacher retention in high need urban schools.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	15
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:	Horizon provides evidence of practices, policies and rules that facilitate personalized learning for all students.	

- Within the governing structure of the Concept Schools Charter Network, the Superintendent has signed an MOU and will manage grant funds and fully comply with all federal laws and regulations. A chart of the Horizon Science Academies Organizational Structure is provided. Specific details regarding provision of support and services in participating schools is provided and includes such things as materials, supplies and equipment to support the participating schools. This governing structure is sufficient to meet the requirements of the proposal.
- School leadership will be responsible for all school expenditures and will have sufficient flexibility and autonomy to support the three components of the proposal.
- A major strength of this component is inclusion of school leadership teams with shared leadership responsibilities such as setting schedules and calendars. This process encourages buy-in from teachers and other staff.
- Students already have the opportunity to progress when ready and this practice will be continued in this proposal. This practice encourages students to stay focused on their individual goals.
- Evidence of the use of a variety of assessments across the schools provides multiple opportunities for students to master standards in multiple ways. Examples of evidence include norm-reference and criterion referenced assessments; informal and formal assessments and adaptive technology software that allows students to monitor their own progress to mastery in a major way.
- Learning resources and instructional practices that will also support students with disabilities and English Learners are clearly delineated and indicate the applicant's strong commitment to include all students. Some examples include highly qualified special education teachers, use of Response to Intervention(RTI) tiered intervention, and language acquisition and content knowledge attainment.
- The applicant includes key goals, activities and rationale for activities selected, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementation.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
---	-----------	-----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant addresses how Horizon's infrastructure will support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provides every student, educator, and level of education system with the support and resources they need when they are needed.

- An extensive list of resources and tools are delineated as evidence of access and technical support. Some of the most innovative and compelling include the Lab Day model using a small group design; student ePortfolios providing student an opportunity to self monitor their progress and technology tutorials for parents.
- A wide range of support will be provided for technology use with strategies such as on-line tutorials, training from industry specialists, and how to access the new data dashboard. This support will allow students, parents and teachers to work more collaboratively and have a common focus.
- Evidence of information technology that will enable parents and student to export their information to an open data format and includes the new data dashboard, along with the ePortfolio. They are both innovative options that will also provide parents and students with additional technology training that may be transferable to other environments.
- The applicant provides evidence of the use of interoperable data systems that are currently a part of the Horizon schools' central office. Numerous data sets are included and accessible.
- Key goals, activities and rationale for activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementation are evident in the application.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly describes the continuous improvement process and will sufficiently monitor and provide an approach to continuously improve its plan.

- Horizon provides a cycle for continuous improvement for different phases of the proposal including the design, implementation, management, evaluation and assessment phases as evidence to support this component of the proposal. The cycle of continuous improvement will also be supported by survey data, informal feedback and other data points, which are critical for monitoring and measuring the progress toward implementation of project goals and opportunities to make improvements.

- The applicant provides a comprehensive plan to ensure implementation fidelity at the System-wide level, School level, Grade/Cluster level, Classroom level, and State/Regional Level. A major strength of this approach is that data from each level can be analyzed, triangulated, and interpreted in multiple ways to determine what the data really means and to confirm improvements that should be made.
- It is unclear as to how the applicant will publicly share information on the quality of its investments such as professional development, technology and staff.
- Key goals, activities and the rationale for activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities are evident in the proposal.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement of internal and external stakeholders is comprehensive and well developed.

- Evidence of regular communications with educators across the 19 schools in the network school and at the local school level include Summer Institutes and face to face meetings.
- Monthly meetings with regional superintendents and school leaders is significant and will continue to garner the needed support for the proposal.
- Consistently sharing student performance data is crucial in this time of high stakes testing and educator accountability for student performance.
- Intentionally including community stakeholders in ongoing communications and engagement is vital, particularly those stakeholders who initially provided their support and will occur through face to face meetings, fundraisers, and newsletters among other events.
- Weekly and monthly ongoing communications and engagement with parents and students will include PTO meetings, curriculum nights, school fundraisers, school ceremonies, newsletters, Parent University sessions.
- The applicant's plan includes key goals, activities and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementation.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Horizon includes ambitious yet achievable performance measures by subgroups with the required annual targets, along with performance measures across grades K-12 depending on the population served by the participating school. The performance measures are ambitious because of the number of students in the high-need category, but achievable because of the innovative approaches proposed and the quality of support to be provided during implementation.

- Performance measures are provided, but are not completed and do not include a rationale for selection.
- The applicant includes the number and percentages of participating students who complete and submit the FAFSA form and percentages are broken out by all required subgroups. Strong rationales are provided for selection of each measure.
- It is unclear how the performance measures will provide rigorous and timely information regarding implementation success.
- A cohesive plan to review and improve the measures over time is not provided in this section.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A rigorous and comprehensive evaluation plan is not clearly described. The applicant indicates that data analytics will be used to measure the growth in student performance on a list of assessment tools previously delineated. Horizon does not address how effectiveness of various activities proposed, such as professional development, Lab day, the Algebra Project and Career Academies, will be measured.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budget and budget narrative include allocation of funds sufficient to support the proposal. The budget also includes funds from other sources.

- It is unclear, but it appears that technology and classroom supplies are a one time cost for the project. Technology will age and classroom supplies could be consumable.
- Horizon indicates they will take on the cost of personnel after the four years of RTT funding to ensure sustainability.
- Concept Schools will use its own funds to support two initiatives included in the proposal. The Summer Institute, the Alumni Summer Summit and Alumni Networking Events are the designated initiatives to be funded by Concept Schools.

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

10

4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a plan to sustain the grant initiatives with state funds and other grant initiatives funds.

- Horizon does not include how they will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use data to inform future investments or how they will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget.
- Though the applicant provides information on expansion of the Concept Schools and the rate of growth, along with additional revenue, an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the RTT grant is not provided.
- The applicant's proposal includes key goals, activities and the rationale for activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities.
- Support letters from government officials are evidence of State and Local government support for sustaining grant initiatives.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Horizons will only focus on the Career Academies for the Competitive Preference Priority because this is the area most in need of developing partnerships.

- Horizon schools provide strong evidence of developing true partnerships with numerous organizations that will support the project initiatives with specific focus on the Career Academies component of the application which has the greatest need for partnership development. The partnerships are needed to provide shadowing, mentoring, internships, apprenticeships and workstudy programs. This is a reasonable and appropriate focus for the applicant to select and will contribute to the success of the proposal. Other sections of the proposal indicate some level of partnership with the partners listed, however, there is no evidence in this criteria section that the applicant has already developed partnerships with all organization listed which are coherent and sustainable to support the plan.
- The applicant identified more than 10 individualized population level desired goals and clearly connects them with the broader proposal initiatives to be implemented., specifically students graduating from high school college and career-ready. Goals are selected for grades 10-12 because the focus is on the Career Academy Partnerships.
- The applicant will track selected indicators through closely monitoring progress in each shadowing opportunity, internship, apprenticeship and work-study program. The applicant delineates 11 indicators that will be tracked and added to the new data dashboard. Including the indicators in the data dashboard ensures inclusion in the broader proposal and is evidence of the importance of monitoring students who are off the campus site. It is unclear how the applicant will work with partners to support tracking selected indicators.
- The applicant will use the data to target its resources through regular meetings between the Career Academy Director and Career Academy teachers in the 6 high school. These meetings will provide a platform to discuss the progress of all students in the partnerships. Regular meetings and use of the data dashboard will maintain focus on students participating in various types of internships or other placements off site. It is unclear if and how the partners will be included in this process.
- The model will be scaled up by offering partnership placement possibilities to AP-Track students in addition to non-

- AP Track students. 80% of students served are currently not on the AP track and will therefore require partnership placements to effectively implement the Academy component of the proposal.
- The applicant will improve results for participating students in the high schools through regular meetings designed to discuss student progress that will be linked to the continuous improvement model for change.
 - A clear description of how the partnership will integrate education and other services is provided and includes needs and assets for students and identifying needs and assets of the school and community. There will also be daily and weekly meetings among teachers and administrators to review and make data-based decision that will allow them to more effectively support students who are at risk for failure in their off campus site. The option to make referrals to guidance counselors and social workers provides another level of support for students in community based sites.
 - The applicant addresses how they will create decision making processes and infrastructure along with engaging parents and families. the applicant will hold a pre-conference and post-conference meeting with students and their community partner. Consideration will be given to a half-way conference if needed for students experiencing difficulties on the site.
 - Encouraging and embracing more parent responsibility is evident by the need for parents to provide or arrange transportation and necessary supplies such as a uniform. Parents will be involved in helping students select the partner that best matches their career goals.
 - The applicant will routinely assess progress, monitor each student's attainment of the 11 indicators, and add these data to the data dashboard, making it an integral part of the regular review process. The publication of annual reports examining results of the partnership data is additional evidence and will be critical for improving, developing and recruiting additional community partnership placements.
 - The annual performance measures are ambitious yet achievable for the proposed population-level and clearly describe desired results for students. Evidence to demonstrate the desired results for students includes increased career based knowledge, a decrease in behavior concerns, and support for students who are at risk for failing in their partnership site.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
Absolute Priority 1 is adequately addressed for all components.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has aligned the initiatives of the proposal, including Lab Day, Algebra Project, Data Dashboard, Career Academy and Alumni Network with the Common Core Standards the Ohio State Standards, the Next Generation Science Standards and the College Readiness Standards. The Horizon schools and Concept Charter Network have a data system that measures student growth and success. The data dashboard has expansive capabilities and the ePortfolio provides students an opportunity to self monitor. Lab days will provide opportunities to review, make data based decision, and provide small group, laser focused support to students requiring additional support. The applicant will support teachers through a tuition remission program for teachers enrolled in graduate courses. An effective and highly effective pool of teachers will serve students who are academically challenged and need the best teachers. Teachers and leaders will participate in Professional Learning Communities designed to provide them with a platform to problem solve and experience reciprocal mentoring with other participants. 		

Total	210	174
-------	-----	-----

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form



Application #0090OH-2 for Horizon Educational Services, Inc. (Horizon Science Academy Cleveland HS)

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This is a high range response.

(a) The Applicant provides credible and convincing evidence of its building on the four core assurance areas.

The strengths are:

- The Applicant has fully aligned its curricula with Ohio state standards and is progressing toward aligning its curricula with the applicable Common Core standards.
- The Applicant has set standards for students regarding behavior and promotion in addition to academic performance standards. Setting the latter standards is consistent with developing skills enabling success in school, college matriculation, and college graduation.
- The Applicant's assessments include a skills diagnosis at enrollment, formative assessments, comprehensive batteries of interim and summative assessments at every grade level which enable educators, parents, and students to monitor and facilitate student success.
- The Applicant's assessments include assessing skill development and character traits supportive of success in school, college, and career.
- Data from these assessments is available to students, parents, educators, and governing board members.
- The Applicant's data system currently provides educators, parents, students, and administrators with information regarding student achievement and growth. The system informs instruction.
- The Applicant rewards teachers by giving high performers special recognition and by encouraging students and parents to recommend teachers for such recognition.
- The Applicant develops teachers by providing tuition assistance to those seeking graduate degrees, by providing individual, personalized support and professional development, and by a "promotion pipeline."

The weaknesses are:

- The Applicant provides little information regarding its educator recruitment efforts.
- The time provided for observations and the infrequency of observations and walk-throughs coupled with the level of detail which evaluators are required provide call to question the reliability of the data which will be reported. This in turn calls to question the credibility and thus the effectiveness of each systems.
- The Applicant's discussion of how three of its schools compare to nearby local schools in terms of students performance is not responsive to the requirement of showing how the Applicant has turned around its lowest performing schools.

(b) The Applicant's approach to accelerating achievement is comprehensive, coherent, and credible.

The strengths are:

- The Applicant's approach to student character development will facilitate students' gaining skills associated with academic and personal success in academic and work careers.
- The Applicant couples a school-wide discipline policy at each school with training for all staff and supports for students to meet the requirements of the policy.
- The Applicant's expectation that all students will graduate and matriculate in college is supported by a comprehensive program and system of supports extending from enrollment into the early years of college. The extent of this longitudinal support is highly unusual but consistent with what has been learned about fostering college completion by students sharing the demographics of the participating students designated by the Applicant.
- Parents are supported, learn skills, and information all of which are likely to increase their capacity to help their students succeed.
- The Applicant uses the Response to Intervention (RTI) program to support students in meeting the challenges of

behaving and participating in class in productive ways. When implemented systematically and thoroughly, this system provides sound learning environments and fosters student success among students who otherwise struggle to succeed academically and in meeting behavior expectations.

- Staff are required to make home visits. Such visits typically result in greater parent engagement than is otherwise experienced with parents sharing the demographics of the participating students.
- Schools are expected to provide a number of events involving parents and families and take a variety of other approaches to engaging parents. Such efforts often result in greater parent engagement than is otherwise experienced with parents sharing the demographics of the participating students.

The weaknesses are:

- Applicant does not indicate for most of the competitions it describes the number or percentage of students who participate. Without this, whether they have the beneficial effect claimed is difficult to determine.
- It is not clear that the FTE devoted to supporting students struggling with the discipline policy is adequate to make the approach a success.
- The number of parents and the amount of participation in the Parent Universities is not stated. This makes unclear the degree to which this approach is successful.

(c) The Applicant provides a detailed and credible description of the proposed classroom experiences for students and teachers.

The strengths are:

- The description of the various kinds of lab days to be experienced at the various grade levels and in the various subject areas includes most of the elements of a high quality plan—the goals, activities, rationale for the activities, the responsible parties, and the time involved. This shows that thought and care went into their design. The proposed activities are consistent with successful practices for increasing achievement among students sharing the demographics of the participating students.
- The description of the Algebra Project as it is to be experienced by students and teachers includes most of the elements of a high quality plan—the goals, activities, rationale for the activities, the responsible parties, and the time involved. This shows that thought and care went into the choice of the Algebra Project and the implementation plan.
- The rationale for sequencing the teaching as outlined reflects thought, care, and knowledge of what is likely to be successful in meeting the challenges of fostering success with algebra among students sharing the demographics of the participating students.
- Provision is made within the Algebra Project for students who master the subject “early.” This contributes to equity by enabling highly successful students to accelerate their learning in mathematics.
- The description of the elements of career academies—small learning environments, more time in school--comport with what are successful strategies for fostering learning among students sharing the demographics of the participating students.
- Expanding the data system as described complements the activities and and goals of the other initiatives in Applicant's proposal.
- Strengthening the alumni network as described is a thoughtful and informed approach to meeting the challenges of college enrollment and completion known to have been experienced by students sharing the demographics of the participating students.
- The Applicant correctly identifies significant challenges to providing in-college support for its alumni and describes thoughtful, resourceful, and potentially successful solutions.

The weaknesses are:

- The age appropriateness of requiring all 8th grade students to take Algebra I and all 9th grade students to take Algebra II can and will be called to question particularly for students presenting the demographics which they do. The Applicant does not indicate whether there is a history of success in doing this with students sharing its students demographics. The absence of such a discussion weakens the response.
- The descriptions of the HAHS and HAF academies lack sufficient detail to determine the likelihood of their implementation is likely to result in the Applicant meeting the applicable goals.
- The creation of a school within a school (Career Academies initiative) involving less than all (30 to 40 percent) students at each high Applicants creates a challenge to maintaining an all inclusive, mutually supportive culture among students. Placing four separate Career Academy teaching teams into each participating school's faculty creates challenges to faculty unity. Neither of these challenges is discussed.
- It is problematic to presume as Applicant does that one person can perform all the tasks assigned to the Career Academic Director for six schools particularly when, as here, their geographic separation among schools is

substantial.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>This is a high range response.</p> <p>All the Ohio schools in the Concept school system will participate. The percentage of students involved who are low income meets the threshold requirement. This is not stated directly and that weakens the response. It is implied, however, that the Ohio schools were chosen to participate because they have been in system longer than others, and more of them are successful. It also appears to be implied that there is something to be gained by their all being governed by one state's charter school rules. There is a rational basis for such a choice and nothing unreasonable or inappropriate about it.</p> <p>The Applicant justifies placing a lab day program in each elementary school because, regardless of the size to the school, the participating students will benefit. There is nothing unreasonable in this approach.</p> <p>There is no direct explanation of the decision to recruit non-AP students into the Career Academies. This weakens the response. It can be inferred, however, that this choice is a way to cause give less skilled students what are understood to be the benefits theme-based educational settings: small learning communities, focused teacher teams, career-based curricula, etc. typically associated with theme-based education. This is a reasonable approach because there is some history of these strategies being successful with students who present similar demographics to those of the participating students.</p> <p>The alumni network will affect all juniors, senior, and is intended to reach all alumni enrolled in their first or second year. These years are crucial to becoming college ready, graduating, enrolling in college, and staying enrolled. Focusing on these students at these times in their careers are consistent with the goals of the Application and the proposal.</p> <p>The enhancement of the data system via the dashboard initiative will affect all participating students and further facilitate the personalizing students' educations and personalizing supports. Such an initiative is consistent with the goals of the Application and the proposal.</p> <p>The percentage of low income students involved in the proposal (85 percent of the total enrollment of the participating schools) meets the specified threshold requirement Ninety eight percent of the participating students are minority group members. These two percentages combine to establish the significance of the number of high needs students ($6944 \times 85\% \times 98\% = 5784$) to be served.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>This is a mid range response.</p> <p><u>Scaling the reforms:</u> The Applicant states general principles regarding planning which do not in and of themselves constitute a HQP or substitute for it. The Applicant's discussion of creating readiness does contain the required elements to a substantial degree. The Applicant describes key, pertinent activities, a series of pertinent outcomes (i.e. deliverables) to result from the activities, and a start date apparently triggered by the hiring new Project Staff. The Applicant does not indicated the timing of other pertinent activities, and the responsible party appears to be "we." The latter is not a sufficient designation of the responsible parties for a HQP.</p> <p>The discussion of creating programmatic infrastructure contains some of the elements of a HQP including an apparent deadline of completing the requisite activities so that roll out can occur during the 2014-15 school year. That "Project Staff Teams" at each school will develop site-specific phase in plans and the logistics of implementation is made clear, but who will review "everyone's roles and responsibilities" and "install formative evaluation measures" is not.</p> <p>It can be presumed from the context, that it is LEA-level Project Staff who will integrate the Summer Professional Institutes with the balance of each year's professional development, and the Applicant describes the outcomes to be gained from that aspect of professional development sufficiently.</p> <p>The Applicant plans to "collect information," clarify way to improve, and "facilitate the expansion" of its reform initiatives to neighboring schools during Project Years 2 and 3 (also described in the narrative as the "evolutionary phase"). This aspiration seems outside the scope of Race to the Top and more important, is vague and will be difficult to monitor. It does not substitute for a HQP for scaling up the pilot reform initiatives to the balance of the Concept School network—an activity which is more consistent with requirements under (A) (3).</p> <p><u>Horizon Schools Theory of Change:</u> The Applicant's response is to reiterate the rationales and the anticipated benefits which will accrue from implementation from the five "pilot" (i.e. reform) initiatives. The Applicant also summarizes the activities which will take place once the initiatives are in place in boxes or tables labeled by initiative title, These are the anticipated results of pursuing a model or theory of change but neither is a definitively articulated model or theory per se. The Applicant also asserts that it intends to "shift" its capacity as a network of schools, create a trajectory for K-12, and build teams of collaborative educators. These aspirations are too summarily described to earn high range points as a description of its plan will improve student outcomes beyond the Applicant's participating schools</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant provides some data and sets goals in some of the required areas. For the reasons described, however, this is a low range response.		
(a) <u>Summative Assessments</u> : There are significant weaknesses in this response. They are:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The baseline data and the post-grant goal are stated in sentence form instead of in one table. This makes verifying these assertions extremely difficult and detracts from credibility. Annual goals are not set. The average pace of growth for the three subjects in the grade 3-8 assessments which range from 2.5 to 3.6 percent annually do not appear, without further explanation, ambitious. None of the goals address summative assessments administered at the high school (grades 9-12) level. 		
(b) <u>Decreasing achievement gaps</u> : There are significant weaknesses in this response. They are:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The baseline data and the post-grant goal are stated in sentence form instead of in one table. This makes verifying these assertions extremely difficult and detracts from credibility. Data by sub-group is not presented. Annual goals are not set. Because of the above, it cannot be determined whether the goals presented are achievable or ambitious. 		
(c) <u>Graduation rates</u> : There are significant weaknesses in this response. They are:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The baseline data and the post-grant goal are stated in sentence form instead of in one table. This makes verifying these assertions extremely difficult and detracts from credibility. Data by sub-group is not presented. The proposed reforms are not likely to have sufficient effect on the cohorts who are targeted during the grant years to enable the LEA to realize its post-grant goal of 100 percent graduation. For this reason, the goals are not achievable. 		
(d) <u>Post-secondary degrees</u> : There are significant weaknesses in this response. They are:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The baseline data and the post-grant goal are stated in sentence form instead of in one table. This makes verifying these assertions extremely difficult and detracts from credibility. Data by sub-group is not presented. Annual goals are not set. The proposed reforms are not likely to have sufficient effect on the cohorts targeted during the grant years to increase degree attainment by the 40+ percent goal by the conclusion of the grant period. For this reason the goal is not achievable. 		

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	4
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
This is a low, mid-range response.		
(a) (b) <u>4-year record of success</u> : The only strength in the response is that the Applicant provides some evidence of success in the form of value-added comparisons between its Ohio schools and what the Applicant asserts are comparable charter and public schools. The weaknesses are:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant does not specify for what year or years it has provided its value-added data. The Applicant does not specify what measures are included in the value-added data. The Applicant does not provide the kinds of evidence suggested in the Application (i.e. charts, graphs, raw data). Except for "baseline data" for the school years starting in 2011 and 2012, the Applicant does not provide information directly responsive to the request in the Application regarding student learning outcomes, high school graduation rates, or college enrollment for the past four years. The Applicant does not specifically address the request for evidence pertaining to its instituting reforms among its 		

lowest-achieving schools, and it does not explain this omission.

(c) Making data available:

The strengths of this response are:

- The Applicant's Ohio schools give access to parents, students, and educators to data pertaining to learning, achievement, attendance, discipline, teacher comments, and school-family contents. This data is recorded daily.
- The Applicant's schools provide training ("orientation") to parents for the use of the this data.
- The Applicant's educators are trained in the use of the Atlas system which enables them to "enhance" curricula. It is presumed "enhance" means that teachers can personalize the curricula based on student needs and performance.
- The Concept schools central office provides its educators with professional development which enables them to use the student-related data it provides.
- Data teams at all Concept schools meet each six weeks to review achievement data.
- Concept provides its high schools with interim and end of course assessments.

The weaknesses are:

- Applicant does not discuss training students to use any of the data provided.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This is a mid range response.

The Applicant makes an annual report of the salaries of its Ohio school-based employees to the State. The form it is in is "compatible" with the U.S. Census Bureau's classification system specified in the Application. Members of the public can access this information through "various" websites after it is reported to the State. Members of the public can also request annual salary information as it appears in the minutes of the individual school boards which oversee the Applicant's Ohio schools.

The Applicant does not make clear the degree to which employees' titles or employee categories under the U.S. Census Bureau's classification system (i.e. "instructional staff," "support staff," "teachers") is available should the member of the public either not know an individual employee's name and/or desire to know the aggregate expenditures at a school by category without doing the addition him/herself.

Should a member of the public want information regarding non-personnel expenditures at the Ohio schools, it appears he/she would have to find them in the board minutes of the selected school or he/she would have to find it in the school's report to the State's Education Management Information System. The Applicant did not indicate that the non-personnel information was on the websites.

Because the member of the public must make a substantial effort to obtain reports, minutes, and/or to access unspecified websites to get the specified information, the transparency described is moderate rather than high level.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This is a high range response.

The Applicant asserts that it has sufficient autonomy to implement the initiatives it plans under this proposal. Applicant's Vision contemplates its teaching to the most rigorous curricular standards applicable to college and career readiness. The standards Ohio is reported to have adopted and to which Applicant's Ohio schools are apparently committed are consistent with this Vision. Applicant's Vision contemplates its holding its students to the most rigorous graduation standards applicable to college and career readiness. The standards and assessments Ohio is reported to have adopted and to which Applicant's Ohio schools are apparently committed are consistent with this Vision.

The Ohio school budgets for the 2013 and 2014 school years are likely to increase the chances that Applicant will be able to implement its initiatives because more money per student will be available per student and because Applicant has waiting lists which will cause enrollment to stay the same or increase. The Applicant is likely to get additional monies because the State adds allocations for the kinds of high needs students who are in high percentages in most of Applicant's Ohio schools.

The Applicant does not disclose any impediments to its implementing its five initiatives in its Ohio schools and describes conditions which could facilitate their implementation.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	11
--	-----------	-----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) (ii) The Applicant does not have a collective bargaining agreement with the participating teachers. Consequently, it was required to produce evidence that 70 percent support the proposal. The Applicant did so. [8]

(b) Letters of support:

The strengths conveyed by the letters are:

- There are a total of 51 letters of support.
- Supporters include eight elected officials from all levels starting with both of Ohio's U.S. Senators and included two Mayors of cities in which Applicant's schools are located.
- Other supporters include six parents, one parent organization, and three community based organizations.
- Two college/university leaders wrote letters of support and another came from a professor of education.

The weaknesses mitigating against this apparent level of support are:

- Applicant asserted that there were 60 letters of support but in fact nine communicated recognition for a school or an achievement and did not mention this proposal.
- Sixteen letters were from employees and one from a school site governing board member.
- None of the letters from elected officials spoke of support after the grant ran out.
- Despite the fact that over 90 percent of the students and parents are African-American or Hispanic, no civil rights or minority group advocacy group provided letters of support.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Learning: The substantial strengths of Applicant's response are mitigated by the weaknesses noted. Overall, however, it is a high range response.

(a)

Strengths:

- Much of what the Applicant describes that it already does can be said to be established best practices and/or highly likely to enable students including those with high needs to meet the various objectives listed under (a) of (C) (1).
- The five initiatives which the Applicant will implement through this grant are each highly likely to further enable students to meet the objectives under (C) (1) (a) *as well as* (b) and (c) as explained below:
 - The Lab Days initiatives and the Algebra Project are designed to enable students to master critical content, deepen their learning, routinely set goals, pursue college/career readiness, and increase their appreciation of learning as crucial to success. The Algebra Project was specifically designed for high needs students and the Lab Days incorporate many best practices for working with high needs students.
 - Small learning communities organized as career academies have some history of accomplishing the objectives under (a), (b), and (c) with students presenting the same demographics as Applicant's participating students at several locations in the Nation. The elective programs at Applicant's high schools are likely to foster students' exposure to diverse cultures.
 - Expanding the alumni network in the ways Applicant describes will complement the other initiatives, add emphasis to the importance of planning, goal setting, mastering college prep curricula, and expose students to peers/mentors who can address the importance of learning as a means to success.
 - The expansion of the data system will enable students, parents, and educators to monitor and respond to student performance in all of these areas.
 - Applicant offers a HQP as the term is defined for enabling its educators to implement its five reform initiatives under its response to "(C) (2) Teaching and Leading." Applicant's describing this HQP for implementation substantially increases the likelihood that the five initiatives will be successfully implemented. This substantially increases the likelihood the objectives under (a), (b), and (c) will be realized. Strengths of the HQP for implementation are:

- The Applicant describes a sequence of professional development supporting the implementation of the five initiatives which meet the requirements of a HQP. The description includes an explanation of the first Summer Institute sufficient to determine that each HQP element—goals, activities reasons for which can be inferred from the context for each initiative, responsible parties, and outcomes/deliverables—is included. In the narrative, Applicant outlines its expectations for what will be accomplished in the Summer Institutes which are scheduled for each of the subsequent years of the grant.
- The Applicant provides supplementary detail in tables following its narrative. They include “Goals/Objectives” and “Staff and Faculty” columns for Institutes occurring from 2014 through 2017, one for each of the applicable grant years. Combined, the narrative and the tables fully meet the requirements for a HQP plan for summer professional development supporting its initiatives.
- The Applicant identifies the parties responsible for the supervision of the implementation of each of its five initiatives. The Applicant provides tables containing supplementary outlines which identify additional parties who will be responsible for specific implementation tasks. The tables include descriptions for each initiative of what actions will be taken by whom, what must be delivered by whom, and what the applicable time line or deadlines are. These tables cover the first year and a half of the grant with one exception—the table for the data dashboard initiative covers each year of the grant albeit with diminishing detail.
- The Applicant supplements the implementation tables with additional tables which in some instances further describes the responsibilities of those doing the implementation and in other instances specifies some combination of knowledge, skills, and/or qualifications to be possessed by the responsible parties.
- There is an additional table for the data system enhancement describing the functions which it will provide. The Applicant describes a sequence of professional development supporting the implementation of the five initiatives which meet the requirements of a HQP. The description includes an explanation of the first Summer Institute sufficient to determine that each HQP element—goals, activities reasons for which can be inferred from the context for each initiative, responsible parties, and outcomes/deliverables—is included. In the narrative, Applicant outlines its expectations for what will be accomplished in the Summer Institutes which are scheduled for each of the subsequent years of the grant.
- Regarding each of the plans labeled “HQP” above, the details in each are sufficient to convince that thought, care, and diligence have been exercised in their development. The plans are sufficient to convince that each initiative is likely to be implemented successfully. In short, each plan is credible.

Weaknesses:

- By placing its HQP for implementation of the five initiatives under (C) (2) rather than (C) (1), Applicant has created unnecessary confusion. The initial impression created for a person reading the Application in the ordinary sequence starting with (A) and ending with (F) is that Applicant has *not* articulated a HQP plan that will enable it to meet the objectives under (C) (1) (a) through (c). It is only after reading the response to (C) (2) and concluding it can and should be read as an additional response to (C) (1) that it can be seen that there is a strong likelihood that Applicant can achieve the objectives under (C) (1).
- The format of Applicant's response to (C) (1) is also confusing. Applicant separated its response into two subsections ostensibly addressing romanettes (C) (1) (a) “i” and “ii” under the first section of its response and addressing (a) “iii”- “v” in the second. A number of the “WHAT-WE-NEED-TO-DO-NEXT” activities described in the second section of the response, however, relate primarily to romanettes “i” and “ii.”
- The description of activities in Applicant's response to (C) (1) (c), are presented under two rubrics. The response under “WHAT WE NEED TO DO NEXT” includes a number of aspirational statements which are not activities calculated to realize the objectives under (c). Combining these two types of activities weakens this particular response.
- The promise and apparent strengths in the design of Applicant's current program are mitigated by its weak response to setting LEA wide goals for improved student outcomes under (A) (4) and its weak response to demonstrating a clear record of success under (B) (1).
- The time lines for when the various cohorts of participating students will begin to engage in the five initiatives are not methodically and directly described in Applicant's responses to (C) (1) or (C) (2). Although current juniors and seniors can begin using the strengthened alumni network as soon as additional alumni come available, it is typical for initiatives like Lab Days, the Algebra Project, and

Career Days to be phased in by grade level. Training and use of the enhanced data system is also likely to be phased in in some fashion. Failing to provide such information weakens the otherwise strong implementation plans to some degree.

- The recitations in the “WHAT WE ARE DOING NOW” response to (C) (1) sections are overly long. Although there is some merit in describing the foundations for the reform initiatives are, a significant amount of what is cited appears either marginally relevant or extraneous to the requirements of the Application under (C) (1).

(b)

Strengths:

- As indicated above, the Applicant's current program meets the requirements under romanettes “i” and “ii” of (C) (1) (b) to a substantial degree.
- The activities described in the response to (C) (1) (b) “WHAT WE NEED TO DO NEXT” for romanettes “i” and “ii” are reasonably calculated to further Applicant's meeting the required objectives. As noted above, the HQP for implementation of the reform initiatives under (C) (2) substantially increases the likelihood that these objectives will be achieved.
- The Applicant's current program meets the requirements under romanettes “iv” and “v” of (C) (1) (b) to a substantial degree.
- The activities described under “WHAT WE NEED TO DO NEXT” section for romanettes “iv” and “v” are reasonably calculated to further Applicant's meeting the required objectives. As noted above, the HQP for implementation of the reform initiatives under (C) (2) substantially increases the likelihood that these objectives will be achieved.

Weaknesses:

- The description under (C) (1) (b) “iii” of “WHAT WE CURRENTLY DO” is marginally relevant to the objectives under this romanette.
- The activities described under (C) (1) (b) “iii” are more relevant to increasing access to hardware and software than they are to increasing access to the high quality content described in the Application.

(c)

Strengths:

- The Applicant's current program meets the requirements under this criterion.
- The Applicant's described activities will enhance what is in place.
- As noted above, the HQP for implementation of the reform initiatives under (C) (2) substantially increases the likelihood that the objectives required to be met under (c) will be achieved.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(C) (2) Teaching and Learning:

This response is in the high range. The nature of the “strengths” and their number are substantial. There are two significant weaknesses as will be explained below—the apparent inability to report a clear track record of success and the failure to address (d) in any substantive manner.

(a) Strengths

- The Applicant says that its educators currently work in professional teams or communities.
- Throughout the Application, the Applicant describes current practices by its educators sufficient to convince that they support personalized learning environments resulting in graduation rates superior to comparable schools serving students with similar demographics, provide some adaptations of content and instruction, and frequently measure student progress. The Applicant has created evaluation systems which meet the requirements of the State of Ohio which is, itself a Race to the Top State. It can be inferred from this that the systems meet the requirements for an adequate evaluation system as outlined in this RTT-D Application. The Applicant will add indicators to its system

- meeting the goals for student learning under (C) (1) of this Application as part of its data dashboard initiative. There is a specific time line with a deadline for completion in time for the second year's Summer Institute.
- The Applicant will add to its support of teachers for the purposes required by this criterion through its Lab Days, Algebra Project, and Career Academies by adding site-based personal who will provide complementary professional development.
 - Applicant offers a HQP as the term is defined for enabling its educators to implement its five reform initiatives. Successful implementation of each initiative will substantially increase the level of personalization Applicant provides to each of its participating students virtually all of whom are high needs students. More specifically,
 - The Applicant describes a sequence of professional development supporting the implementation of the five initiatives which meet the requirements of a HQP. The description includes an explanation of the first Summer Institute sufficient to determine that each HQP element—goals, activities reasons for which can be inferred from the context for each initiative, responsible parties, and outcomes/deliverables—is included. In the narrative, Applicant outlines its expectations for Institutes to occur in each of the subsequent years of the grant.
 - The Applicant provides supplementary detail in tables following the narrative. They include “Goals/Objectives” and “Staff and Faculty” columns for Institutes occurring from 2014 through 2017, one for each of the applicable grant years. Combined, the narrative and the tables fully meet the requirements for a HQP plan for summer professional development supporting its initiatives.
 - The Applicant identifies the parties responsible for the supervision of the implementation of each of its five initiatives. The Applicant provides tables containing supplementary outlines which identify additional parties who will be responsible for specific implementation tasks. The tables include descriptions for each initiative of what actions will be taken by whom, what must be delivered by whom, and what the applicable time line or deadlines are. These tables cover the first year and a half of the grant with one exception—the table for the data dashboard initiative covers each year of the grant albeit with diminishing detail.
 - The Applicant supplements the implementation tables with additional tables which in some instances further describes the responsibilities of those doing the implementation and in other instances specifies some combination of knowledge, skills, and/or qualifications to be possessed by the responsible parties.
 - There is an additional table for the data dashboard describing the functions which the dashboard will provide.
 - Regarding each of the plans labeled “HQP” above, the details in each are sufficient to convince that thought, care, and diligence have been exercised in their development. The plans are sufficient to convince that each initiative is likely to be implemented successfully. In short, each plan is credible.

Weaknesses:

- The purported strengths of Applicant's current approach to teaching and leading program are mitigated by its weak response to its demonstrating a clear record of success under (B) (1). Were the current practices as strong and thoroughly implemented as is stated or implied, it stands to reason that Applicant would be able to provide a more comprehensive record of success than that which is offered.
- Under (A), the Applicant provided copious detail regarding its current evaluation system for teachers and principals. An extraordinary amount of information in extraordinary detail is to be gathered by the evaluator over the course of two formal observations and, in the case of teachers, a few walk-throughs. Time for conferences appears to be short. Given these factors, it does not appear that these exercises will be enlightening for the educators, productive of significant changes in behavior if called for, or produce ratings which are regarded as fully credible. Presuming this conclusion to be valid, using these systems are not likely to result in improved teaching and learning. [6]

(b) Strengths:

- Participating educators have some experience and some previous success in using tools, data, and resources to accelerate students' progress.
- Successful implementation of the five reform initiatives will substantially enhance educators' capacities to meet the goals described under romanettes “i”-“iv.” As noted and for the reasons stated, Applicant presents a HQP for implementation of each initiative.

Weaknesses:

- The proposed activities to get educators at each school “on the same page” are vague.
- The three other activities included under this criterion are duplicative of the outcomes to be realized from the implementation of the five reform initiatives. That makes their inclusion here non-responsive as the term is used in the Scoring Tool. [4+]

(c) Strengths:

- The kinds and amounts of data the Applicant says are currently available can enable school leaders and teachers to competently assess and take steps to improve educators' effectiveness, school culture, school climate, increase student performance, and close gaps.
- The Applicant says that educators are already involved in site-based, job-specific professional development during the school year which enables them to address the goals described immediately above. The staff to be added under the grant to provide professional development supporting the five reform initiatives and the four Summer Institutes will further enhance educators' capacities to meet these goals.
- The successful implementation the four student-focused reform initiatives will substantially enhance educators' capacity to meet the goals immediately above.
- The successful implementation of the data dashboard initiative will substantially increase the amount of data available to educators and should enhance their capacities to meet the goals.

Weaknesses:

- The credibility of the evaluations systems for teachers and principals and its usefulness for meeting the pertinent goals is problematic for the reasons stated above. [4+]

(d) The Applicant appears to ignore the definitions of "effective" and "highly effective" as defined in the Application in responding to this criterion. The Applicant does not present a HQP as defined to increase the number of participating students served by effective/highly effective educators as those terms are defined in the Application. No time lines are described for meeting the criterion, and no interim targets are set. No parties are made responsible to increase the numbers of the defined educators. The current activities as described and the proposed activities to be funded under the grant do not relate directly to meet the goals specified under the 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:

This is a high range response.

(a) The Applicant is operating from a HQP for its central office (Concept) to provide support and services to the 19 schools in its LEA. The plan described by Applicant includes pertinent goals and functions for all parties concerned with support and services at Concept, responsible parties are identified for each of the primary functions, the pertinent roles and responsibilities for each are described, and what each party is to provide ("deliverables") is stated. Time lines are implied from the nature of the deliverable. The level of detail in this response and that provided under (C) (1) and (2) make the plan credible.

(b) The participating schools do not have school leadership teams as defined in the Scoring Tool. Site-based personnel have input and/or share responsibility with "higher" levels within the LEA regarding the items listed under (b), and the Applicant will give teachers and principals the flexibility to group students and teachers in the Lab Days and Algebra Project initiatives.

(c) AP students can earn college credit by passing an AP exam whether or not they take an "AP course." The Applicant does not say whether or not there is a time requirement to earn credit under the dual credit and other college credit courses its students now take. The same is true regarding the certificate programs in its Career Academies. It is not clear whether moving to the next grade during the Algebra Project and/or during Math Lab Days is the same as earning credit or is an approach to enriching a student's day-to-day instructional experience without having an impact on the credit toward graduation he/she earns. These uncertainties weaken this response.

(d) The Applicant provides its member schools a variety of assessments both formative and summative. Under (A), the Applicant asserted that its teachers have great flexibility in meeting objectives in its curricula. In the response to (d) under this criterion, the Applicant gives examples of its teachers adapting resources and instruction to Special Education (SPED) and English as a Second Language (ELL) students. All of this supports an inference that students can demonstrate mastery of standards in multiple ways at multiple times.

(e) The Applicant cites a number of credible examples of how site based educators adapt resources and instruction to make them accessible to all students. Adaptations to the needs of SPED and ELL students are emphasized in this response. This response is sufficient to meet the requirements under (e).

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

This is a mid range response.

(a) As the Applicant asserts and these Comments particularly under (C) (1) and (C) (2) indicate, the Applicant has proposed a HQP to provide students with enhanced opportunities to access necessary, even crucial, content, tools, and other learning resources *via* the Lab Days and the Algebra Project. The professional development for educators associated with these initiatives will enhance their access to the same content and to the skills enabling them to more effectively teach it. The Career Academies promise to create an environment in which participating students will be more likely to engage with critical content, and these students learning resources will be enhanced by their receipt of tablet computers. The alumni network initiative will provide students and parents with additional resources likely to increase the chances that students will enroll and succeed in college. They are likely to be able to access these in and outside the school building.

The data dashboard initiative will expand the access in and out of school to students, parents, and teachers to measures of student achievement and growth. Parents will gain additional opportunities to learn to help their students to succeed in school and college. The scholarship program will increase the chances students can matriculate and remain in college.

(b) The Applicant's previous responses combined with this response to constitute a HQP to increase the technical support students, families, and educators will receive. In this response, the Applicant supplements what has been previously described in this regard with additional, credible detail specifying the pertinent deliverables and timelines, i.e. what each of these groups will receive when in order to enhance their skills in using technology.

(c) The Applicant's response is equivocal. It does not directly state that the information will be in "open data format" as the term is defined and as is required under this criterion. Instead the Applicant uses terms such as "accessible," "robust," and "downloadable" at parent conferences all of which signal less accessibility than is required by the Scoring Tool.

(d) The Applicant indicates that it currently uses interoperable data systems with one exception, the performance data pertaining to its educators. The exception weakens this response some what.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This is a mid range response.

The Applicant has provided a list of approximately 32 activities which if implemented could create a communication network among its employees enabling them to meet the goals of regular feedback on project goals and creating opportunities for corrections and improvements to be made. All of the activities described appear to be reasonably related to one or both of the two goals, and none are clearly irrelevant. The Applicant has differentiated among the activities and identified them to the pertinent "level" of the LEA which makes it clear to both implementors and those who must monitor the plan in what division of the LEA they are to take place. With few exceptions, the Applicant has identified the parties responsible for the activities, and in the few instances where this is not specified, the parties are either named elsewhere in the Application (Summer Institutes) or who is responsible can be reasonably inferred. In a substantial number of instances, the time line for occurrences of the activities are stated within the context of the activity description (e.g. "monthly," "weekly," "for Wednesday afternoon PD sessions," "continuously").

Some of the activity descriptions suffer from being vague, overly general, and/or aspirational--e.g. "needs to be clear lines of communication," "must respond," "encourage," "should," "aired out"). Although it might be that Applicant could assert that these activities are already occurring, it does not say so. If they are not already in place, the response is weakened by Applicant's not stating time lines or deadlines for their implementation.

The Applicant does not address who, how, or when it will measure the quality of its investments in professional development, technology, and staff in response to this criterion. The "Return on Investment" measure described in Applicant's response to (E) (4) is not focused on the investments specified here under (E) (1). The Applicant does not state who, when, and how its assessments of progress will be made public in this response.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This is a mid range response. As noted, the Applicant describes a sound plan for continuous improvement based on its approach to internal communications. As noted, in most instances, the Applicant describes each of the required elements: responsible parties, activities calculated to further internal communications, applicable time line, and deliverables/outcomes. The Applicant's plans for external communications outlined in the third and fourth bullet of this response do not constitute HQP's. The plan for students and parents is vague regarding responsible parties, activities, time lines, and deliverables. The plan for universities, community organizations, and the business community contains fewer specifics than the plan for the students and parents.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This is a low range response. The strengths are that the Applicant identifies and documents the characteristics of its participating students as required. The Applicant provides some baseline data for each assessment except as noted below. The weaknesses are:

- (a) The Applicant does not directly state the rationale for the measures chosen. The rationales are left to be inferred
- (b) The Applicant does not state how the assessments will provide formative information accomplishing the purposes outlined in the Scoring Tool under this sub-criterion.
- (c) The Applicant does not state how it will review and improve any of the measures it has chosen. The Scoring Tool requires such a statement for every assessment.
- In the cases of nine of the 14 assessments chosen, the Applicant does not supply any data for the sub-groups as required by the Scoring Tool. The exceptions are: Concept Schools Practice Tests, Concept Schools End of Course Practice Assessment, Ohio Achievement Assessment, Ohio Graduation Test, Advanced Placement tests—five of 14 assessments.
- The Applicant does not provide annual targets for any of the assessments.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant does not describe how it will focus the "Return on Investment" (ROI) measure it proposes on the grant funded activities described in the Scoring Tool under either (E) (1) or (E) (4) as required. It does not explain how ROI could be used to evaluate any of the primary grant-funded initiatives which are not technology driven—Lab Days, the Algebra Project, Career Academies, and Alumni Network. In short the Applicant has not made clear how using the ROI lends itself to the kinds of evaluations required by the Scoring Tool. Applicant's choice of it as the sole evaluation tool in response to (E) (4) makes this response very weak.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This is a high range response.

(a) The Applicant identifies all funds that will support its proposal and their sources—\$20 million from this grant and \$756,000 from its per pupil allocation from the State of Ohio. The Applicant specifies what the Ohio funds will support—the Summer Institutes and two activities which are part of its plan for strengthening its alumni network.

(b) Over half of the proposed grant is for new, "critical personnel." The proposed salaries are set at reasonable levels. This makes the proposed allocation for them sufficient. The proposed stipends for the lead teachers (\$10,000 per teacher per year) are also reasonable and common amounts to pay for what is typically compensated as a demanding extra duty. The number of lead teachers is consistent with Applicant's objectives and goals. These facts make the request sufficient.

The estimated cost to acquire hardware to initiate the reforms is reasonable and based on what appear to be standard prices. The amount of equipment proposed is consistent with Applicant's description of the initiatives the equipment will support. The total request, therefore, is sufficient. The Applicant appears to assume that there will be no maintenance or replacement costs during the life of the grant or that the Applicant is going to assume them. Its proposal is weakened somewhat because these issues are not discussed.

(c) (i) (ii) As noted the Applicant has identified all sources of funds and the total amount to be obtained from the two

sources. The Applicant has identified its one-time expenditures. The Applicant asserts that it will have the financial strength to absorb all of the on-going expenses required to continue all the reforms in its proposal after the grant expires without resorting to outside sources.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>This is a low, mid range response.</p> <p>The Applicant does not present a HQP as defined for sustainability, and it does not present a three-year post-grant budget as required in the Scoring Tool. The Applicant anticipates that the enrollment in all of its current schools will be stable or grow and that it will be able to add one or two new schools per year for the foreseeable future. The Applicant asserts that this revenue will enable it to absorb the approximately \$17 million in on-going expenditures after the grant expires. Its reference to a success in obtaining a \$50,000 grant and its intent to continue to apply for grants is insufficient to constitute a plan as defined. Beyond this mention of grant-writing, the Applicant does not discuss pursuing outside funding in the post-grant years. The Applicant does not discuss how it will evaluate the effectiveness of its reforms or how it will use such data to inform future investments. The Applicant does not discuss how potential improvements in productivity or outcomes would inform its post grant budgets. Although Applicant's assumptions might prove accurate regarding its ability to self fund, this response does not meet most of the requirements under this criterion.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This is a mid range response for the reasons stated below.

(1) The Applicant provides a list of five kinds of out of school, work related experiences it would like its Career Academy students to have. It lists 18 entities which might provide one or more of them. The Applicant does not indicate how many of its students would participate in any of the experiences or when in their careers. The Applicant does not indicate which of the entities it hopes or anticipates would provide which experiences. It does not state that any of the desired partnerships now exist and does not suggest who, when, or how any of these partnerships will be formed. Given this, the response does not represent a description of a coherent and sustainable partnership as required.

(2)

(a) The Applicant's list of "personalized education goals" are aspirational in form. As a comparison with the examples in the Scoring Tool show, they are not the kinds of "population-level," "educational results" required.

(b) The Applicant's list does not meet the definition of "family and community supports" in the Scoring Tool.

(3)

(a) The Applicant describes 11 non-cognitive indicators which could measure student performance in one or more of the work-related experiences it desires for its students. It does not provide who, how, or when the relevant data would be collected or on what basis students would be judged. More important, these indicators do not relate directly to or constitute the kinds of "results" or "family and community supports" required by the Scoring Tool.

(b) Applicant's response is more relevant to (3) (d). The Applicant does not address any of the challenges identified in the Scoring Tool under (3) (b).

(c) Strength: To scale up, the Applicant suggests that AP students could be included in the out of school experiences which would otherwise be available only to the non-AP students. There are no unique challenges to such an expansion; so this is a credible way to scale up.

Weaknesses: Including students from other schools presents multiple challenges none of which are discussed. Having members of the entities which are sponsoring the work-related experiences help recruit 9th graders might increase the numbers of participating students but would not lead to additional scaling up as that term is understood in the Scoring Tool.

(d) The Applicant repeats its generalized explanation of its continuous improvement process offered previously under (E). Its inclusion here is marginally relevant. Because the Applicant did not meet the requirements for a competent response under (a), the balance of Applicant's discussion is not relevant.

(4) The out of work experiences desired by Applicant for its students are likely to provide personal attention and mentoring for participating students. They will expose participating students to out of school, work-focused cultures. They are, however, not designed or typically expected to integrate out of school services and education services at the institutional level as contemplated by the Scoring Tool. Therefore, the meetings described by the Applicant are not responsive.

(5)

(a) The kinds of individual student conferences as described by the Applicant could result in helping students successfully

complete their work-related experience and thereby contribute to their success in completing their education and graduating. They are not, however, designed or expected to create the kind of system focused data contemplated by the Scoring Tool for reforming or improving education at the school level and/or improving family and community supports as defined in the Scoring Tool.

(b) The Applicant's response is narrowly focused on a student who is not meeting his/her obligations. As such it is non-responsive to the Scoring Tool requirement for a description of how a partner and the LEA will inventory needs and assets of the school and community as institutions and use the inventory to improve education and family and community supports.

(c) As in the response to (5) (b), the Applicant narrowly focuses on students not meeting their obligations. This is a non-responsive approach for the reasons stated above. In addition, the Applicant is directed to create a decision-making process. Here the Applicant lists a series of questions and decisions to be made in the context of its focus on students and their obligations. Identifying such contextual issues is not the same as creating a process for decision making as required.

(d) Here, the Applicant is asked to describe how parents will improve the results of the processes inquired after under the previous sub-criteria under (5). By narrowly focusing on students and their individual experiences, the Applicant's discussion is out of context and non-responsive.

(e) The Applicant sketches a data collection process which is relevant to the affective indicators described under (5) (a). In and of itself, this sketch is credible. The discussion is not sufficient, however, because these indicators will not provide information relevant to the "results" required under the kinds of data contemplated under (2) (a) and (b).

(6) The Applicant describes its goals in aspirational terms rather than as the kind of results requested under (2). It does not provide baseline data, and it does not state annual targets. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether its goals are achievable or ambitious.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant meets the priority. The Applicant already employs curricula meeting State of Ohio standards, and it is in the process of adapting them to the Common Core. These curricula are aligned with college and career ready standards. They will provide the curricular foundation for the Lab Days, Algebra Project, and Career Academies initiatives. The Applicant has high standards for behavior and supplies support to enable all its students including its high needs students to meet them. The curricula and the behavior standards coupled with support will create the kind of school climate and culture within which these initiatives can succeed.

The Lab Days initiative provides flexibility in scheduling and grouping of students according to their individual levels of learning and support needs. This flexibility will also enable students to be exposed to challenges at a pace consistent with their academic and emotional readiness. This flexibility also means that teachers can personalize instruction and assessment.

Algebra is commonly regarded as the gateway to college. Because all participating students are being prepared for college, all of them must master it. Many students who present the demographics of Applicant's participating students do not. Among the frequently identified factors are the failure to master precursor skills and content and/or too little instructional time. The Algebra Project initiative will address these by enabling all participating students to begin pre-Algebra instruction two years before beginning the subject itself and providing for pre-Algebra and Algebra instruction through 10th grade. As with Lab Days, teachers will have scheduling and grouping flexibility which will enable them to personalize instruction, assessment, and support. Students will be able to progress at their own pace including acceleration.

The Career Academy initiative will create small learning communities starting at grade 10. It will involve the non-AP or lesser skilled and, presumably, lesser motivated of the participating students. Each academy will be focused on a college/career theme. As with the Lab Days and Algebra Project initiatives, the Applicant can build the academic aspect of this program on its existing high quality curricula. It can build the culture and climate aspects on its approach to high expectations for behavior coupled with support.

The Career Academy/small learning community approach is designed to personalize, accelerate, and deepen student learning. It is expected, and there is some historical support for the idea, that students will find "school" more relevant, engage more and persist longer toward graduation and college enrollment in small environments where the curriculum is framed in terms of their interests.

The Applicant's proposal provides for professional development to build support and understanding across the staff for the initiatives. More focused professional development is planned for the teachers directly involved in the initiatives. Highly skilled teachers in the areas pertinent to the initiatives will be recruited, given additional training, and a significant stipend to be lead teachers in the Lab Days and Algebra Project initiatives. Teams of teachers will be recruited to lead and deliver

key courses in each of the Career Academies. All of these approaches are designed to increase the effectiveness of the teachers implementing the instructional initiatives.

The initiative to strengthen each high school's alumni network is designed to provide greater personalization and support for participating students as they pursue college admission. The increased support will be focused on Applicant's junior and seniors and will come from orchestrated contacts with both college-enrolled alumni from the participating students' high schools and trained and knowledgeable college counselor. The alumni will provide role models presenting the same demographics as the participating students as well as practical advice. Creating such an alumni network is challenging, but the Applicant has some promising, practical approaches to its development. These enhancements are highly likely to increase student motivation, provide more incentives, and ultimately increase the chances that participating students will graduate, enroll in college, and earn degrees.

The Applicant already has a data system which is accessible to students and parents. They can use it to monitor student progress. The Applicant already provides training in its use for students and parents. The system enables educators to provide some personalization of content and instruction. The data "dashboard" initiative will enhance the system in each of its functional areas. In addition data will be collected and arrayed for all stakeholders to use regarding students development of attitudes and characteristics consistent linked to college and career success.

The four year budget which the Applicant has proposed is complements its Vision and reform goals.

The weaknesses of Applicant's proposal as noted in the Comments above to not negate the conclusion that it has met Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	136
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0090OH-3 for Horizon Educational Services, Inc. (Horizon Science Academy Cleveland HS)

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has proposed an excellent reform vision that is comprehensive, ambitious, and yet actionable and likely to result in continued success.

The applicant shows a strong plan for assessing student growth through various types of assessments, including standardized tests, LEA-developed interim assessments to gauge progression towards state assessments, and e-portfolios, which allows students to show their progression through actual artifacts. In addition, the LEA proposes using social and emotional assessments for measuring critical non-cognitive skills that are necessary for student success in college, although the nature of these assessments is not detailed. Impressive is the LEA's focus on measuring post-secondary development of its students, including their attainment of college degrees. The LEA shows a strong commitment towards high quality assessment beyond multiple-choice exams, as evidenced not only by the e-portfolios, but also the in-house assessments that provide for open-answer responses and scoring by multiple teachers (e.g. the Concept Schools Interim Assessment).

The applicant proposes the use of effective data systems for collecting and displaying both cognitive, non-cognitive, and behavioral outcomes that can be accessed by students, parents, and teachers/leaders, with routine scheduled opportunities for all stakeholders to review this data in light of individual student learning plans. The proposal to review this data as teachers every six weeks for curriculum planning is appropriate, as is annual presentations on the data to parents, sponsors, and the Board of Directors.

The applicant does not directly discuss how to recruit effective teachers, but does discuss at great length the development

of effective teachers through tuition assistance for continuing higher education, and annual professional development. Impressively, the LEA has in-house Directors over the professional development of teachers in various areas (elementary, secondary education, arts, sciences, languages, etc.). The applicant also discusses rewarding and encouraging teachers through annual awards, recognition, and stipends for additional responsibilities as Lead Teachers in their personalized learning model. The applicant has adapted a state teacher and principal evaluation plan into a strong proposal for rigorous teacher and principal evaluation that is also locally appropriate to the LEA's goals.

The applicant has a strong record of success (Over 50% of schools achieving an A status) turning around students' outcomes in the most challenging circumstances (90% students with low SES and 100% minority schools where less than 50% of students are white). Consistently the LEA's schools outperform peers with similar demographics.

From this foundation, the applicant has articulated a clear and credible approach to accelerating student learning and achievement through personalized learning. In its proposal, the LEA describes a plan to regroup students several times a week into large, small-group, and individual learning scenarios based on ability, using technology and Lead Teachers (skilled teachers paid a stipend for this added responsibility) mediating and guiding the activities. The classroom experience is clear how students will proceed through this regrouping each week, and then progress in high school to learning academies based on disciplinary interests of the students.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan will be far-reaching both within the LEA and potentially outside of it. The applicant's plan will include all schools managed by the LEA, with different approaches for each grade level (i.e. Lab Day for elementary levels, Algebra Project for middle schools, and Career Academies for high schools). Impressively, the LEA has a plan as well for supporting its students in their post-secondary achievements through fundraising for tuitions and creating a strong alumni mentoring network to provide regular and consistent mentoring of students, based on data, who have gone on to college. The combination of these proposals allows for targeted reforms at each level that will work together for LEA-wide success. All of the schools managed by the LEA are high need schools, according to student poverty and racial demographics.

In addition to serving the LEA schools, the LEA has proposed sharing its methods, data management system, and other tools with neighboring schools in order to support reform beyond the LEA.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a high quality plan for reform throughout the LEA, as well as beyond the LEA into neighboring schools. The applicant has key goals that focus on college and career readiness, including the improvement of alumni receiving post-secondary degrees. The LEA's logic model includes a focus on career-centric academies where students will interact with community and industry stakeholders and engage in authentic practice related to a particular career within smaller student communities (150-200 students). This will create a strong pathway for students, based on their personal needs and choices, into specific careers and college tracks. These academies, labs, and personalized curriculums will be led by experienced teachers who will be compensated by a stipend for extra attention to this effort, and directors hired over specific activities, leaving no confusion over which parties are responsible for implementing activities, and the timeline for the activities to occur. Impressive are the efforts to create reform beyond the participating schools by sharing the data management tools development, the pedagogical models, and even by doing "train the trainer" programs to train other schools not associated with this LEA so that they can implement the reforms in their own schools.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's reform vision should result in increased learning and performance on student outcomes. The specific goals set by the LEA will meet state targets, as the LEA already outperforms, on average, comparable schools in the state. The reforms presented in the application focus energy particularly on the elementary and middle school grades where the LEA has not had as much success outperforming other schools in the state (this performance is not unexpected necessarily, as the LEA takes in students in the elementary levels from various low-performing schools and then works to close the gaps by high school, which the evidence suggests it is doing very well). The LEA's goals are ambitious, but perhaps not achievable, seeking 100% graduation from high school and near 100% on most summative assessments. However, the LEA has shown a good track record of closing gaps and improving student success on summative assessments, and the goals are appropriately aligned to helping the most needy children close gaps so that by graduation they are performing at the same level as their peers (a difference of less than 10%). In particular the LEA is focusing on reform in middle school

mathematics, where the gaps have been largest. Impressive is the LEA's focus on postsecondary attainment, and the goals of 95% college enrollment and 65% postsecondary attainment represent a significant focus on preparing students not only to graduate, but to be college and career ready.

In the narrative of the proposal, the LEA identifies some target goals for the end of the granting period, as I have discussed above. However, what is lacking are annual targets, as the tables in the appendix are blank, as well as the comprehensive list of all goals for all measures. This omission reflects in the score, because the applicant's overall goals, when described, and their measures are strong, but there is no discussion of all of the measures in order to give a full evaluation.

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	14

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a strong track record of successfully attaining student outcomes when compared against similar and comparable schools. For example

- 33% of Charter schools and 0% of Public Urban Schools received an A grade according to the state's assessment, but 53% of the LEA's schools achieved this mark.

- 35% of Charters and 76% of Urban public schools received a D or F grade, whereas only 12% of the LEA's schools did, and none of these were F grades.

- No Urban public schools received an A or B grade, but 65% of the LEA's schools did. These grades are averaged from grades assigned for a school's performance on each of 9 measures.

- The LEA received a B grade for its special education population growth, showing the LEA's ability to help even the most challenging students

- The only two schools in the LEA to receive D grades were elementary schools, showing the LEA's ability to improve student learning outcomes drastically by high school, where they consistently receive higher marks.

- The LEA has received numerous distinctions for closing gaps and for being high performing from state and national media and agencies (e.g. Ohio/Michigan/Indiana Department of Education, U.S. News and World Report)

- The LEA currently has a strong, for high-needs urban areas, graduation rate of 71% and college enrollment rate of 88%, which are above peer institutions.

The LEA has made student performance data available on its charter network's website, and in a database accessible to parents, educators, and students. They provide orientations and training to parents to be able to use this information. The LEA has also shown a commitment of using the data to inform services through dedicating a Director of Assessment to this task, and asking high school teams to meet every six weeks to review data. The LEA only has two schools that would be considered low performing at this time, even though these schools are still outperforming at least 2/3rds of peer public institutions, but these are also elementary schools where the LEA has not had as much time to provide interventions to turn around these students' learning performances. However, the LEA has shown that the longer the students are in their schools, the better they typically perform. Still, more work could be done to help these two lowest-performing schools.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
---	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA is compliant with state transparency regulations, but it does not appear that the LEA goes beyond these regulations to provide the level of transparency requested in this criteria. For example, the LEA makes salary data public from "various web-sites" but the application does not make it clear what websites these are. In addition, employment information is made available to the public by request, but does not appear to be already available. In particular, the applicant does not discuss actual personnel salaries and expenditures at the school level, and how these are made available in an easy way to the public.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not describe in great detail the official autonomy granted from the state, but alludes to it by describing what they have done and accomplished. It appears that the state of OH, which is the state for the LEA's home offices, is very supportive of charter schools, as evidenced by increased funding and a petition to the LEA to open up an additional school in 1999 when the LEA first began operating. In addition, the LEA mentions having extended school hours, sessions on Saturday, mandatory participation in after school clubs, etc., which indicate good autonomy in decision making. In addition, while discussion is made about the context in OH regarding common core, specifics are not given about the actual autonomy that the LEA will have in implementing its reforms. However, the support letters in the appendix show strong support from legislative and education leaders, and great appreciation for the work of the LEA.

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

15

15

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has done an excellent job of engaging, in meaningful ways and at different stages of the development of the proposal, the parents, teachers, school leaders, and communities of these schools. For example, the LEA:

- Met in teams in all 19 schools to brainstorm with educators, parents, and administrators the ideas for these reforms.
- Surveyed all stakeholders (n=240) about initial thoughts on how they could improve the teaching and learning experience in their schools
- After developing their reform plan from these initial ideas, the LEA sent out another survey to parents, educators, and students (n= over 300) for feedback to be incorporated into the revisions
- Received a strong showing a support from stakeholders, including 92% of parents and 91% of teachers supporting the reform plan.
- In addition, the LEA has received many letters of support from business and community persons.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In general, the applicant has a strong plan for improving and personalizing the learning and teaching within the LEA. The applicant explains well the activities to be done, and has done an impressive job of specifying who is in charge of different activities and setting aside current and future (i.e. grant monies) resources for specific people tasked with accomplishing parts of the vision. There are clear timelines in the application for implementing each major reform, and each reform has been designed based on the needs of the grade levels it will support.

(a)

-- The use of the Career Academies is a good activity for helping students see how their learning connects to their careers, and the academies create pathways into careers of interest for students. Impressive is the focus on hiring teachers with industry experience to partner with industry personnel to make the academy experiences authentic through real-life scenarios (working with dummies to practice medical issues in the Health Services academy) and the use of professional tools (such as professional finance software in the Finance Academy).

- These activities should provide deep learning experiences for students, which will be further developed through the use of the e-portfolio system to help students create products that show their learning in a particular discipline.

- The LEA mentions culture activities and language study, including immersion programs in Spanish and Turkish, but it does not mention how widespread these programs are throughout the LEA nor what the students do in these programs. It also does not discuss why Turkish was selected, and whether this had any particular significance to the local community.

(b) The application describes a strong vision for personalized education that would involve regrouping students once or twice a week into large groups, small groups, and individuals in a computer lab working according to their ability, with a reassigning of teacher responsibilities to help them. This is an interesting and should be successful approach, although a few minor details are not explained, such as what will happen in the small groups, and why one teacher is sufficient for the students assigned even though they are in small groups (4 groups of 5 students is still 20!). In addition, the application

mentions that the LEA will purchase adaptive software for the students working in the computer labs and on the tablets, but it does not describe this software. Finally, the LEA mentions hiring Math Coaches, which might provide more guidance in the small group sessions, but it is not explained who these coaches are or what they will do.

These regroupings will allow for a good variety of instructional environments for students. In addition, the LEA supports an AP track for highest performing students and dual enrollment so students can earn college credit. Wisely, a chromebook (an affordable choice) will be provided to all high schoolers because of the expectation that they will be engaging in online courses, many of which will count towards their college degree.

The LEA also has a very strong plan for using data daily (within grades), weekly (within schools) and several times a year (within regions) to understand student growth and to adapt curriculum and pedagogies. This data is also available immediately and continually to students and teachers and parents for individualized learning.

(c) The LEA has a strong emphasis on training for teachers and students to ensure they understand how to use these tools. The application explains that twice a year, teams of two from the schools will visit the homes of every student to discuss the students' progress.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application describes a strong approach to supporting, and holding accountable, teaching and leading in the context of reform. This constitutes a high-quality plan in that most deliverables and activities are articulated, along with the parties responsible for carrying them out, for example, having lead teachers responsible for leading regrouping, an in-house professional development center in charge of training and supporting teachers, and directors over various components of the plan. Timelines are also provided for accomplishing tasks. Following is information related to each sub-criteria.

(a)

The LEA will begin the grant period by having a professional development conference for all educators to explain the vision and the strategies of the reforms. Then the LEA will hold professional development conferences for each grade band as they begin their individual new reforms. The timeline and expectations for these professional development sessions is laid out in the application. What is still not clear is how the professional development will be sustained throughout the year after the conferences. However, the LEA has a good track record of in-house professional development, having dedicated past resources to hiring a Director of Professional Development. With grant monies, the LEA will expand this to hire Directors over each academy, as well as the other reform initiatives (Math for middle school, and Lab Days for elementary school), along with coaches and Lead Teachers who will direct these efforts and assumedly handle just-in-time professional development, although this is not as clear as it could be.

The LEA has a good proposal, and strong previous history, in training and supporting teachers in using data to accelerate student progress. The teachers meet daily within their grade bands to discuss data and its application to their teaching, which is remarkable. They also meet weekly within their schools, and several times a year within their regions to develop collective wisdom and alignment in curriculum. With the adoption of Common Core standards, these professional development activities have focused on aligning efforts to support the new student standards.

A strong component of the LEA is the focus on using teacher and leader evaluations for formative as well as summative evaluation and improvement. Before each observation, the teacher being observed discusses with the observer the class context and situation, objectives, and goals. Then again after the observation they meet to reflect on what was observed. The focus of these discussions will help provide feedback and recommendations to the teachers (for example, asking the teachers ahead of time, "What would you like me to focus on in my observation today?" shows a strong consideration of the needs of the teacher in learning from the evaluation experience).

(b)

The applicant has already integrated strong use of tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress, including:

- Set aside time to review school-aggregated data for improving pedagogy, with a plan in this proposal to extend this effort to regularly analyzing student-level data for improving student-level teaching.
- Teachers communicate often with parents about student progress
- Response to Intervention is used as a framework for employing data-based interventions for students
- The LEA had developed interim and in-house assessments that assist in providing quicker feedback in between the

state assessments

- The LEA proposes developing social and emotional assessments to provide additional data
- A data dashboard is used to manage the data and make it easier for teachers and parents to utilize.
- Professional development regarding the use of the student data is regularly conducted.

(c)

The applicant has a strong record of teacher and leader evaluation that includes formal and informal observations and value-added assessments of student test scores. The observations are rigorous and supported by rubrics and questions that articulate exactly what desired behaviors should be seen in effective teaching and leading. The observations, as discussed above, are structured to be useful to the teacher in supporting her continual development. Still, while there is much discussion in the application about using student data to improve teaching, it is not clear how the teacher and leader data is fed back into the continual improvement process.

(d)

The regrouping strategy, managed by a Lead Teacher who has experience and strong ability in the content area, should help in increasing students' interactions with highly effective teachers. In addition, the application discusses goals for increasing the number of students being taught by a highly effective teacher, including recruiting from abroad for important STEM teaching positions, providing tuition assistants for teachers to earn master's degrees, and hiring math coaches and career academy teachers that can mentor other teachers in math and industry-related teaching.

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:

The LEA is a consortium of 19 schools managed by one Charter organization. These 19 schools are then organized into 4 regions that each have a superintendent. The lead school, Horizon Science Academy Cleveland High School, is one of the two oldest schools in the network and will serve as the lead LEA member managing the grant funds and activities, reporting to the Horizon School Board, which represents the 19 schools. Regional superintendents will assist in oversight and decision making as members of the Horizon School Board, and principals for each school will be responsible for expenditures, which will allow the school leadership teams to have sufficient flexibility and autonomy. Throughout the Charter home office, in Chicago, will provide support. However, it is still a little unclear how the superintendent of the lead LEA member, along with the Board, will be supported by the central office in these duties of managing the grant.

School teams will have the autonomy to set schedules for lab days and math lab days, and to adapt the plan to their local needs, although under what situations and circumstances this will be possible is not clear. Budgeting and hiring decisions will be made at the local level and then approved by the central office and school board. The schools will have some autonomy to adjust some aspects of the LEA's overall plan, but what adjustments and under what conditions is not articulated.

The LEA already has in place a strong system for giving students the opportunity to progress in multiple ways through dual enrollment with colleges and universities, and AP credit. Students in the Algebra Project to be able to progress to higher grade levels during math lab days. In addition, with the creation of the Career Academies, students will be able to earn industry-based certificates.

The LEA currently implements daily, weekly, quarterly, and annual assessments of student performance, and proposes integrating e-portfolio assessments as part of this grant to give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery in product-based ways.

To support students with special needs, the LEA has implemented RTI strategies to good effect, as the special needs teaching has been graded a B by the state of Ohio.

Overall, the applicant has a high quality plan with specific goals based on summative assessments, as well as a strong logic model with activities to be undertaken and a carefully organized LEA structure to provide accountability for who is responsible for which aspects of the plan.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The LEA does a good job of outlining a high quality plan to ensure project implementation with every student, educator, and parent by articulating specific activities and responsible parties for supporting project implementation. Following are some aspects of this plan:</p> <p>(a) In order to ensure that all participating students and parents have access to the elements of the plan, the LEA will organize Lab Days and Math Lab Days so that students can have one-on-one attention from a content teacher. In addition, the high school students will get one-on-one use of technology. Wisely, the LEA has chosen to issue Chromebooks to every high schooler so they can participate in online curriculum. In addition, the LEA currently conducts home visits twice a year to teach parents how to assist their students. They also provide Parent University classes to teach parents how to support their students in applying for, attending, and paying for post-secondary education.</p> <p>(a(b) The LEA will hire a Software Engineer to oversee development of the data dashboard, and to create online tutorials for its use. All elementary students will receive training on the iPad apps and the adaptive software that will be used, while Career Academy students will be trained on the use of the Chromebooks and lab materials. Students in grades 3-12 will be trained in how to add artifacts to their e-portfolios and how to access data from the dashboard. Educators will be trained during the summer institute and regular professional development days, and will receive ongoing support from the IT Teacher, the Director of Curriculum and Assessment, and industry persons (in relation to using the industry-specific tools in the Career Academies).</p> <p>(c & d) The proposed data dashboard will be accessible to all important stakeholders, and the data will be able to be exported and downloaded, and the LEA claims their system is interoperable across their own systems, but it is not clear in the application whether the data will be truly interoperable with other systems that the parents may want to use.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has a high quality plan for continuously improving and revising their plan in implementation that begins with well laid-out timelines and activities for rolling out the reforms through different summer professional development institutes. These are tentatively planned for the next four years of the grant. Throughout the proposal, the personnel responsible for overseeing portions of the grant are identified, for example the Directors of each academy over academy-specific training, the Software Engineer newly hired to oversee the data dashboard and online tutorial development, etc. The application identifies the communication channels that need to be open, and regular times when communication and feedback will occur (e.g. monthly meeting between Grant Project Director, Academic Office, Alumni Director, and Career Academy Director; regional superintendents meeting monthly with the Lead Superintendent; weekly Wednesday afternoon professional development sessions in the schools, and weekly grade-level planning meetings).</p> <p>The plan mentions sharing information with outside stakeholders, but it does not discuss the details of when and how this will be done and whether this information will be made public.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)		
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has a strong plan for regular communication with internal stakeholders, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Annual Summer Institutes -- Monthly meetings with regional superintendents and school leaders -- Monthly meetings with project staff and directors at the Horizon (central office) level -- Weekly meetings at the school level that will occasionally involve parents and students <p>Mention is made of communicating with external stakeholders, but details are not given about how often, for what</p>		

purposes, and with whom, thus this plan is a good one, but missing some key elements of a high quality plan.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant has identified a good mix of state and in-house assessments that represent a good variety of measures for evaluating performance growth. However, it appears they forgot to fill out the tables, as there are no goals or targets identified for any of these measures except graduation rates, where their target is 100%, which is ambitious, but may not be achievable.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)		
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant's plan for evaluation is for the central office to use "data analytics," but the proposal does not discuss what this means. No mention is made of an external evaluator or an overall evaluation plan to report on the quality of the professional development activities, the implementation of pedagogies and technologies, etc. The only plan proposed by the applicant is Return on Investment, which uses a dubious estimation of the economic gain from producing more successful graduates.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
(a) The applicant has clearly identified all funds for the project.		
(b) The budget seems reasonable, given the applicant's plan. For example, the majority of monies are to support hiring of critical staff such as math coaches, Lead Teachers, and Directors, all of whom will be having direct impact on the learning of students. In addition the LEA has been thoughtful in its technology purchases by choosing to purchase Chromebooks, which are cheaper, and investing in increased bandwidth at the schools so that the chromebooks can be effective.		
(c) The LEA provides a rationale for all investments, and clearly explains how nearly \$3 million will be one-time investments, and how they will absorb the remaining personnel costs so that they can continue the reforms after the grant ends.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant's vision for sustaining project goals is to purchase extended warranties for the technologies, which is likely important in a school setting, continue expanding at the rate of 1-2 new charter schools each year, which will bring in additional money, and to continue fundraising. Future expansion is likely given past history with this LEA, although that will also incur new costs, and future fundraising potential is always unknown, making this future planning for sustainability not very strong.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant describes their competitive preference plan in relation to the Career Academies for high school students that will be focused on various career opportunities and learning for students with support and collaboration from industry partners.		

- (1) The applicant identifies 18 community partners for four Career Academies. These partners would provide opportunities for shadowing, mentoring, internships, apprenticeships, and work study programs.
- (2) The applicant has identified 15 goals, although these goals are not all equally measureable. For example, providing community service opportunities, helping students make academic connections, and building teamwork skills.
- (3) The LEA mentions adding 11 indicators related to these goals into the data dashboard system being developed, but does not discuss how those indicators would be assessed and by whom and how often.
- (4) The LEA mentions meeting daily and weekly to discuss this integration of education into the partnership, but it is not clear what exactly will happen at these meetings
- (5) The LEA has a plan for building capacity in its staff through Summer Institute professional development, planning meetings between teachers and industry partners, and consistent support from the LEA leadership. Annual reports on the data collected will be published and available to students. Key moments in the students experience in the Academies are noted as opportunities for parental involvement, mostly to help with poor behavior if it arises. The decision-making process and needs inventorying is not as well discussed in this section or clear how it will be enacted.
- (6) Performance measures are listed broadly ("increase career-building knowledge"), but without specific goals.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
<p>This proposal meets absolute priority 1 with a strong proposal that will promote effective personalized learning through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --- a strong connection to career and college goals through Career Academies, the Algebra Project, and alumni mentoring, designed to help alumni succeed in postsecondary education; --- building a data system with cognitive, behavioral, and non-cognitive indicators of student progression, along with training for teachers, students, and educators on how to use this data for improvement; --- an emphasis on recruiting STEM-focused teachers with industry experience --- a focus on serving needy students in high-poverty, urban areas, and in particular serving the most needy students in the LEA according to performance data, which is the elementary level students. <p>The proposal articulates a vision for personalizing education through regrouping, technology and small-group learning, and Career Academies chosen by the student participants. The proposal also discusses developing effective teachers through professional development, and increasing the rates of graduation from high school and college.</p>		

Total	210	159
-------	-----	-----