



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0156TX-1 for Uplift Education - Peak Preparatory

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a comprehensive portrayal of its current realities and coherent reform vision that will build on its work in the four core education assurance areas. The applicant cites numerous examples of its track record of success. The applicant proposes to enhance its current International Baccalaureate model by creating more student-directed, personalized learning environments. Class time will involve structured individual and group projects that will allow teachers more time to facilitate small group instruction to accelerate student achievement.</p> <p>The applicant appropriately documents the strategies used to develop a plan of action to integrate personalized learning for every student within the network of schools and details the four step plan to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through personalized support. The four part plan includes: 1) a Learning Management System (LMS) for teachers, students, and parents, 2) K-5 blended learning strategy to drive small group instruction, 3) Redesign of the 6-12 program, putting students in the driver's seat, and 4) build a case manager model for student's social and emotional success.</p> <p>The applicant provides a complete list of strategies it will implement to personalize the learning environment as well as describes the classroom environment. One example cited for students was to group them into three small groups every 30 minutes through personalized stations for core content. This strategy affords students time to work on independent and group projects to apply learning. At the secondary level, for students in grades 9-12th the day/week will be reformatted to directed content learning through the Learning Management System and independent practice and small group work aligned to the student's personal interest. Teachers will also serve as facilitators instead of strictly delivering content instruction. They will shift their focus to target small group instruction based on data to provide mini lessons to help struggling students or accelerate students who are above mastery.</p> <p>Teachers will use data from the Learning Management System in weekly teacher planning meetings to inform small group instruction, student intervention, and enrichment.</p> <p>The applicant documents the students' and teachers' daily and weekly schedule as well as provides a sample yearly calendar for both teachers and students.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Uplift application is for a consortium of all five of the applicant's districts (each district is an LEA according to Texas statute). All schools, all grades, and all subjects are included.</p> <p>The applicant will select schools to participate in Phase One by having them submit an internal proposal describing how they would implement the new model and become a model site for other principals and teachers to observe their process. An assessment will be made on each school team in terms of interest in the new model and openness to try something new as well as the ability to support teachers as they learn the new model. Other determining factors in selecting participating schools will include assessing technology infrastructure on each campus, the number of new teachers, and if the school has other major initiatives in progress.</p> <p>The applicant provides a list of the schools participating in the grant.</p> <p>For each participating school, all required information is included, the total number of participating students, of participating students from low-income families, of participating students who are high-need, and of participating educators.</p>		

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant will include all further student enrollee after this year as part of their plan to scale public charter schools, Current discussions are underway with a local public school district to open an Uplift school of choice within a traditional Intermediate School district (SD) for school year 2015-16. The applicant plans to scale these reforms at this school as well which will serve not only Uplift students, but also that of ISD's students.</p> <p>The applicant will also partner with a regional education nonprofit agency that disseminates best practices to host tours at its pilot schools and create a best practices report sharing its model and data for other schools in the region to access.</p> <p>Other educational entities will have access to professional development videos and play lists housed on the applicant's LMS to share with teachers.</p> <p>The applicant clearly articulates its theory of action which is to address college readiness, persistence and graduation gaps by using personalized learning and sets forth three core tenets of its model which are 1) academic rigor set at the standard of International Baccalaureate, 2) school cultures that emphasize strong positive relationships, and 3) facilitated and informal collaboration among adults to support their professional growth.</p> <p>The applicant describes the intended impact is to improve college readiness of all students across all 3 school levels over the grant period and sets measurable goals to achieve this target by 2017. The applicant also sets goals to improve teacher retention, satisfaction, and professional growth.</p> <p>The applicant makes reference to Appendix G-1 for additional information regarding the scaling plans and current wait list, however, a review of the soft and electronic copies of the application indicate this appendix is not attached,</p> <p>While the applicant does describe the goals to achieve college readiness by 2017, the plan does not meet the definition of high quality in that it does not include activities, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing activities.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides all required baseline data and targets for student performance by grade level, content area, subgroups, and college enrollment. The applicant has included a rationale for performance on assessments and has set ambitious and achievable targets. The methodology for determining the status is provided. The applicant presents a specific methodology for determining the decrease in achievement gaps. The high school graduation is 100% and the goal is to continue to have it at 100%.</p> <p>Seventy percent of applicant's students graduate from college within six years.</p> <p>The applicant makes reference to Appendix G-2, however, a review of the soft and electronic copy of the application revealed this appendix is not attached.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	7
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a copy of four year longitudinal data charts that shows improved student outcomes in reading and math state assessments for five of the participating schools, however, no data was provided on the other participating schools.</p> <p>The applicant also provides charts, graphs and raw student data indicating improved student learning and achievement for 2012-2013. For example, the applicant presents state assessment data as compared to the state, the local school district, other high performing schools and itself. An analysis of the data revealed that while the applicant did perform higher than the state on the mathematics and geometry assessments, three other schools in the district consistently out performed the applicant on the geometry state assessments and one school out performed the applicant on the mathematics grade 4 assessment. Additionally, students percentage scores at the distinguished level were higher in four schools on the mathematics and geometry assessments in when compared to the applicants distinguished percentage score.</p>		

The applicant states on average third grade students who have been enrolled with Uplift score 2.8 RIT points higher in math and 3.6RIT points higher in reading than students who have been with them for 1-2 years, but provide no charts or graphs to document this claim.

To better understand and meet the diverse needs of its student population, the applicant uses common formative assessment to direct instructional planning. The consistent use of assessments and analysis of data has assisted the district in better interventions to turn around its low performing schools. The applicant also has implemented an International Baccalaureate program that focuses on developing critical thinking skills needed for college and career readiness.

The applicant makes student performance data available through network-wide and campus-based dashboards. The Learning Management System provides real-time data, recommendations, and predictive analysis to teachers and instructional leaders. The teachers and principals will use the data to inform focused interventions at the individual student level.

Assessment data is shared with students, however, the applicant does not state describe the process for sharing this information and how the data is shared. Student performance data is shared with parents through regular meetings.

The applicant has consistently achieved 100% college acceptance rate of all graduates across the network.

While the applicant has demonstrated some level of success for the 2012-2013 school year , its track record of success in the past four years is not clearly establishing in advancing student learning and achievement. An analysis of the charts provided illustrate the gains are only for the 2011-2012 school year. The reviewer was not able to compare longitudinal data for the mathematics and geometry assessments for previous school years because this data was not provided.

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

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant documents in the narrative that it has a comprehensive communication program in place to ensure all staff members understand its commitment to achieving salary parity including specifics on merit-based and differentiated pay, development opportunities, and compensation. Financial information is shared in the annual report, made available in print, and is available on the district's website.

The transparency chart in Appendix B-2 illustrates evidence on information type, the information sharing mechanism, and audience. Specific information topics include, educator and staff salaries, total expenditures per school on all salaries, and non-personnel expenditures, overview of revenue expenditures, government filings, policies and processes, including for evaluation, compensation, promotion and dismissal. The chart, however, is unclear as to how expenditures are actually reported.

Information is shared at internal meetings, shared in and with peer organizations, in the annual report, on the Uplift external web site, in the e-newsletters, and in presentations.

The applicant reports the total expenditures per school on all salaries, educator salaries and non-personnel expenditures.

Personnel salaries for school-level instructional staff and teachers are provided in Appendix B2.

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

10

5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant assures it has the legal, statutory, and regulatory autonomy needed to implement the plan and lists three of its current reform partners to include Teach for America, Southern Methodist University, and Commit which is a public/private partnership for reform across the P-12 continuum in Dallas.

The applicant assures its meets the state requirements as needed for standards and assessments, accountability, financial reporting and meets the the needs of disabled students.

The narrative lacks specificity how these tools will assist teachers, teacher teams, and school leaders to continuously focus on improving individual student achievement and closing achievement gaps.

The applicant has had problems with funding of its charters schools in the past, and it is unclear if the applicant has the conditions to be fully successful.

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

15

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes in general terms its commitment to stakeholder involvement as evidenced by the dashboard goals which encompass each campus and the entire consortium measures for stakeholder satisfaction. Family members served on the RTTD steering committee to brainstorm, review, and provide feedback on the application.

All Uplift employees are at will employees and are not under contract. Faculty members completed a survey attesting to their support and the applicant provides a copy of the survey results in Appendix B-2. The survey only indicated the faculty that were in favor of the reform proposal or if they were not in favor of the proposal.

The narrative lacks specificity as to how teachers, parents, and other stakeholders were engaged in the development of the proposal.

The applicant provides letters of support from several stakeholders, however, there are no letters from institutions of higher education, parents, or Teach for America who is a current partner. The applicant provides letters of support from two mayors and a foundation. However, it was noted that the letter from the foundation lacks a signature.

.A total of 228 teachers out of the 876 participating teachers responded to the survey which represents approximately 26 percent of the teachers who are in favor of the project.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant outlines what the personal learning environment will look like and includes goals, rationale, activities, deliverables, and parties responsible. In collaboration with teachers, parents, and students an annual learning plan will be created for each student which will focus on college and career readiness. The student learning goals will be tracked in the new Learning Management System. The International Baccalaureate curriculum currently being used will expose, engage, and deepen students' learning across content areas to raise college-readiness as well as empower students to take responsibility for his or her own learning.</p> <p>Students will have access to digital resources such as e-books and videos to offer blended learning strategies and education programs will be made available through software and online sites to differentiate instruction based on students' interests, data, and learning styles.</p> <p>The Learning Management System will be utilized in grades 6-12 to make recommendations to guidance counselors regarding majors and fields of study based on student's individual results and interests. Individual student data will also be available through the Learning Management System to both the student and families. Data will also be shared by content standards and performance bands in the goal setting process.</p> <p>The applicant provides an overview of the IB curriculum which was found in the Appendix. The application could have been strengthened by providing a one page sequence of the instructional content for the three IB levels to demonstrate the progression through the various grade levels to prepare students on time for college and careers.</p> <p>The applicant provides a chart detailing its instructional methods that will personalize the learning environment.</p> <p>The Learning Management System will be used to house electronic text, adaptive software applications, and track learning maps, and assessments as well as curriculum play lists and project based learning. The LMS will also be used to measure and ensure both student teacher impact with digital materials and online learning.</p> <p>The applicant presents detailed charts with an accompanying plan overview for grades K-5, 6-9 and 9-12, as well as a plan for the LMS. The plan includes the vision, strategies, goals and milestone and responsible parties. The K-5 plan does not identify training for students to ensure they understand how to use the new LMS system.</p> <p>The narrative does not provide information related to accommodations for high needs students to ensure they are on track toward meeting college and career standards.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant presents information related to its efforts to improve teaching and learning. A new classroom teacher leadership position has been created. The course leader serves as a consortium-wide chair of a subject area in a particular grade across the consortium. Course leaders are responsible for providing sample lessons and unit plans, and organizing grading days.

Curriculum Coordinators positions will be added to support new schools and teachers as well as rewrite the curriculum into IB inquiry-based learning. Coordinators will also provide support to teachers and deans in the creation, refinement, and support of the use of curriculum materials. Technology Specialists will also be hired to assist with integrating blending learning online learning in the classroom.

The applicant will provide training during the summer and throughout the school year with a specific focus on blended learning options. All current and new teachers as well as instructional support staff will receive on-going IB training. The applicant, however, does not address how it would modify the instruction.

All teachers are regularly observed by the school leadership and formative feedback is provided to support teachers' growth and development. New teachers and teachers needing additional support receive feedback and support from the Instructional Coaches.

While the applicant describes how it will work with students and parents to track annual goals, it provides limited information on how it measures students' progress using data. It is unclear how teachers use the data that they have access to.

The applicant does not address how high quality learning resources are aligned to college and career-ready standards.

The applicant does not provide a high quality plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

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:

The LEA is a 501c3 nonprofit organization with 28 schools under five charter schools district, organized into four regional districts. The Central Management Office executive team consists of the Acting Superintendent, Chief Academic Officer, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Development Officer, and Chief Operations Officer.

The CMO is responsible for the development of the strategy and sets growth goals, codifies and shares the consortium's model and supports clusters with training, recruitment, support, and fundraising. Managing directors provide day-to-day management of cluster of schools, support sharing of best practices, coordinate and execute professional development and develop leaders.

School leaders have the autonomy and flexibility to set school budgets, schedules, and calendars. The principals focus on instruction within their schools and across the organization, share best practices, and identify and support innovative instruction. School personnel decisions are made at the school level with principals having the autonomy to hire, retain, and terminate teachers and leaders. However, hiring decisions are forwarded to the CMO for final submission to ensure that proper policies have been followed.

To ensure all students are accepted to a four year college, the applicant currently utilizes grade level placement committees and online curricula to provide students the opportunity to progress based on demonstrated mastery. Uplift schools also partner with community colleges to offer dual credit courses as an additional way to ensure rigor and college readiness.

The applicant uses a variety of assessments to gauge student mastery of standards. Formal assessments are given weekly, quarterly, and annually. Informal assessments are administered daily and weekly in all curriculum areas.

Students in grades K-5 will be placed in small groups based on standards mastery and will continue to progress as they master content areas. In the 6-8 model students will control their own learning one day per week and one hour per day through learning play lists that show them standards not mastered for continued learning. Students in grades 9-12 model, are in the driver's seat of their learning, setting goals, planning their learning weeks and pulling playlists for standards they have not mastered.

The applicant presents information related to its legal commitment to students with disabilities and provides the appropriate assurances. Before and after school tutoring is also provided to LEP students to help them gain language skills.

The applicant does not, however, address other resources such as assistive technology to support students with disabilities..

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes how it will personalize student learning through the Learning Management System that will provide an interactive interface where students check for content mastery, then build their learning journey based on standards not mastered while engaging with teachers and peers through this online platform.

All 6—12 students will be given a device to access all learning tools; however, the applicant did not specifically identify the device.

All K-5 classrooms will be outfitted with 15 computers to support the blended rotation model. To ensure access to the online platform, the applicant has also scheduled computer lab hours after school and on Saturdays. It is unclear if transportation will be provided to students for Saturday school.

The applicant has given thoughtful consideration to not all students having internet access and will work with students to secure library cards for access to public computers and Internet. The applicant will design online tutorials that provide guidance on all new technology and will provide links from those sites to the tutorials. The applicant has worked out an agreement to allow students to have access to their teachers via cell phone until 10:00 p.m.

A new link will be added to the Learning Management System to enable teachers to post messages to parents and students. Training will also be provided to parents on the LMS and they will have access to the Internet through the schools or other nonprofit partnerships.

All teachers are supplied with a laptop computer which ensures they have anytime access to content, tools, professional development and learning resources.

The applicant assures that students and parents can export their data through the current Power School system which is in an open format. The new LMS will provide recommendations to teachers, thus saving some of the time devoted to analysis of data.

The applicant's current system is interoperable and data flows from one system to another. The iShines data warehouse interoperates with the HR systems, and the APTA financial systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant adequately describes its current continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback. The applicant uses balanced scorecards for each school with annual goals that are reported on during public meetings throughout the year. Each school campus also has its own strategic plan tied to delivery of those goals. The strategic plan includes key activities to focus on each month aligned to the stretch goals for the campus. Each month, school leaders review progress against their plan with the managing directors and once a quarter with the CEO and Chief Academic Officer. Data is used at these meetings to determine what is working well and what adjustments to the plan need to be made. Twice a year, at the network meetings the entire leadership team consisting of all deans, principals, and CMO leaders come together to develop organization-wide priorities and to discuss the progress and what needs to be refined. District performance is shared with all stakeholders to include, staff, parents, and students.

To measure performance against RTTD goals, the applicant proposes to create a RTT Steering Committee that will meet weekly to discuss progress towards goals, effectiveness of programs, agree on refinements to program, and make sure effective communication is taking place with stakeholders. The applicant will focus on four questions to improve results and understand impact. It seeks to determine if student achievement is improving, are students, teachers, and leaders getting what they need to successfully implement the plan, and are stakeholders informed and satisfied with the program,

the implementation, and the results, and are the investments in program resources producing good return in terms of the metrics.

The applicant will use internal interim assessments given each grading quarter to see trends and make adjustments accordingly. Through the use of assessment data, survey results, and other qualitative forms of feedback, the applicant will identify and address any gaps in the support mechanisms initially identified for the plan such as technology training, coaching, and professional development.

The applicant also provides an evaluation process that includes activities, timelines and facilitators.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant documents its effort to ensure ongoing communication and engagement. First, it will report on the program to internally engage stakeholders across the consortium and reinforce the program's core tenets. The applicant will also provide data to the U.S. Department of Education. To keep the community informed and engaged, the applicant will share successes and challenges with the broader education community by publishing a bi-annual newsletter and report aimed at educators and other stakeholders. The applicant will continue to participate in panel discussions around the community and write case studies and make them available on the district's website to reach a broader audience. Monthly community open houses will be held and open to anyone to visit the pilot schools and see first-hand the new academic model.

The applicant does not provide a high quality plan that includes activities, rationale, goals, deliverables, and the parties responsible for carrying out the activities.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has set twelve ambitious yet achievable performance measures with annual targets. The applicant provides charts for each performance measure with the rationale and targets for continuous improvements. For each performance measure, baseline data and annual targets for the grant period and beyond are provided for all students and for the district identified subgroups.

The applicant provides inadequate information related to how the measures will provide rigorous, timely information tailored to its proposed theory of action.

The applicant does not address how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

To evaluate the effectiveness of investments, the applicant states it will analyze student achievement results related to the RTT plan elements, assess teacher and leader effectiveness in terms of the level of RTT support elements, and analyze the extent of educator and student family use of the portal.

While the applicant refers the reviewer to the Selection Criteria E1, for documentation of the process for conducting the analysis, that plan lacks goals, activities, and rationale.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a comprehensive budget that includes line items and key strategies for success. Extensive charts are provided for each budget. The narrative includes funding from others sources and it appears reasonable and sufficient to support the goals of the project.

The applicant states it has already secured funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, however, it is unclear if

these funds will be used to ensure the long-term sustainability of the project as the funding amount was not given nor an explanation as to what the funds would be used for.

The applicant includes a line item for digital devices at a cost of \$300.00 each; however, it does not specifically state what the devices are. This was found to be consistent throughout the narrative as well.

The additional projects that are one-time investments are not clearly identified in the budget.

The applicant does not describe any federal funding sources in its narrative.

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

10

2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant assures that the core model is sustainable on public (state, local, federal) funding alone and that it relies upon philanthropy to seed new programs. However, no grant partners were clearly identified in the narrative for future funding.

The applicant also does not provide a high quality plan to include activities, rationale, goals, deliverables, timelines, and persons responsible.

The applicant does not provide details of how it will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use data to inform future investments.

The plan lacks a coherent rationale for each project. The applicant lacks a clear plan of action of how it will sustain itself beyond the grant period.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has identified three partners to support the social and emotional well-being of its students and details 12 desired results for students. The results include both educational and family outcomes.

The applicant will create custom dashboards through the Learning Management System to track key indicators for all students. It will also work with community partners to identify the best surveys to ensue measurement of program success. The applicant provides a tables depicting how it will track indicators and provides the methodology for tracking as well.

The Senior Director of Special Populations will ensure all schools are meeting the needs of every student.

The applicant provides limited information regarding its strategy to scale to other high-need students.

The applicant assures that school level leadership will work with community partnerships to integrate services into the schools; however the plan lacks specificity related to the protocols.

While the applicant states it will use the expertise of the teachers to support students, it does not address how it will build the capacity of staff by providing them with the tools and supports to assess the needs of students. It is unclear who would be responsible for conducting and analyzing the results of the needs assessment.

Teachers are trained in identifying and support high-risk student behavior. The Senior Director of Special Populations maintains, updates, and shares a list of community organizations that provide various support services to the school campuses.

The applicant will utilize the RAPID decision-making process. Parents are represented on local school boards, and participate in the individual meetings. Parents are also invited to participate in a CEO committee where major program plans are discussed.

The applicant will use quantitative and qualitative data to review progress on a quarterly basis and share with parents and the community members through electronic newsletter. The CEO will also host annual community forums.

The applicant provides a table with baseline data identifying its ambitious yet achievable performance measures.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant coherently and comprehensively addresses how it will build on the core educational assurances and has designed a plan to to improve individualized learning environment. The applicant clearly articulates the importance of using data systems to measure student growth and success, implementing the Common Core Framework to ensure students are college and career ready, recruiting, developing, and rewarding educators and staff through performance management, and turning around low performance schools by ensuring fidelity with its International Baccalaureate Model. The application is researched-based and advocates a whole-child approach and a balanced education system that would personalize teaching and learning. It moves teachers from the traditional role of the deliverer of information to one of facilitator of student learning.		
Total	210	138



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0156TX-2 for Uplift Education - Peak Preparatory

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 earned a score of 10 in this category. The applicant's program is built upon integrating standards connected to the International Baccalaureate standards, Texas Essential Knowledge and Common Core Standards, Texas College and Career Readiness standards, ACT/SAT standards, Advanced Placement standards, and English Language standards. The data system is presented as a comprehensive performance management system. The applicant collects data from a variety of resources and utilizes the <i>iShine</i> data warehouse system to track student performance. The applicant intends to utilize funding from the grant to expand upon this system to create a learning management system that will monitor student goals, align resources to customize student learning based upon student needs, measure student growth as it is aligned to standards, and identify student growth and need areas with the ultimate goal of increasing college and career readiness The applicant has developed a competency based model, <i>Shine Through Teaching Excellence</i> system. The system is designed to recruit, develop, reward, and retain teachers and principals. The applicant has implemented an academic model that incorporates teacher observation, coaching sessions, reviewing student data, differentiating instruction, and setting high standards for students and staff. As a result of implementing these strategies the applicant has demonstrated minimal types of success using this model in turning around one of its low achieving schools. The proposal demonstrates that there will be ongoing professional development dialogues focused on personalized learning		

and piloted blended models. Personalized Learning Teams from campuses and central management office will visit high performing schools. Internal websites will be dedicated to gathering feedback on how to personalize learning. The applicant uses all of the aforementioned activities to clearly articulate a plan designed to individualize and increase learning for students as well as providing personalized professional development for teachers. Each documented strategy is aligned with the ultimate goal for increasing student achievement.

There is a clear vision for using technology in conjunction with blended learning strategies to set and meet individualized student goals and level the learning field for all students.

The applicant outlines how personalized learning will be enhanced through the use of the IB framework and partnering with community organizations and interventions designed to increase teacher and principal performance.

The applicant provides detailed learning models, daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly schedules for elementary, middle, and high school learning environments. There are extensive descriptions of learning activities, successfully researched interventions, monitoring structures, and explanations for approaches to implementing, reflecting upon, and evaluating outlined learning experiences both inside and outside the classroom.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scored the maximum number of points (10) for this section.

The applicant provides a description of the process that was used to select schools to participate. The proposal outlines support for the applicant’s decision based upon data collected from schools being impacted by high needs students in need of personalized learning. In addition, rationales for the selection process are clearly stated. Goals have been set and aligned with activities and deliverables. Timelines and key decision makers for the selection process are referred to in the narratives.

A detailed chart lists all schools, educators, number of students, and data for low income students who will be participating in grant activities.

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

10

5

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a score of 5 for this section.

Key goals and rationales are provided as *Theories of Action* to address college readiness and graduation gaps using the IB standards to meet the college acceptance goal of 100%. The applicant will partner with a regional education non-profit group to tour pilot schools and design best practice reports in which a successful model will be shared for other schools in the region to access. The applicant proposes to administer teacher and student surveys to continually assess the impact of each proposed activity on teacher and student learning and attitude climates. The school has undertaken research activities with local colleges.

A Director of Personalized Learning will be hired to oversee K-5 blended learning, grades 6-12 personalized learning, and personalized teacher professional development. A pre-existing committee will solicit feedback from stakeholders. The documented activities are presented. Timelines are not provided as to when each of the proposed Theories of Action will occur. In addition, the plan does not account for who will be responsible for overseeing all the data collection, the implementation and execution of the technology systems, and the evaluation process for documenting and analyzing the data that will demonstrate actual student increases necessary to assure a successful reform plan.

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

10

6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a score of 6 in this area.

The applicant provides a detailed chart aligning summative assessments with value-added projected percentage rates for increasing student achievement and decreasing achievement gaps for all identified subgroups within the charter school. The benchmarks vary for each subgroup demonstrating a vision for personalizing student learning within subgroups. Final goal increases for the last year of the grant only have some subgroup levels for attainment of an 80% success rate. The goals for all groups are achievable, but only some of the goal increases and decreased achievement gap goals for some subgroups are ambitious. The documented percentages do not show equity for believing all students will succeed as is described in the narratives that identify aggressive learning strategies using technology. The narratives and goals present

a discrepancy among the personalized learning activities that will suggest mastery of standards for all students and the goal scores. Some subgroups are projected to achieve learning to levels with nearly 30 %goal gains and other subgroups are projected to achieve increased learning increment goals of only 20% over the lifetime of the grant.

Graduation rates and college enrollment goals are set to maintain at the 100% goal level for all students.

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
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a score of 4 for this section.</p> <p>The applicant shows increases in student learning for students in grades 3, 6 and 8 who have attended the school for a consecutive 3 years. There is no data to show sustained increases of success over the past four years for students at other grade levels. There is limited data to demonstrate a clear record of success for increases in student learning over the past four years.</p> <p>There is data demonstrating baseline graduation rates to be at 100% for the past year. There is no data to support documentation of high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates prior to the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p>The proposal explains that over the course of the last three years the applicant has implemented assessments designed to bring about a better understanding of student needs. There is no data to show that the reforms that have been implemented demonstrated ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools over the past four years.</p> <p>The applicant provides student performance data to students, educators, and parents through personalized teacher-student and teacher-parent conferences and through the use of data warehousing systems. The proposal provides information demonstrating that data is readily available to all instructional staff through their intranet and data warehouse systems. The school uses the <i>iShine</i> software program to make student performance data available to all staff, students, and parents. The proposal describes how through the use of current technological advances, performance data can be tracked by teachers so that teachers can better understand their students in order to improve student and teacher participation in meeting individualized student needs, which will ultimately lead to improved teacher and student participation and learning.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a low score of 1 for this section.</p> <p>The applicant provides a paragraph explaining that opportunities are sought for sharing information with the community related to processes, practices, and investments. The proposal contains a chart documenting salaries for all personnel. There is no explanation for how the personnel salary information is communicated to the public for transparency purposes. The proposal did not account for specific transparency activities relative to the availability of actual non-personnel expenditures.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	4
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a score of 4 in this section.</p> <p>The proposal provides a narrative expressing the applicant's belief that there are successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. The applicant provides the required letters of support for organizations committed to public/private reform at the state level.</p> <p>The applicant describes some of the successful elements of reform that have been put into place as examples of its autonomy to begin to implement personalized learning environments in the form of Common Formative Assessments, a human capital management system for teachers, principals, and non-instructional staff, data-driven accountability systems,</p>		

and implementation of a curriculum.

The proposal provides information that State funding for charter schools is rated at the bottom when compared to other states and that recent state legislation has brought about increases for caps on charter school funding. There are unsigned letters from the mayor. There is a letter from the State Education Association stating "declined to comment" on the applicant's Race to the Top proposal. There is no clear data to substantiate that the state will increase and/or support future charter school initiatives. There is no documentation to support a correlation between state funding and legal or state autonomy for implementing educational reforms in the charter school environment.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	2
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a 2 for this portion of the proposal.

There are letters of support for the Race to the Top proposal from various community representatives, such as: 2 mayors, a program officer from the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation, Communities Foundation of Texas, Charter School Growth Fund, Parent Liaison/Communication Specialist, Readers to Leaders Program Community Liaison Specialist, Perot Museum of Nature and Science, Uplift Williams Preparatory.

The proposal contains information that family members supported and participated on Race to the Top steering committees. There was no data provided such as: parent meeting agendas, documented minutes from meetings, signatures of students, etc.

The applicant stated that a survey related to the Race to the Top proposal was sent to all teachers. There was a return response from the teachers of 34%. Of the 34% who responded only 93% indicates support for the plan. This falls short of the 70% teacher evidenced support requirement.

There is a letter from the Texas Education Agency in the form of a "decline to comment" notice for the applicant's Race to the Top proposal. This letter demonstrates that there was not clear support from the organization for the applicant's Race to the Top proposal.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a score of 15 for this section of the plan.

Parents, teachers and students will meet to set annual personalized growth and attainment goals for each student.

The applicant will create a student/family portal so that individual students and parents have instant access to student data. Individualized student plans will use the IB standards as a foundation to prepare each student to be college- and career- ready. High school students will participate in a yearlong learning project based upon student academic interests. Technology will be used to customize lessons as part of this learning project

The proposal states that students will have the opportunity to be exposed to diverse cultures through the use of software that will provide for encouraging students to explore a variety of sources and resources, but does not specify which software and what type of activities will foster the development of cultural awareness that will lead to increased/and or personalized student learning.

The applicant proposes a collaborative partnership with parents, educators, and students for using the IB standards as a foundation to develop personalized student learning plans which the applicant explains will promote goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving.

The proposal contains a plan for developing and implementing a Learning Management System that will be aligned with student learning goals and provide immediate feedback that measures and reports mastery of college- and career-ready standards.

The applicant lists programs designed to personalize learning instruction for all students, such as Revolution Prep for Math and Achieve 3000 for reading. The proposal contains a one-time mention of meeting the needs of subgroups of students. There is no mention of specific programs that would be developmentally appropriate for various levels of subgroups. There

is not a specific plan detailing how the needs of subgroups would specifically be met to show definitive increases in student achievement.

The plan provides for teachers and staff members to provide learning opportunities for students to develop skills and understanding for how to use tools and resources to track data aligned with learning and progress.

The plan accounts for varied activities for preparing students for college and the workforce. The plan contains rationales, goals, and activities that are aligned to standards and designed to promote personalized learning environments. There is a detailed chart which shows timelines and assigns leadership responsibilities for activities.

The plan accounts for technology to be a major part of how the instructional activities will be delivered in order to personalize learning for each student. The plan states that currently the available technology is outdated and unable to meet the goals and vision for the future. The plan does not clearly outline a process for how many computers or how much technology will be needed to meet the goals that are set forth as part of the Race to the Top project. The plan does not have a projection of exactly how much equipment will be needed in classrooms and in the schools in order to successfully execute the goals and vision set forth by the applicant. The plan only mentions the Learning Management System, but does not detail specific names of software programs that will be used as interventions for advanced, delayed, students with learning disabilities, etc. and how these programs will be used in classrooms and at home.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received 17 points for this area.

The applicant provides rationales and goals for key activities designed to provide a credible plan to implement professional development skills for educators to assess student learning and deliver improved instructional activities for increasing student achievement, maintaining graduation rates, preparing students for college and work, and decreasing achievement gaps.

The applicant proposes to employ the services of a Consortium which will provide curriculum support to accomplish the shift to personalize education plans. The Consortium will devote resources to assist educators to guide instruction that prepares students for college success, builds critical thinking skills, integrates literacy across all content areas, and a global view of education

The proposal describes a plan for establishing a Course Leader whose role it will be to work with a Curriculum Team of educators on Common Formative Assessments. The Course Leader will assist educators to organize sessions, make connections to professional development, provide sample lesson and unit plans through the use of the digital *iShine* tool. Teachers and students will be able to have immediate access to data which will facilitate improved student learning in order to be college and career prepared.

The plan addresses a systematic evaluation process which involves multiple formal observations and feedback from staff and principals on a quarterly basis. In addition administrators do frequent walkthroughs offering immediate feedback designed to provide ways to support and intervene as needed in order to improve teacher effectiveness.

The applicant described a plan for providing teachers with a differentiated teacher professional development plan for teachers to accommodate what level and types of learning styles and needs teachers require in order to be able to respond to and identify optimal student needs and interests.

Throughout the plan the applicant uses the IB standards as its foundation for aligning student learning with college-and career-ready standards and graduation requirements. There is a plan in place to offer continuous off-site and on-site IB training for new teachers and instructional support staff. The plan also accounts for an annual conference for instructional coaches, deans and leaders. The plan includes seeking funding to add five new coaches to a current team of eight.

The applicant provides a detailed chart outlining activities with timelines and identification of those who will be responsible to oversee each proposed activity.

The plan does not account for activities for recruiting teachers for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education).

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	12
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a 12 in this area.</p> <p>The applicant confirms in the narratives that support and services will be provided to participating schools in order to enable each school to effectively implement the plan. The central office administration has promised to add 6 new positions to focus on the implementation of the proposed plan. In addition the plan lists key roles and responsibilities of current personnel who will be responsible for implementing and monitoring the plan</p> <p>The plan demonstrates that currently school principals have the flexibility and autonomy to set school budgets, school schedules and calendars. Central office leadership offers assistance to the principals as part of advising for the budget teaming process. The applicant provides information that allows each school to have complete autonomy to hire and dismiss all staff.</p> <p>One of the goals of the applicant's proposal is to have graduates accepted to a four year college and be ready to be successful their first day of college. The applicant used grade level placement committees, online curricula, dual credit courses as a means for students to earn credit based on mastery rather than time spent on topic</p> <p>The proposal provides narratives that explain how the applicant assesses student mastery of standards with a variety of formative and summative assessments on an annual, quarterly, weekly and daily basis. Computer based software programs are also used to measure student progress. The narratives describe traditional forms of assessment along with real time gathering of assessment data for measuring student progress. There is no mention of performance based assessments.</p> <p>The proposal simply states all students have access to resources and practices at school. The narratives explain that students with learning disabilities have access to resources in general education classrooms and are supported by the special education teacher and a general education teacher in part-time inclusion programs. Other special education resources that are available to students are not provided within the narratives. The applicant explains that immersion learning is available for Limited English Proficient Learners, combined with one-to-one learning activities. There is no mention of specific programs or that other adaptable programs are made available to students with disabilities, Limited English Proficient Learners, or other high needs students.</p> <p>The applicant's proposal lacks proposed timelines and individuals responsible for assuring the successful execution of the delivery of policies, rules, and the success rate for resources and practices available to all students, especially for students with disabilities and Limited English Proficient Learners.</p>		

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a score of 8 in this area.</p> <p>The proposal outlines an extensive list of making content, tools, and additional resources available to all stakeholders, such as: parent handbooks, student records through a student management system, web sites ,and report cards.</p> <p>Throughout the proposal the applicant demonstrates a strong commitment with a vast array of technical support in the form of professional development to educators. Timelines and individuals responsible for technical support to educators are found in narratives and charts throughout the proposal. The applicant proposes providing various levels of technical support to parents through parent meetings that will be held at the beginning, middle and end of the school year. Teachers will be responsible during the school day and by cell phone after school hours for providing technical support to students.</p> <p>The proposal contains information naming the Power School system as the current means of exporting Information to other systems. "The proposal refers to the newly developed Learning Management System as the future avenue for exporting digital information in Open Data Format.</p> <p>The proposal states that the following systems are totally interoperable for linking students and teachers together: iShine, TEAMS, APTA. The applicant further explains that the interoperable systems are used to regularly report to the Texas Education Agency and other local, state, and federal agencies.</p> <p>Throughout the proposal, the applicant provides a credible plan relative to timelines and responsibility assignments for the management of making technical and digital resources available for interoperability, both currently and for the future duration of the grant project.</p> <p>It is not clear how much technology the applicant currently has available to ensure delivery of technical support to the</p>		

extent that is proposed. It is not clear how many computers and/or what types of computers will be available for the successful implementation of technical assistance to all students, parents, teachers, administrators and key stakeholders. Not having clarity with how the technology will be purchased and how many computers will be purchased, how they will be distributed, and where they will be housed puts a dent in the credibility for a successful plan.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a score of 10 for this area.</p> <p>The applicant provides a detailed plan for continually seeking feedback for improvements and public sharing of information, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal assessments will be administered to stakeholders on a quarterly basis. • Weekly meetings with grade level teams. • Parent information sessions. • Seeking input and presenting information in weekly “Teaching and Learning Team” bulletins. • Posting video messages on the intranet. • Discussions at monthly school leader meetings and weekly staff meetings. • Developing and sharing an annual calendar of activities. • Quarterly review of strategic plan performance with CEO and Chief Academic Officer. <p>Goals for the project are linked to activities and deliverables. Rationales for implementation of activities and explanations for goal setting are clearly outlined. There is a detailed chart of the evaluation process with listed monitoring and reporting activities, timelines and assigned individual responsibilities.</p> <p>A narrative describes how the applicant will measure the quality of its investments. The applicant proposes gathering data and analyzing the most effective investments in the plan based upon achieving the goal of increased student achievement through personalized learning environments. For each program there will be a calculated “return on investment” by analyzing the cost compared to what were the academic or other tangible outcomes. The explanation for measuring the quality of investment is very general. It is not clear as to how the applicant proposes to create a calculation, what the process will look like for creating the calculation, and what the applicant will do with those investments that are not effective.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a score of 3.</p> <p>Rationales and goals for communicating information are clearly stated.</p> <p>The applicant proposes the following activities for providing ongoing communication and engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish bi-annual newsletter and report for educators and other interested stakeholders (parents, funding partners, post secondary institutions, schools of education, government leaders, etc.). • Community panel discussions. • Make written case studies available on the website. • Share case studies with organizations such as Commit and Leading Foundations. • Sponsoring monthly community open houses to visit pilot schools. • Communications to teachers, leaders, parents, and staff. <p>The applicant proposes to communicate internally. The applicant does not outline or specifically state how information related to The Race to the Top will be communicated internally or who will be considered the targets who will be receiving this communication of information.</p> <p>The applicant plans to present quarterly compliance reports on program elements, budgetary issues, and annual data analysis information to the Department of Education.</p>		

Some of the activities have timelines attached to them such as annual, quarterly or monthly reports. Others such as the community panel discussion and written case studies do not have timelines for presentations. There is no one assigned to oversee the activities such as the newsletter publication, writer for case studies, leader for community panel discussion, leader to prepare and plan community open house.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a score of 2 for this area.

The applicant has the required number of Performance Measures. The applicant supplies a detailed chart listing all the performance measures as required with annual timelines and formative assessment measures with quantitative annual goal data for measuring success in literacy and math. The applicant also addresses decreasing discipline incidents as a social/emotional indicator and parent satisfaction being measured with a parent questionnaire.

The applicant sets goals of less than 100% for "*providing highly qualified teachers and principals*" by the last year of the project and beyond the years of the project. State requirements for public schools require 100% of teachers and principals to be highly effective. It is not clearly explained as to why the teacher and principal highly effective goals in areas are well below a goal of 100% such as: 53%, 46%, 57%.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a score of 2 for this area.

The plan for assessing student data is clearly outlined with rationales and goals in charts and tables throughout the plan. Timelines are identified for evaluating progress and individuals are assigned to be responsible for overseeing programs related to increasing student achievement in academic areas, meeting graduation goals, and assuring that students are prepared for college- and career-ready workplace environments.

The plan has goals, rationales and a process in place for analyzing the productivity of the electronic management systems that are proposed for the project. It is unclear how the plan will determine if there will be sufficient technology to successfully execute the plan. There is also not a plan proposed for how the applicant will proceed should there not be sufficient computers and/or technology to fulfill the goals that are set within the plan.

It is unclear how the applicant will measure teacher effectiveness. The applicant provides ample opportunities for professional development activities and timelines for the activities to be implemented. The plan does not account for the benchmark for how teacher effectiveness will be measured. There is no system in place to determine if a teacher or principal must attend a determined number of professional development activities for the teacher to be rated effective, or if quantitative or qualitative data will be collected after each professional development activity. There is not a definitive system described as to how the professional development system will be used to recruit, retain or reward highly effective teachers and principals.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scored 9 points for this area.

The applicant provided a comprehensive budget designed to meet the proposal needs as outlined in the goals presented in the budget. In the application the applicant stated that there is little technology available currently to meet the goals of the plan. Technology systems are being purchased as part of the budget. It is questionable that enough technology is being purchased to truly personalize all student learning as is set forth in the plan's academic achievement goals. Individualized computers for student and parent use are not proposed as part of the plan in order to confirm the proposed plan to be a credible success.

The proposed revenue and expenditures support the activities and programs delineated within the entire proposal. Careful accurate calculations are documented for the purpose of determining funding needed for the lifetime of the grant and for

one-time investments. The application also provided for funding from partners and outside sources. Detailed rationales were provided for each activity and deliverable. Reasonable timelines were documented to assure delivery of proposed activities and funding availability.

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

10

4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received an 4 for this area.

The plan does account for rationales for ways to fund beyond the grant years, along with secured funding from outside sources and from private resources to sustain activities proposed as part of the plan. There is not a timeline of activities, specific professional development activities, and salary proposals that will extend beyond the duration of the grant.

It is not clearly outlined as to how the applicant will continue to sustain salaries of those who were added with funding from the project, continue to maintain technology, and continue to add needed new technology. It is not stated as to whether the added personnel would still be maintained after grant funding is gone and/or if the plan is successful would their responsibilities be the same and remain needed in the same capacity as they were during the active grant proposal years.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant receives a score of 2 for this area.

The applicant has partnered with the following private organizations: Communities in Schools, Just Say Yes, and Boys and Girls Clubs. These agencies provide a sustainable partnership with the applicant and supports the personalized learning goals of the plan with extended student social and emotional services

The applicant provides 3 educational, 1 family, and 2 personal/social population-level desired results for students. The plan promotes attaining results that promote regular student attendance, increase academic achievement, decrease disciplinary and bullying incidents, engage parents in resolving personal/social issues with their children, increase substance abuse awareness, and build positive student attitudes towards school.

The applicant proposes using the Learning Management System and survey questionnaires to track results for each of the named indicators: attendance rates, suspension rates, discipline rates for bullying, participation in programs, participation in non-academic school activities, student knowledge around social/emotional topics, and parent attendance at Parent University.

The plan names teachers and principals as the individuals responsible for reviewing data and ensuring intervention plans are executed appropriately. The Senior Director of Special Populations will review data monthly to oversee that student needs are met, identify best practices, and provide resources for those who are not achieving. The plan does not specifically address how the data will target students facing significant challenges, English Language Learners, students affected by poverty, family instability, or other child welfare issues.

The applicant does not provide a plan for developing a strategy to scale the model beyond participating students to other high-need students and communities.

The applicant provides narratives that explain data will be collected and reviewed during data meetings. The plan does not provide specific details as to how these agencies will use data to improve results over time or how they will know that the results of the gathered data show measurable successes.

The applicant names the Chief Academic Officer and Managing Directors as the persons responsible for working closely with school leadership to assure that the community partnerships are integrated into the schools. Specific activities and timelines for how this will be accomplished are not provided.

The plan provides for using the expertise and knowledge of staff to assess student needs and assets. The applicant does not provide activities that demonstrate how the applicant's and the partnership's goals are aligned for improving the education of family and community supports. In addition there are no specific activities of goals for using the staff knowledge to work with community service staff to integrate activities that would collaboratively build capacity.

The plan names the schools administrators who will meet with school personnel to identify and support high-risk student behavior. The applicant does not provide specific activities for partnering with the private agencies in order to identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community or how they will align their goals with the community agencies' goals.

The applicant will use a RAPID framework for decision making. The plan does not provide specific activities for how the agency partnerships will be trained or involved with implementing this framework to address the individual needs of participating students or how this process will bring about improved results.

The applicant proposes that parents will provide input as part of an annually distributed survey. Parents in conjunction with the school board will discuss Central Management Office's successes and growth opportunities related to the community partnerships. Parents will be invited to participate in executive committee meetings to plan and discuss major program plans.

The applicant proposes that the Chief Executive Officer and CEO will assess the applicant's progress in implementing the plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges within the school systems. There are no activities or named personnel from any of the community agencies that would assist or collaborate with reviewing data or assessing progress.

The plan provides a detailed chart that lists the achievable Annual Performance Goals and Results. There is a budget that accounts for all revenue and expenses related to working with the outside agencies. The plan does not provide for an ambitious sequence of activities or events to involve the agencies actively or collaboratively. There is no specificity as to how the schools and the community agencies will integrate activities to support or show significant student improvement working together to combine services in the best interests of the students and community.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has met the Absolute Priority 1.

The applicant consistently plans to use the International Baccalaureate standards as the foundation to prepare students for college and careers and plan for all academic activities designed to provide personalized learning environments for all students. Throughout the proposal the applicant refers to attaining a graduation rate of 100% and the plan proposes activities that will assist with maintaining this standard. There is a thread throughout the proposal that has all key goals aligned with activities that promote providing personalized learning for all students. The applicant includes a teacher and principal evaluation process that is designed to increase the effectiveness of educators. Detailed data is provided in charts or tables that provide data that clearly demonstrates that the proposal works towards increasing student achievement and decreasing achievement gaps across student groups.

Total	210	126
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0156TX-3 for Uplift Education - Peak Preparatory

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) Uplift is a network of 28 K-12 public charter schools (in 5 LEAs) in North Texas that serves 9,784 traditionally underserved students. The proposal builds upon the progress they have made building on the four core educational assurance areas, each of which is specifically addressed.</p> <p>Their curriculum and inquiry-based approach is based on the International Baccalaureate (IB) framework integrated with the Common Core standards and aligned to several other standards, including the Texas College and Career Readiness Standards and Advanced Placement standards. They use the national normed test, MAP, for annual summative assessments, and college readiness measures to track students' performance by standard. Uplift has a comprehensive performance management system, iShine, an interoperable system that links all student data to teacher performance, provides an ongoing picture of student achievement and informs teachers with data to make adjustments to their lessons. They also have a human capital continuum that supports recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals. It ties teachers and principals directly to student growth goals and rewards teachers. Uplift schools met Texas state standards in most of their schools, but not in two middle schools because they failed to differentiate their instruction adequately. They have made corrections for the current school year using a strategy that was successful with one of their previous turnaround schools to improve these two schools and assure other schools stay on track.</p> <p>b) Uplift articulates a clear approach to the goals of the RTT-D grant that include personalizing learning for each student through an expanded IB framework in elementary and middle schools, support educators with a learning management system that supports IB implementation and increases teacher effectiveness, and provide greater support to the families with access to the learning management system.</p> <p>c) Uplift's proposal describes what the classroom experience will be like for student and teachers participating in increasingly personalized learning environments. A different model is presented for primary, middle, and high schools. While the structure of the models will vary for different grade levels, the goals of the support will be consistent. Across both primary and secondary schools, blended learning tools will be used and teachers will use data to inform their instruction. For K-5, the student and teacher's typical daily schedule is presented and a chart showing how students will rotate between thirty-minute rotations of leveled instruction. Middle school students will begin to shift from teacher directed learning to more independent learning hours, with two hour blocks that include both small group and self directed learning. Teachers will be facilitators of small group projects. The shift from teacher directed learning will be more distinct in high school with students being able to complete projects and papers at their own pace. Daily, weekly, and yearly schedules are suggested for each school level for teachers and students. How the principal experience will change is also described for the high school level.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Uplift application is for a consortium of all five of their LEAs. Since their plan is fundamental to their mission, all schools, grades, and subject areas will be included. As Uplift continues to grow in student numbers, new schools will be included in the program. 68% of the current 9,784 students qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch, 91% are minority and all students are classified as high-needs as defined by federal standards. Overall, the total number of students is anticipated to grow to 16,000 and mirror current demographics and 671 educators will participate in the program.</p> <p>While all schools meet the RTT-D competition eligibility requirements, a phased approach, based upon a volunteer application process, to implement personalize learning throughout the network was described. A defined rubric will be used to score and select pilot schools by a committee that includes the CEO, Chief Academic Officer, and Managing Directors (principals) of Uplift schools.</p> <p>All students will not benefit from the grant during the first years, but all schools serving grades K-12 will be phased in by the end of the grant. A table showing a list of all the schools and the required information is included, but it does not account for the increasing number of students benefiting each year.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A logic model showing their theory of change and their theory of action, along with text describing each was presented. The table included resources/inputs, activities, goals, objectives, outcomes, and outputs. No short-term outcomes were</p>		

included in the table. The text traced their current situation, the core tenets of their model, and their intended impact and ultimate goals. A high quality plan, including goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing the reforms across schools was not included in this section. Targeted tables displaying these components were included in other sections of the proposal. For example, in Criterion C(2), a detailed human capital management table showing one aspect of a high quality plan is included. Appendix G1, referred to in the text for Uplift's scaling plans, was missing.

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

10

8

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Baseline data and targets for student performance by grade and content area, graduation rates, and college enrollments for all students and by subgroups are presented. Methodology for the targets is included, and targets for subgroups enable narrowing of gaps between subgroup performances. Baseline data and targets for the optional category, Postsecondary Degree Attainment, are also included. The summative assessments used for baseline and growth targets are identified.

The growth in several of the targets of 2-3% could be considered low, but perhaps it is realistic. Growth rates resulting in only between 74 and 78% of elementary economically disadvantaged students reaching targets did not seem ambitious.

The calculation of achievement Grade Point Average (GPA) for each subject area and grade level was compared with Texas's highest performing group of students, Asians. Their goal that 70% of Uplift Alumni graduate from college within 6 years, a rate higher than the national average, especially for this population, is very commendable. Appendix G-2 was missing

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	7

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Uplift Schools have a record of success in raising student achievement, high school graduation rates, and excellent college enrollment. An increasing percentage of students are achieving "Recommended" or "Distinguished" status on state assessments. An example of scores in Geometry showed their scores to be as good or better than many other local charter schools, such as Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP) and surpassing the State average. A table showing growth over the past 5 years across grade levels was not provided. Texas changed its assessment system beginning in Spring 2012 and it has taken Uplift three years to get a consistent line of assessments in place across the network.

Evidence was provided that there is a trend toward improvement for students at Uplift for at least 3 years. When specific MAP and SAT scores are correlated to student tenure, the more time enrolled at an Uplift school, the higher the scores. Sixth grade students who have been with Uplift at least 3 years scored on average, 7.5 RIT points higher in math and 7.2 RIT points higher in reading than students who had been in Uplift for 1-2 years.

While Uplift has made significant academic gains for their students, they are still seeing some achievement gaps in subpopulations. They noted three reasons why these gaps exist. They have spent the last three years implementing various assessments and they admit that it has take three years to create a process that holds their schools accountable to fidelity to the Uplift academic model, while still providing flexibility to Principals. It has also taken Uplift three years to develop and implement their iShine Data warehouse tool that provides useful student level data to teachers and principals. After revision of the portal, they report being better prepared to have consistent use of assessment and student and objective level data which will help them intervene in focused ways. The portal now allows users to "drill down" and access customizable reports on student performance. With RTT=D funds they plan to connect their data warehouse tool to a new learning management system that will provide real time data, recommendations, and predictive analytics to teachers and instructional leaders. The plans sound promising, but there was minimal evidence that they have had the ability to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction and services during the past four years.

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

5

2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided evidence of some transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments across their different sites. Expenditures per school and salaries are reported to the Texas Education Agency and posted on their website. They reported that their expenditures on personnel and achieving salary parity for teachers, while committing to a transparent and effective system of performance-based pay are in place across schools. Personnel salaries at the school level for instructional and non-instructional staff were provided in an Appendix. Teacher salaries were aggregated as a line item for each school which did not communicate teacher's salaries in different subjects or by experience. It appears that most communications about processes, practices, and investments is communicated school by school.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Uplift network of schools, located in Texas, feels it has the legal, statutory, and regulatory autonomy to implement the plan. Organizations and partners in the state that support school reform include Teach for America, Education Pioneers, Teaching Trust program (a school leadership development program founded by Uplift founder and CEO), and Commit! They note that, unfortunately, Texas was rated in the bottom for funding adequacy and equitable access to operational funding in an analysis by the National Public Charter School Alliance which makes the State context challenging for implementing charter schools. But, recently, Texas voted to provide access to the Permanent School Fund to charter schools and increase the cap on charters in the State, so perhaps Texas become a more supportive state context in the future.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Some evidence of stakeholder engagement and support was provided. Family members were included as members of the RTT-D steering committee to provide feedback on the application. An application draft was shared with all teaches and of the 34% who responded to the survey of the draft, 93% indicated support for the plan. This does not meet the required minimum evidence that at least 70% of teachers from participating schools support the proposal. Letters of support were received from a few local foundations such as the Harold Simmons and the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation, the Charter School Growth Fund, Arlington Mayor Robert Cluck, parent groups from district schools and a few community partner organizations. Given the number of schools and students who would benefit from this grant, the number of letters of support was minimal.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	9

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

One of the fundamental goals of Uplift Prep's Plan is to personalize student learning using the rigorous curriculum framework of the International Baccalaureate (IB) based on conceptual study and inquiry. Students will establish annual and long-term goals and as they get older take more control over establishing a personalized course of study that provides college-and career-readiness. For each of three major components at elementary, middle, and secondary school, a description was provided of how the plan is currently being implemented, specific goals and objectives, a summary of activities, next steps (including timeline and responsible individuals), and how impact will be measured. The goals and plans will serve to guide student work and a new, more robust Learning Management System (LMS) will be developed to integrate data supporting student performance, goals, and will capture student progress toward college readiness. Expanded use of educational technology and blended strategies will enhance IB classrooms and provide more student resources, but not much detail is provided and it is not apparent how technology will be used by students to enhance instruction. Uplift Prep will continue its successful Road to College (RTC) program that provides all students with information about college options and helps them identify the best fit. The Senior Director Personalized Learning will be responsible for designing the training of students to use the LMS. It was not clear when and by whom such training would take place. There was a helpful section describing how class time would be restructured under Criterion 1 rather than in this section. No detail was provided as what activities will give students exposure to diverse cultures and perspectives. Students in the IB program will be given activities that develop critical thinking, and problem solving skills, but it sounds like this will not be at all schools, so how this will happen at the other schools is not clear. A comprehensive high quality plan including a timeline showing the year in which different schools will adapt this model of instruction and who will be responsible for implementation at each school would be helpful.

Individual data will be available to students and their families and will be linked to goals. The applicant noted that 65% of Seniors had a college-ready SAT score of 1070 (Math/Reading) or higher last year, but it was not specified how additional accommodations and high quality strategies for high needs students would help ensure that more students are on track toward meeting college-and career ready graduation requirements.

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

20

7

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

C2 follows the same format of C1 with a description of how the plan is currently being implemented what activities will change in the future. Uplift’s support system focuses on curriculum support, training and certification, professional development, and ongoing coaching and evaluation. A more personalized learning environment will be provided using the IB framework and approach. Support will be provided to teachers to translate the IB inquiry based curriculum into every classroom. Course Leaders, a new teacher leadership role, will lead a particular subject area at each grade across the Consortium and more will be added to support new schools and offer targeted support for integrated blended learning into classrooms.

The applicant described their integrated certification and professional development that occurs network wide and at each school. Uplift wants to ensure consistent practice across all schools and all teachers take 1.5 professional development days after each quarter to work on teaching to standards, and norm grading. Funding will enable Uplift to train more teachers in the IB instructional approach, work with students and parents to set and track annual goals, and modify instruction to create options for student learning and include digital resources. They will make a significant investment in expanding their coaching team from eight to thirteen in year one. All teachers, new to teaching, new to the Uplift Consortium, and/or new to IB will receive coaching, and experienced teachers will be offered support as well. Uplift plans to link their continuum of human capital management to personalized learning and criteria will be developed for teacher performance that can be measured through their evaluation system. This all sounds like important steps forward, but provides evidence that Uplift has a lot to do to fully implement personalized teaching for all students. There was no information about how school leaders and school leadership teams would be trained to enable them to structure new, more personalized learning environments.

Shine Through Teaching Excellence (STTE), which combines integrated support mechanisms with performance-based evaluation, is a key element of Uplift’s overall RTTT-D strategy. They continue to refine it and the next iteration will include a teacher observation form specifying teachers’ and leaders’ ability to effectively personalize student learning toward student growth and achievement to a college-ready level and application of the blended learning strategy into the IB framework. A high quality plan was included for STTE Refinement that included goals, activities, deliverables, and timeline, but missing parties responsible for implementing each activity.

There was not a high quality plan that shows the increasing number of students that will receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard to staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	6

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Uplift’s governance structure is similar to that of a traditional school district with a central office. There are 28 schools under five Uplift charter schools, organized into four regional clusters, that are each led by a managing director. School principals have the autonomy to tailor their approach to the unique needs of their students, including hiring and terminating personnel and managing the school budget. A list of six personnel, 4 temporary, 2 permanent, will be hired to support RTT-D. A Director of Personalized Learning will be hired to manage and supervise the RTT-D grant program and report to the Chief Academic Officer who will oversee the implementation of all initiatives in the proposal. The Chief Development Officer “will support the Director of RTT in managing the grant,” it was not clear who this was, perhaps the Director of Personalized learning.

School leaders have the autonomy and flexibility to set school budgets, schedules and calendars, and experiment with various instructional and structural ideas. This grant will enable Uplift to develop standards aligned to learning maps covering the core subject areas. Real time data will tell teachers the standards students have mastered and which

students need more time to master them.

Each grade level group (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12) will deal with opportunities for mastery in different ways and frequencies. For example, in K-5, students will be placed in small groups based upon mastery and work on it this way, in the 9-12 model, students will have specific opportunities to demonstrate mastery including quarterly MAP testing, and formative assessments given three times per year. There was no explanation of how students might be given opportunities to master a particular standard in multiple ways and at times other than the structured times.

An explanation was provided as to how Uplift currently meets the needs of students with disabilities and English Language Learners. The initiatives proposed in this plan are all intended to support differentiated learning and there was no specificity regarding how a range of learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable for all students, as well as students with special needs will be supported with RTT-D funding.

Points were subtracted because the applicant did not have a high quality plan showing timeline for activities, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing each item.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Uplift's plan allows for students to have access to learning resources both in and out of school. Students and parents will have access to monitor student learning through their more robust LMS online system. To ensure access to the 68% of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch, computer lab hours will be scheduled after school and on Saturdays and the school will work to secure library cards for Internet and computer access at the public library. It was noted that "all 6-12 students will be given a device to access all the learning tools needed for success" but what devices will be given to each student was not identified. All K-5 classrooms will have 15 computers to support the blended rotation model.

Uplift schools already maintain extensive outreach to parents through a variety of avenues that include home visits by teachers. And, students have access to their teachers via cell phones until 10pm. Uplift will continue to host parent meetings and they will include sessions on using the new LMS system. It was not clear how or if parents would be able to obtain additional support if they could not attend a meeting.

All teachers will be given training on how to maximize the LMS system to use data to inform instruction. Additional support will include campus-based IT support staff.

Parents and students currently have access to information through Power School, which allows students and parents to export their data in an open format. With the new LMS system, parents and students will also be able to export their data for use in other learning systems.

All of Uplift's data systems will continue to be interoperable data systems. Uplift uses the interoperability of their systems to report to the Texas Education Agency and others requested data including demographic, academic, personnel, financial, and organizational.

Points were subtracted because the applicant did not have a high quality plan that includes a timeline, deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing each activity.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not include a high quality plan (as defined in the RTT-D notice) that is tied to key goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and parties responsible. For the proposal, the applicant built on their culture and existing evaluation, feedback and communications systems to create a focused process to measure their performance against RTT plans, improve outcomes, and communicate with stakeholders. Creating a RTT Steering committee that will meet weekly to discuss the progress toward goals, effectiveness on programs, and agree on refinements of the program is positive. The applicant listed the members of the committee, but they were primarily at the central office level, along with Principals in their pilot schools. No teachers or other school level staff were included. A plan to gather useful information in order to adjust program activities and improve results was reasonable. Four excellent key evaluation questions were identified:

Is student achievement improving? Are students teachers and leaders getting what they need to successfully implement the

plan? Are our stakeholders informed about and satisfied with the program, the implementation, and the results? Are our investments in program resources producing good returns in terms of the above metrics? Uplift Charter plans to gather data to answer these questions and use the existing communication channels for ongoing communication and engagement which included every other week meetings with pilot schools, monthly board meetings, etc. Continual feedback on goals, evaluations, and observations will be made, but it was not evident that there would be time to really work on the continuous improvement of classroom practices that ensure personalized learning environments.

The Evaluation Process and Activities table listed meetings and facilitators throughout the year. There was a lot about evaluation in this section, but not many details about how continuous improvement would be authentically supported.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Four communication goals were described to support this criterion:

1) Report on program internally to improve existing program; 2) provide data and analysis to the Dept. of Education; 3) share information on the program, results, and lessons learned to the broader education community and write and share case studies, and, 4) include targeted communications to local community to address the ways RTT has made improvements to Uplift schools.

These goals did not align with the plan described in E. The goals described activities that would take place and identified deliverables, but they did not include all the components necessary to demonstrate a high quality plan, such as timelines and who would be responsible for each activity.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A table and supporting text is provided for the twelve indicators selected for each grade band. The rationale for selecting that measure, how the measure will provide useful information were provided. Each performance measure is addressed by whole group participation and by subgroups, setting baselines and yearly targets for improvement. There was no information about how the applicant will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Project Director, will be responsible for evaluating effectiveness of investments, along with support from the RTT Steering Committee and the parent/staff working group (for family engagement). The process was outlined in E1 and includes conducting an analysis of:

- Student achievement results (overall and related to individual involvement with RTT elements such as effective teachers and blended learning options)
- Teacher and leader effectiveness in terms of the level of RTT support elements (Professional Development, coaching and training in blended learning methodologies)
- The extent of educator and student/family use of the portal.
- Budget analysis of correlation between investments and outcomes

How the questions outlined in E1 would be answered by this analysis was not discussed, but several protocols in the appendix were relevant. Without a high quality plan showing the responsibilities of different people, it was unclear how much of the Project Director's time would be spent on this work.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budget identifies funds to support the grant, including two outside family foundation grants. An overall

budget summary table is provided, but no details about specific categories (i.e. equipment, contractual) are provided. An overall budget summary project list is provided with references to the associated criteria in the proposal. This was helpful in understanding the sum of funds used for categories such as “K-5 blended”, “6-12 personalization,” and “RTT project Management.” Additional tables identified how much would be spent for line items including equipment and personnel in each grade block. There were still some details missing. For example, it is not clear exactly what the largest equipment purchase in year 4 is for.

If awarded the grant, the applicant will use it to pilot an academic model of personalization that will become core to school reform moving forward. A helpful table is provided showing a summary of how each project ties to the components of their strategy.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Uplift’s financial model is to sustain all core academic programs through its per pupil state and federal allotment. According to detailed financial analysis and projections at full enrollment, their schools are completely sustainable on public (state, local, federal) funding alone. The projects described in this proposal “are mainly one time investments of developing platforms to facilitate our personalized learning plan.” The applicant did not include a high quality plan including timelines and activities needed to sustain the project’s goals after the term of the grant. There was no discussion of how the applicant would evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Uplift Prep has identified three key partners that will help support their plan to personalize support to students.

1. Communities in Schools Dallas Region currently provides case managers (i.e., social counselors) to work with individual students on a holistic wrap-around approach. They currently work with two of Uplift’s schools and they plan to expand this partnership to include one social counselor per K-12 district.
2. Just SAY Yes provides speakers, media, and curriculum to help students make positive decisions that will improve their success inside and outside of the classroom. Students in this program will be able to view short videos via the LMS on social topics. During grades 6-12 advisory time, teachers will serve as facilitate discussions around the content viewed by students.
3. Boys and Girls Clubs are a third important partner to Uplift.

The applicant provided five K-12 goals and two 6-12 goals for these partnerships that align with their overall goal of ensuring that 100% of students are accepted to college and are successful there. The desired results presented in this section were very vague: For example, “Parents will be engaged in resolving any personal/social issues of their children.” There was no description of how data would be used to target the resources for particular students or how this strategy might be scaled beyond participating students.

It was pointed out that iShine, and the proposed LMS system would create custom dashboards to track key indicators at both student and school level and by subpopulations and that community partners will be asked to identify appropriate surveys to measure program success. Teachers, principals, and the Senior Director of Special Populations will review data, have discussions, and make adjustments for those not making clear gains. Best practices will be shared through case studies on the Uplift Website. The program will include all Uplift students, so there will be no need to develop a strategy to scale the model.

Uplift described various ways in which the staff already assesses needs of students, has a decision-making process and infrastructure, engages parents in decision-making, and routinely assesses progress. Annual performance measures to understand their progress were included. Examples included some measures which had been presented previously, such as increasing student achievement each year and other measures which pertained directly to the partnerships such as “80% of student will master knowledge around critical social issues tested” and “Positively stated student attitudes about school will increase 15% each year of the grant.”

The applicant only mildly conveyed the importance of working collaboratively with community partners to establish a

network of support to meet the needs of students and families in this section.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal meets the requirements of Absolute Priority 1. Uplift Prep coherently and comprehensively addresses how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to enhance their current IB academic model to create more student-directed personalized learning environments. They will shift from teachers being the drivers of content delivery to facilitators of students learning in the hopes of accelerating and deepening student learning, expanding access of students to effective educators, decrease achievement gaps and continue to ensure that students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.</p>		
Total	210	107