



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0304MI-1 for Ann Arbor Public Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>While the applicant provides a thorough description of the district's demographics, strengths and weaknesses, it does not provide a strong reform vision or build on the work in the four core educational assurance areas. The application does provide a description of the eight core educational actions, including implementing a personalized learning plan for each student, AAPS would take to support targeted students in the RTT schools. The logic model provided in the Appendix provides some information about the desired long range student outcomes; however, it does not provide a vision for reform. While the passage of the technology bond will surely support LEA-wide reform and change, it does not provide a vision for district-wide reform in itself.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Selecting the most economically challenged schools in the district is a very reasonable approach to identifying the most appropriate population for this grant. Participating schools meet the requirements for a minimum of 40% FRPL students. The total of the students at these schools total over 2,000 -- the minimum number of students to be required to be served. Specific schools, students and teachers are provided in the table provide for (A)(2).</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant did not provide a specific section for (A)(3); however, a logic model is included in the appendix of the application and referenced in section (A)(1). Strategies put in place in the "pilot" RTT schools would be expanded district-wide with the recently-passed technology bond. While actions and outcomes are provided in the logic model, it is lacking a clear theory of causation from the major program components to the desired outcomes.</p>		
<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Applicant has established a goal of 5% growth per year for all students in the state tests for reading and math and a goal of closing the achievement gap by 4 points per year for each subgroup. While this approach is logical, it results in some cohorts/ schools having goals that are not ambitious. This is especially true for the LEP subgroup listed in several schools (i.e. Carpenter 4th grade reading and math, Carpenter 5th grade reading and math) where 0% are listed at proficient in the baseline year and the goal in 2015-16 is listed as 20%. Similarly, the goals do not account for differences between cohorts, resulting in goals for some groups of students who were proficient in high rates to lower goals in future years. For example, in the baseline year 55% of Pittsfield 4th graders were proficient or above on the MEAP math exam; yet the goal for that group of students is only 45% proficiency in 2012-13.</p> <p>The goals for closing the achievement gap are not ambitious in some cases. For example, the Hispanic Caucasian gap in 3rd grade reading has a goal of moving from 92 to 72, which leave a huge gap even at the end of this process. In cases where the gap is that big to begin with, an ambitious goal would require accelerated growth to close or dramatically narrow the gap over the course of the grant.</p> <p>Goals for increasing the graduation rate are consistent across all groups -- 3% growth per year. This does not reflect a desire to close the graduation gap between subgroups and the graduation gap remains the same in the goals throughout the period of the grant.</p> <p>The college enrollment goals in the application do not use the definitions provided to create goals for college enrollment. The 2012-13 goal should reflect the goal for percentage of 11-12 graduates enroll in a higher-education institution.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The data presented in the application show a high-performing district relative to the state and many of the 2011-12 test data points indicate a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans at most grade levels. Unfortunately this progress follows a recent history of up-and-down performance for a number of subgroups including African Americans. By most measures, the gap between African Americans, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students and special education students and their peers outside of those categories remains large. While the district has identified "focus schools" with significant achievement gaps, no evidence is provided to show significant reforms in these schools at this time.</p> <p>The Applicant does make student achievement data available to middle and high schools students and has plans to make NWEA test score data available to parents of elementary school students.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Applicant provides significant district-level budget information on their website including the board-approved budget for the present academic year, historical analysis of fiscal information and trends, and a timeline for budget development and discussion that includes community forums, but the district does not include school level expenditure data. The Applicant does have this available for constituents through the finance department. While it is good that the data can be requested from the finance department, the level of transparency decreases significantly because of the increased effort required to access the information.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Applicant has provided state code demonstrating that it does indeed have the autonomy to implement the learning environment described in the proposal.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Applicant describes a collaborative relationship with the Ann Arbor Education Association and regular communications with other stakeholders including parents, but does not describe stakeholders' involvement <i>in the development of this proposal</i>. Letters of support from the AAEA, principals of the targeted schools, the mayor, chamber of commerce, CAN, and the research partnership with University of Michigan have been provided. There is no evidence of meaningful stakeholder input or support from parents.</p>		
<b>(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Applicant provided a list of the assessment tools used to assess individual students throughout the grade spans served. Beyond the assessments listed, which occur more frequently for students in intervention programs, a high quality plan for analysis of the status of implementing personalized learning environments is absent. The application does provide a rationale of providing English learner students with tablet apps that "adapt from English to home language and back" to provide more language support for those students.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Applicant plans to provide students in the target schools with tablets and Compass Learning Odyssey. The introduction to this section notes that the goal will be met "through the use of 21st Century technology, project based learning, and students' use of a curriculum that is tailored to their skills and speed of content mastery." It is not clear from the rest of the narrative how project based</p>		

learning will come into play in the personalized learning environment. While this application is very strong on the personalized pace of learning, it is unclear how they will ensure that each student has goals aligned to college-and career-ready standards and that he or she will progress steadily toward those goals.

Other than the use of assistive technology for some special needs students, there is no indication of how high-need students will receive differentiated instruction to ensure that they are on track toward meeting college-and career-ready standards.

The application does cite a budget line item for coaches to support teachers in students in the use of new technology. This is a positive element that increases the likelihood of appropriate use of the new technology.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

This section of the application is designed to assess the applicant's ability to help educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress. The quick mentions of training in the use of new technology purchases and subject-specific leadership groups give a nod to this goal but stop short of providing a clear plan of action as to how educators (teachers and administrators) will become prepared to implement the program so that it drives students to college-and career-readiness. There is no mention as to how the district will help school administrators and/ or leadership teams take steps to improve individual and collective teacher effectiveness and school culture and climate.

The applicant does provide information on plans to provide parent training to increase the school-home connection for students and continue personalized learning at home. This could positively impact the program's effectiveness.

A discussion of the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals is absent from the proposal.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The Applicant describes how the district will provide operational support to participating schools, but there is little mention of the method for providing academic support to these schools. School leadership teams do have significant amounts of flexibility in schedule, budget choices, whether or not to use particular curricular or other approaches. While the application states that students do have the ability to "progress at their own pace, . . . demonstrate mastery at many intervals and in multiple comparable ways." there is no actual description of the ways in which students can demonstrate mastery. Again, the application states that the learning resources and instructional practices are fully accessible to all students, but no evidence to that point has been provided.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The application notes that the district is proposing to create a school-based community center through each participating buildings' media centers. This could be one effective strategy to expand access to families that may not have a way to access these tools otherwise. There is no mention of the availability of wireless internet access throughout the community, which may be a hindrance to full access to the personalized learning environment.

Technical support will be provided at the community center. Additional means of support are not mentioned.

Parents will be able to export their data in an open data format from the software used and analyze their student's progress.

The district does not use inter-operable data system at this time but will work to do so if they are awarded the grant.

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

While the hint of an outline of a system for continuous improvement is provided in the paragraph responding to this item, it has insufficient details to be fully responsive. The outline includes "poll participants and their families, keep tracking the response of principals and building staff to our investments, and most importantly, keep constant track of student achievement data via the technological tools we are purchasing." The applicant also notes that they will have a website to share information about the progress of the grant. This is insufficient to suggest a rigorous continuous improvement process and does not address how the applicant will comprehensively monitor and measure the quality of investments funded by RTT-D.

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

5

3

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The Applicant will solicit feedback from participating schools' media centers, through the technology tools, and through use of the website, BOE meetings, and PTO meetings. These methods are appropriate to solicit feedback from engaged stakeholders; however, they may be insufficient to reach families that are not typically engaged with the district.

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

5

2

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

While the Applicant has the table from the application rather than listing the district's own performance measures, they do discuss a number of measures that will be used including the following:

- graduation rate
- elementary students achievement and growth data
- attention to tasks at hand
- demonstration of self-control
- perseverance when tasks are difficult
- completion of tasks independently
- choice of and acceptance of challenging tasks
- willingness to take risks and try new things
- cooperative work with others
- constructive problem solving
- respectful speech and actions

The narrative does not mirror the criteria in the application but it does provide some measures for consideration. It does not include data on the mandatory performance measures required for each grade level grouping.

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

5

4

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The Applicant has noted that they will employ the services of an external professional evaluation team to determine the best methods for evaluating program investments. The applicant also notes that they will communicate with stakeholders through "online surveys, informal discussion groups, and professional judgment to analyze our projects and their utility."

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	10	6
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The budget provides some information on where RTT funds would go under this proposal. It also notes a \$150,000 contribution from the District technology bond. Year one costs include tablets, covers, carts, apps, and assistive devices for special needs students and training and a stipend for technology coaches each participating building. Sufficiency of this the hardware budget is questionable given that no additional funds for hardware are included in the remainder of the budget for replacement units and units for new students and teachers as years pass.</p> <p>The rationale for expenditures is provided throughout the grant and each expenditure in the project budget are explained in this section.</p>		

The cost of the administrative assistant is unreasonable given other salaries in the budget. At \$35,000 for a 0.5 FTE, this position would be at the same cost as the position listed for Race to the Top Executive Director (\$70,000).

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The Applicant has support of a bond measure for a total of ten years to help sustain the progress made under the grant. The applicant notes that the district will absorb some costs along with the help of the philanthropic community.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant did not participate in the competitive preference priority.

**Absolute Priority 1**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>	<b>Met/Not Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

This Applicant has built a proposal around the use of technology to provide one-on-one instruction to students; however, they have not built on the core educational assurance areas and did not comprehensively express their theory of action as to how this approach would prepare students to be college- and career-ready. While there was some mention of professional development, building great teachers and leaders through evaluation, reflection and professional development is not a significant part of this plan. They make mention of polling student and parents as well as the data that will come from working in the proposed programs, but there is no discussion of the data systems available to facilitate productive use of the data available.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>124</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0304MI-2 for Ann Arbor Public Schools

**A. Vision (40 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The Ann Arbor Public Schools reform vision is focused on the implementation of eight core educational strategies that are intended to advance their mission statement. AAPS indicated that the method for deepening learning and accelerating achievement for participating

schools is to address the student's learning environment in the classroom and home. A few of the implementation initiatives mentioned were

- Personal technology-1:1 iPads or tablets for every participating student to ensure technological equity
- Alignment of curriculum to CCLS
- Every Day Math licensing
- Do the Math intervention curriculum
- School Media Centers as School-to-Home Education Hubs

Although, the educational strategies are delineated in the Strategic Plan the implementation process for several strategies is missing or vague. Strategy 4 in the Strategic Plan reads: We will ensure meaningful learning through effective instruction. The implementation steps are missing. Personalized learning environment is mentioned throughout the document. A detailed description or example of what it would look like is not presented.

Technology is described in the vision reform as being the vehicle for "scaling-up" the AAPS vision. Ann Arbor voters passed a technology bond to be implemented in three phases over ten years. Intervention methods include technology devices to ensure student access in the classroom and home. More specifically, providing students with the technology to create their own learning plans. Thus, AAPS proposes to use a portion of the RTT funds to purchase an iPad for every student.

The APPS reports that they continue to be a high performing school district and cited student scores on the ACT. Nine AAPS students scored a perfect 36 on the ACT with 113 students scoring 36 in one or more of the subcategories. Not mentioned is the racial and gender breakdown of the students. This is also true for the demographics of high school graduates. Additional data illustrate achievement gaps for subgroups in the focus schools. The APPS intends to address the disparity with the creation of The Achievement Gap Plan and the Discipline Gap Plan. The gains for African American students increased by a small percentage, however Caucasian students still outperformed them.

The inclusion of the School Improvement Plan, Achievement Gap Plan, Discipline Gap Plan along with the RTT proposal are all very ambitious. A thorough description or visual to represent how the provisions of each plan will interface with one another, to ultimately accelerate student learning and implementation of personalized learning environments would be helpful.

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

**10**

**6**

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The AAPS selected the most economically challenged schools in their district. Their approach to implementing the proposed RTT initiatives did not address each specific subgroup at the participating schools.

Five elementary and one middle school are included in this application. The elementary schools by state standards are designated Focus Schools. They have the largest achievement gaps between the top 30% and the bottom 30% of all students. APPS provided the following: A list of the schools, number of students and teachers, and demographics and assessment data for participating schools.

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

**10**

**4**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

AAPS referenced strategic initiative number 5 as being the catalyst for expanding and enhancing professional development for all staff. Teachers who are proficient in the use of technology will be recruited to train and mentor novice teachers. Newly hired teachers will be trained in how to deliver instruction in engaging ways. Paraprofessionals, principals and special area teachers will also support the initiatives.

Several specific results outlined in strategic initiative 5 were accomplished. The outcome from each result was not discussed. Supporting evidence and explanations of whether the result data was positive or negative was missing. AAPS provided a general statement of the importance of enhancing the district professional learning system but no thorough step by step process of how the reform proposal would be scaled up to all staff.

Evidence of a high-quality and well defined process for scaling up the reform initiatives beyond the participating schools is sparse.

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

**10**

**7**

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

AAPS intends to implement several computer based programs, formative and summative assessment instruments, and instructional strategies to alleviate the achievement gap and increase the graduation rate. However, a thorough description of the implementation steps for the strategies is not documented. AAPS stated that the goal for proficiency is a 20% gain in proficiency rates for all students in

the identified sub-groups using both the MEAP and NWEA MAP assessment for Mathematics and Reading. The goal is an annual 3 point increase for students who are not at the proficient level.

Data presented illustrate that AAPS is slowly narrowing the achievement gap. AAPS cited improvement on the Michigan Merit Exam for 11th graders. More specifically, a small increase in math and reading for African American and Hispanic students, who were consistently performing low. At the elementary level reading scores are gradually improving for the grade bands. Reading proficiency for African American and Hispanic students in grade 3 drops significantly in comparison to Caucasian and Asian students;and continues to decline thereafter.

Current graduation rate for AAPS is 89.7%, with a 93.6% rate for Caucasian students, a 75.7% rate for African American students, a 87 % rate for Hispanic or Latino students, a 75.6 % rate of graduation for students receiving special education services, and 74.4% rate of graduation for students who are economically disadvantage.

The AAPS analysis of gaps in the achievement data as it related to specific subgroups resulted in a systemic reform of its K-12 literacy program. This was evident in the extensive academic data presented for each participating school. The use of data for allocating resources to inform instruction is implemented district-wide. AAPS states that creating a personalized learning environment for every student will be implemented through the use of 21st Century technology, project based learning, and students' use of a curriculum that is tailored to their skills and speed of content mastery.

Overall, achievement results are low but are gradually improving. The vision that AAPS has put forth and the inclusion of supplemental plans to support the goals are ambitious but emphasize a state of urgency for the most high-need students.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>AAPS reported slow but consistent growth for the identified participating subgroups. This evidence is illustrated in the charts, raw student data and narrative descriptors presented in this document. It is unclear whether there are specific needs unique to each of the participating schools that impedes student learning. High School graduation rates illustrate baseline data for subgroups and yearly anticipated goals. The 2011-12 graduation data was not available.</p> <p>Students in middle and high school have access to their achievement data 24/7 through Power School. At the elementary level NWEA has a component that will provide parents a detailed description of their child's areas of strength and weakness. However, there is no evidence of parents having the ability to currently access data. AAPS plans to obtain a tablet for every participating student and train them to use it as a tool for accessing the curriculum, monitoring their progress, sharing data with parents, and developing a portfolio of their work.</p> <p>Because the academic gains are incremental and the achievement gap remains, AAPS believes that funding from RTT will enhance the intervention supports through technology tools provided by their service vendors. AAPS emphasized that the district sustained a 20 year public conversation with stakeholders regarding academic performance for all students but did not discuss the contents.</p> <p>Overall, the evidence presented demonstrates a history of recognition for specific schools and programs in AAPS. However, AAPS continues to recognize that there are buildings designated Focus Schools.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>AAPS prides itself on their reputation for obtaining the 2012 "Sunny Award" for transparency in financial reporting. APPS is committed to providing transparent fiscal information to all stakeholders and community. Information is required to be in an easily accessible format on the district website. AAPS is currently developing a format for making building level financial reports available to the public. If funded the AAPS will include the ongoing implementation process and status of RTT on their district website. AAPS also identified the Executive Director of Grants and the district webmaster as individuals responsible for posting and maintaining current RTT information.</p>		

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Evidence for this criterion were referenced in the Michigan Revised School Code, detailing the general powers of the school district. APPS included this information in the text and appendix. However, APPS did not describe how specific contents of the Michigan Revised School Code would affect the implementation of personalized learning environments.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>AAPS describes a process for engaging key stakeholders but not a thorough description of the role each played in the development of this proposal and how their feedback was utilized in any revisions of the document as evident in the following statements:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"Through our community partners, we have developed an open dialogue with parents and other stakeholders. Ann Arbor Public Schools has a committed Parent Teacher Organization Council (PTOC), made of representatives from each school's parent group. This leadership body has been very effective in getting our message out about impending budget cuts, achievement challenges and best practices for home-to-school-partnership. We have made a concerted effort to draw partners and students in to each phase of the planning process"</p> <p>There is a formal process for engaging each collective bargaining unit. AAPS notes that there is a respectful and cohesive relationship with their teachers union. Therefore, district committees are highly representative of members from these units. Detailed evidence to support the meaningful engagement of parents, and students in the RTT application process, when applicable; such as, meeting agendas, calendar of RTT public meetings, sign-in sheets, student and parent surveys or flyers were not documented. The names of only two parents were listed on the AAPS District Improvement Plan Stakeholders Roster. There is an existing Parent Involvement Policy and a Parent Engagement Toolkit. How effectively they are used in engaging a diverse group of parents is not described. Letters of support from a few stakeholders and officials were submitted.</p>		
<b>(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>An analysis of current data depicts a wide range of academic levels for AAPS students. AAPS addressed the varying levels by focusing on systemic reform of its K-12 literacy program. Reading progress and achievement are reported through multiple assessment measures at the elementary and secondary levels. Tables illustrating proficiency levels were included in this document. However, AAPS plans for addressing the non-academic needs and achievement gaps of participating subgroups did not include a coherent and comprehensive description of the personalized learning environments.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>AAPS goals for developing a personalized learning environment for every student will be implemented through the use of 21st century technology skills, project based learning, and individualized curriculum that focuses on their speed of content mastery.</p> <p>The vision and plan articulated in this application provides goal statements for personalized learning environments. Although parents will have access to training and their child's data in each school's media center; the challenge for AAPS is to articulate an effective step by step process that is inclusive of parents and students in designing the personalized learning environment.</p>		

Approaches describing the type of student involvement in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest; access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts; development of learning goals; high quality content in addition to instructional software; training for students and accountability for equipment; a protocol for engaging students in feedback and self- reflection; and an analysis of personal data are not thoroughly developed. The goals and implementation process presented in this section are vague.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

AAPS expects to add substantial technology and instructional resources for students and teachers to support academic and professional learning. AAPS selected several systems and tools to provide students with access to 21st century technology and usage. Through the use of these technologies teachers will have immediate access in real time to student data. Thus, providing them with knowledge of the learners' strengths, weaknesses and instructional intervention strategies. Teachers will be trained to work with parents.

AAPS intends to create subject -specific leadership groups that will spread their skill and training district-wide. Additionally, AAPS proposes creating a Math Leadership Academy. In October 2012, Toyota Motor Corporation selected AAPS as a partnership to pilot a new international math and science focus. Teachers will have the opportunity to travel to Singapore and learn about their educational system. Collaborations have also included local universities to support on-going professional learning for teachers.

Overall, AAPS articulated numerous goals and strategies that rely heavily on the use of technology. The teacher, principal and superintendent evaluation instruments were also included in this application but not referenced in this criterion. Each school has control over whether or not to employ mastery learning objectives. How this decision will affect the RTT initiatives targeting teaching and learning is not documented.

AAPS notes that each student will be provided the ability to progress at their own pace, with teacher support that can ensure mastery at many intervals. Missing is a thorough explanation describing how the content and instruction will be adapted to ensure that students will be engaged in common and individual tasks, discussion, and project-based learning.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

Although, AAPS describe their infrastructure as traditional; yet a flexible hierarchy, school buildings function autonomously in the development of their calendar and daily schedule. They are responsible for their building-level budgets and implementation of school improvement funds. The roles and responsibilities of faculty and staff are established at the building level. Overall, AAPS identify the infrastructure and supports that exist but lack a coherent plan that thoroughly describes how learning for all participating students will be achieved; thus ensuring college and career readiness. AAPS does not provide evidence of any one initiative or program to address the needs of ELL.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

AAPS recognize the challenges of providing multiple pathways for parents to partner with their child's school. Do the math modules will be presented in English and Spanish for parents and students. Students will have access to content, tools and resources. AAPS will provide parents and students with access to the data systems to export their information in an open data format and use data in other electronic learning systems. Training will be available to parents during the week and on weekends at each participating school. If funded, AAPS intends to integrate human resource data, budget data and an instructional improvement system data; all available for parents to access. AAPS identify an array of initiatives to support the infrastructure in participating schools. However, the logistics to ensure that parents, students, teachers and other stakeholders have ongoing access to technology supports, learning tools and data have not been clearly defined .

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>AAPS provided the following evidence for E1:</p> <p>Executive Director and evaluation team of the RTT-D project will survey participants and their families, track responses of principals and staff, monitor and maintain student achievement data via the proposed technology tools.</p> <p>Access to the Media Center at each school for parents, families and the community.</p> <p>Parents, students and staff will be able to provide feedback through Compass Learning, Every Day Math Online, and Do the Math work tools.</p> <p>The technology tools proposed in the application are intended to fill important gaps in the District's Strategic Plan and lend a seamless articulation of learning pathways, services and supports for all learners, especially those at risk.</p> <p>Teachers and administrators will participate in professional development in the Six Developmental Pathways, Culturally Responsive Teaching and Cooperative Discipline.</p> <p>Measuring and monitoring of social emotional progress of students is determined by the report card system and not inclusive of other non academic indicators to identify needs.</p> <p>Several measures have been identified for monitoring the social/emotional progress of students, such as, narrative statements were provided in the text. Lastly, beyond the grant, the majority of expenses will be absorbed by the district. For example, the Media Centers, online components for Compass Learning and Scholastic will be included in the operating budget. The strategies proposed by AAPS reflect a continuous improvement process.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>AAPS proposes a three fold strategy for communication and engagement with stakeholder as: The establishment of Media Centers at each participating school to be used as community hubs for parents, students and families; access to technology for parents, students and teachers to provide feedback on the usage of technology tools; and the use of the district website, Board of Education meetings and PTO meetings to disseminate information.</p> <p>AAPS has identified communication and engagement strategies that provide multiple paths for parents and staff to be involved and access information. AAPS will need to research non traditional strategies that will increase participation of all families, as evident in the lack of full participation in the RTT process.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>AAPS state that their goals are aggressive yet attainable. AAPS anticipate improving the graduation rate by a 2% increase each year. AAPS also identified the social emotional development data of students in grades kindergarten through five and the connection to academic achievement. Teachers and administrators engaged in examining discipline data. Data is collected and monitored three times a year on specific behavioral tasks. Teachers and administrators were encouraged to explore alternative methods to suspension. Included in this application are examples of professional development related to social emotional behavior. However, AAPS did not articulate how they would improve each measure over time; and if needed, methods for addressing insufficient areas.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>AAPS intends to employ the services of an independent evaluation team to assist in determining a process for assessing RTT program investments. Ongoing feedback will be solicited from parents, students educators and administrators via online surveys and informal</p>		

focus groups. However, a thorough explanation on how each strategy would be monitored and evaluated to determine the effectiveness of RTT activities was not documented.

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The AAPS budget for this application is reasonable and sufficient to support the implementation of the proposal. A description of and rational for funds that will be used for one-time investments was explained in the application. In addition, all funds to support the RTT funds were reported. AAPS will seek financial sustainability support from local businesses and private donors. An in-depth narrative for sustainability after the grant was not demonstrated. Also, an alternative plan for taking into account that private and local donors may or may not provide financial support; and a consistently shrinking budget was not mentioned.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>AAPS identified the resources that would become part of the school or district operating budget. The main recurring expense will be the ongoing purchase and maintenance of the tablet component. AAPS is confident that the ten year technology bond monies will support the initiatives created in the RTT grant. Additional funds include private donations through local businesses and AAPS Educational Foundation. The AAPS proposed sustainability plan is relying on private donations and sponsorship that may or may not occur.</p>		

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Although, AAPS did not submit a thorough and comprehension narrative for this section, some evidence for several of elements in the CCPS are mentioned throughout the application. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For number 1, the APPS provide the following: The Ann Arbor Public Schools are also nurturing partnerships with stakeholders in the business community. Just this month(October 2012) we have received news that our district was selected by Toyota Motor Corporation as the only district in the nation to pilot a new international math and science focused program. This partnership will give secondary teachers and administrators at AAPS access to global educational leaders in Singapore, a country currently at the forefront of STEM initiatives. Teams of Ann Arbor’s curriculum implementation staff will have opportunities to travel to Singapore as soon as April 2013 and the following fall. The program will strive to bring Singapore’s successful instructional strategies back to Ann Arbor and eventually not only see</li> </ul>		

- measurable impacts of these techniques in AAPS, but spread best practices for STEM instruction nationwide. Toyota Technical Center is headquartered in Ann Arbor, and celebrates its 35<sup>th</sup> anniversary at the location this year. Toyota selected Ann Arbor partly because of its strong employee ties to the school district, but also because our district is already committed to international standards and has a rigorous STEM base to grow from. Toyota has announced a desire to hire 250 scientists and engineers in this locale within the next five years (p.107).
- Professional development for teachers and administrators in the areas of teaching and learning, and social emotional and behavioral needs of all students was described, such as the Six Developmental Pathways, Culturally Teaching and Cooperative Discipline, however specific service providers were not identified.
- 2) Evidence for number 2 include student achievement data charts and narratives illustrated in the application.
- 3) AAPS indicate that the resources from partnerships included in this application will provide ongoing professional development for educators in participating schools, For example, Scholastic is committed to ensuring the sustainability of their products beyond the RTT funding period. New staff will be trained in the use of the programs. Through anecdotal evidence, AAPS report that many of their most economically impacted families have a limited perception of their competence with current technologies and curriculum content. APPS will engage parents by training teachers to work with them, building a bond of trust through hands-on-work with students. A school based community center through each participating school media center will provide parents access to student data and trainings. APPS believes that the RTT plan provides learning resources and instructional practices that are accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and ELL. They have included assistive technology in the budget for 1:1 tablet implementation.
- 4) Evidence of a partnership or service provider integrating services targeted at the social emotional needs of students was not apparent in the application
- 5) AAPS described how the LEAs and partnerships will build the capacity of staff in each participation schools as defined in a-e above, in the following paragraph:  

Each of the identified tools and technologies identified in this application fills an important gap within our District’s Strategic Plan, leading to a seamless articulation of learning pathways, services, and supports for all learners, especially those at risk. Equal access to resources and learning opportunities is a critical component of our District Strategic Plan. In an effort to ensure that all students are able to engage in meaningful activities at an appropriate and challenging level, the District has identified a number of resources that fill important gaps in our current programming. These resources provide students and teachers with the opportunity to engage in learning both during the school day and beyond. In addition, the use of our Media Centers as a community access point would allow students, parents and community members the opportunity to engage within the school and with school staff in ways that do not currently exist. As we work to strengthen the partnerships within our community, this is an important step in opening a pathway for increasing parent involvement.

Each of the tools and resources will be monitored for academic impact at many points throughout the school years to ensure efficacy and to make appropriate adjustments in a timely manner. Teachers and administrators engage in Data Team discussions at grade levels and content areas to make deliberate and educated decisions regarding next steps (p.116).
- 6) To support number 6, the academic performance measures and goals for each participating school are illustrated in the Performance on Summative Assessment Tables (p.4-78)

**Absolute Priority 1**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

	Met/Not Met
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b>	
<p>The proposed RTT application submitted by Ann Arbor Public School (AAPS) system is ambitious. AAPS recognizes that the academic data reflects a slow gain. Therefore, throughout the application numerous strategies are articulated that are aggressive. The challenge for AAPS will be the coordination and effective monitoring of its plans.</p> <p>The AAPS stated that prior to RTT the district established ongoing public conversations with stakeholders regarding student achievement and individualized learning environments. Evident throughout this application are examples of student data that support the need to close the achievement gap between the lowest and highest performing students in the participating Focus schools. AAPS identified technology as the vehicle for students to obtain 21st century skills and the strand for developing individualized learning environments.</p> <p>Common Core learning standards, teacher, principal and superintendent evaluations, 21st century technological tools, Media Centers for parents and students, Math Academy, reading and math assessments, data systems, social emotional needs of students and professional development are just a few initiatives included in this application to support system-changing reform. AAPS Strategic Plan addresses strategies for recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers and administrators.</p>	

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>111</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0304MI-3 for Ann Arbor Public Schools

#### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant describes a cohesive vision centered around closing the gaps between the academic performance of students in its most economically disadvantaged schools and its other schools. The district serves a diverse student population with a fair number of high-achieving schools, but there is a persistent achievement gap between the target schools and others. The applicant's overall mission makes it a priority to ensure all students reach their potential, including those students in schools that have a higher number of economically disadvantaged students and those who in schools that consistently underperform the rest of the district. The applicant wants to devote substantial additional resources to the targeted schools to enable each student in those schools to develop and implement a personalized learning plan and to utilize a variety of technology solutions to do so. Each of the interventions identified aim to provide teachers with tools to tailor instruction to specific needs. This plan is wholly consistent with the district's prior stated intention to create personalized learning plans for each student and utilize technology to enable educators to differentiate learning and create a better home-school connection.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The Applicant has set forth a sound plan for implementing its vision. Applicant has selected target schools on the basis of the economic status of the students and their status as Focus Schools. Accordingly, the list of target schools includes both schools with the most economically disadvantaged students and some of the schools that have been identified by the state as having the largest achievement gaps between the top 30% and the bottom 30% of all students. The targeted schools and students who are being served in those</p>		

schools appear to be students in the district who need the most help to improve academic achievement. It is difficult to discern whether there are students in non-target schools who would be equally deserving of the assistance being provided to target schools. The application leaves several questions unanswered: (1) There are 21 other Focus Schools not included. The applicant has not provided any information concerning exactly how the six schools selected. Although the applicant states that the target schools are the most economically disadvantaged, there is no information to confirm the basis for that statement. It is unclear whether the selection was done on the basis of percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch or on some other measure. (2) It is unclear whether there are any schools in the district that were designated as Priority Schools. If so, the applicant does not include any rationale for excluding those schools.

However, because the local government has generated funding independent of the RTT funds to implement similar initiatives, non-participating students' needs will not be left unmet. Instead, they will be served at the same time and pace as the rest of the District rather than as part of the pilot.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The Applicant has adopted two initiatives that are aligned with the goals of the RTT proposal. The Achievement Gap Elimination Plan (AGEP) and to a lesser extent, the Discipline Gap: Gateway to Eliminating the Achievement Gap. The AGEP focuses on reforming the entire district, not only the target schools or those schools that have been identified as Focus Schools. The plan is completely consistent with the goals of the RTT application – a laser-like focus on implementing initiatives that narrow the achievement gap by maintaining a high level of academic achievement overall and utilizing personalized learning strategies to address the underlying causes of underperformance among students in target schools.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The goals are comprehensive and aligned with the stated vision for use of the RTT funds. Each of the goals includes a commitment to strong academic performance in each of the targeted schools as well as improved performance in each subgroup. The goals are also consistent across each of the six schools. For academic performance, the proposal includes goals for both proficiency, growth and separate goals for narrowing the achievement gaps. The applicant focuses on ensuring that students who are proficient continue to achieve at high levels and those who are not proficient make progress in an effort to reduce, but not wholly eliminate the gaps. Graduation rates and college enrollment levels are fairly high already, but willingness to include consistent goals that in light of starting point is ambitious.

Additionally, the goals are certainly achievable in that they are fairly modest in reach. Instead of promising an unrealistic end result, the proposals aims to narrow the achievement gaps gradually. The goals are ambitious in that they include goals for both proficiency and growth and apply to every school. Yet, the extent to which the proposal can be deemed ambitious is limited by the number of schools included. With only six of the 27 Focus Schools included, the goals overall are less impressive in that the reach is limited.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**  
 Applicant includes one year of data for students in high school and elementary school that demonstrate some success in improving achievement among African American students. There is no other data included about other subgroups or other years. Without that data it is impossible to determine if this is actually a trend or just one year of positive performance. While the awards received are laudable, they do not necessarily provide the type of information that would enable one to conclude that the applicant has had more overall success. Instead, the awards point to success in specific schools and based on unknown indicators. More data is needed. Also, the application does not indicate that applicant is prepared to provide parents and students the type of access that will be needed to enable the applicant to meet its goal of having families more engaged in student learning and improving the home-school connection. Access to achievement scores is good, but currently it does not sound like the infrastructure has been established to ensure ongoing access to student work or any systematic reporting of student performance.

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

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Although the applicant currently makes its budget information available in ways that comply with state laws and have garnered recognition within the state, the applicant does not currently make its budget expenditure data available at the school level. It indicated plans to do so and to create a website that includes specific information about the RTT application, spending and investments made with RTT funding.

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

**10**

**8**

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has demonstrated that it will have sufficient autonomy to implement its plans. The assistance that will be provided via the local funding initiative is a critical component of the overall plan. Having those resources available will likely ensure ongoing support for personalized learning and enhanced technology solutions throughout the district. None of the other information applicant provided suggests that there are existing state laws and regulations that might pose barriers to effective implementation.

**(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)**

**10**

**6**

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Applicant does not offer an explicit statement that the proposal has the approval of the teachers as represented by the collective bargaining unit (AAEA). The Strategic Plan suggests that teachers and parents were involved in sanctioning the applicant's planned focus on personalized learning environments and includes specific roles for groups that represent teachers and parents in implementation of the strategic plan. Overall, applicant relies more significantly on plans and intentions to engage stakeholders in the future than proof that it has already done so. The application includes sufficient proof of support within the community, however. The applicant points to various organization's involvement, like the leadership body of the Parent Teacher Organization Council.

**(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)**

**5**

**2**

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not identify any recent analysis of needs and gaps, nor does it set forth a plan for conducting an analysis. Instead applicant points to one year of data showing gaps analysis done 14 years ago. The applicant plainly has a good deal of data available to review and measure progress. However, the applicant does not explain how it will approach the analysis and what measures it will include to ensure that it continues to address root problems and make necessary adjustments in resource allocation and prioritization.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant plans to pursue its goal to prepare students for college and career by personalizing learning through the use of iPads (or an equivalent) and the Compass Learning Odyssey, a complete blended learning curricular program. The plan will enable the applicant to provide students with differentiated instruction and will offer regular feedback on student performance which should enable them to make data driven adjustments to instruction. The curriculum will likely meet needs with regard to critical academic content, as the curriculum is aligned to common core and state standards.</p> <p>However, the applicant does not indicate specifically that the curriculum is aligned to college readiness standards. There is one reference to ensuring that the curriculum is aligned to college and career readiness standards in the discussion of the budget. Without that information, it is difficult to conclude that implementation of the plan will ensure that students will acquire the skills identified in CRS. Additionally, there is no mention of how the program will expose students to diverse cultures or build upon the diversity of the student population that attends AAPS. The program includes some capacity to be adjusted to address the needs of special needs students. However, there is no substantive discussion of how the Compass Learning Odyssey program will be an effective lever to improve achievement for high need students.</p>		
<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		

The applicant intends to drive improved teaching and leading through the purchase of three separate programs. The first, Atlas Curriculum Mapping, is aimed at ensuring the curriculum teachers deliver is aligned to the common core. The second, Everyday Math online and Do the Math intervention modules, will provide training for teachers on how to effectively create a personalized learning environment in math. The third, will focus on training teachers to better engage parents using technology. The professional development that will accompany these programs are all likely to increase the effectiveness of teachers and improve their ability to create a personalized learning experience for each participating student. The resources that will be dedicated to strengthening the home-school connection is a critical piece of the overall plan. Without well-trained teachers who are dedicated to making sure students and their parents understand how the technology is to be used to improve student learning when students are home, efforts to develop a flipped classroom or otherwise deepen learning through use of apps and other online programming will be less effective.

The applicant makes no mention of how the district will monitor the progress of its teachers and administrators and whether they will be equipped with tools or placed within a system that identifies instructional issues and provides a means for course correction. There is no substantive discussion of how the applicant will increase the number of effective and highly effective teachers available to teach participating students. There is not enough information regarding the special program developed to evaluate how that program will impact participating students and the role applicant expects the program will play in enabling participating students to improve academically.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant indicates that the practices and policies that govern the district and its schools will provide participating schools the level of autonomy necessary to ensure faithful implementation of the proposal. Based on the information provided, it does not appear that there are any district practices or rules that would hamper implementation of the applicant's plan. The applicant stresses that each building principal and leadership team has substantial control over the school budget and school-wide initiatives. The autonomy, while important to ensure that each participating school is not precluded from implementing the proposed programs, raises questions about whether each participating school has committed to implementing the proposed initiatives. It is unclear whether schools will have the capacity to deviate from the RTT proposal. It also remains unclear whether there are any barriers to implementation to the blending learning program. The proposal to have the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent actively engaged with school level administrators seems aptly designed to ensure implementation at the school level and allocation of necessary resources and support from the District.		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> The technology being used is adaptable for special needs populations and the location of media centers at each participating schools will ensure that all students and families have access to the technological tools that will be so critical to applicant's ability to create an effective personalized learning environment. However, the applicant does not discuss how the district will ensure that each school has the necessary technical supports to operate the various technological solutions it intends to use to implement its plan. Additionally, although the applicant suggests that it will integrate all necessary systems upon receipt of the RTT grant, it does not include a detailed plan with specific goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties to make sure the plan is implemented.		

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant has not included a high quality plan that details how it will regularly collect data, monitor progress and publish updates on the progress of this initiative to stakeholders. Instead, the applicant focuses on its past history of using data to drive instructional decisions. That past history, however, has not been securely established in the application. Applicant makes references to previous studies, the strategic plan as well as plans to review performance on multiple occasions each year. The applicant has not spelled out who will participate in those reviews, what information will be included or how they will know whether the measures being utilized are sufficient. Although there is some indication that the district collects a lot of data regarding student achievement and barriers to learning, the application is missing a more comprehensively stated commitment to a continuous improvement process.		

<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant suggests that it will include relevant information regarding progress on the initiative on its website. The media centers at participating schools will also play a central role in ensuring that there is ongoing communication with students and families. Although it seems the media centers could be made more readily accessible if open on more than two days per week or on weekends, it is evident that applicant will utilize the media centers to connect with families and engage them in student learning.		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant includes a set of measures based on proficiency and growth for all participating schools and grade levels based on MEAP and NWEA scores. The applicant also includes goals for closing the achievement gap. The goal of increasing performance each year by multiple points for students who are not proficient is ambitious and achievable. The goals for narrowing the achievement gap are laudable. The applicant also includes a set of goals and measures that are tied to behavioral metrics, but there is insufficient information about how these metrics will be obtained and what observations and instruments will be used to conduct the measurements.		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b> Applicant indicates that it generally will collect data, review it and share it with stakeholders. The applicant also indicates that it plans to retain an outside consultant to assist it with identification of the appropriate evaluation tools. It does not identify the consultant who will be used, what the scope of the consultant's engagement will be or what expertise the consultant will have. Instead of a detailed plan with goals, deliverables and responsible parties assigned, the applicant places a substantial amount of the responsibility for meeting this requirement on the outside consultant.		

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> The budget meets the specific requirements given the number of students the applicant proposes to serve. The costs appear to be reasonable based on the investments the applicant intends to make to ensure that each participating school creates a personalized learning environment. The principal expenditures involve purchases of iPads (or equivalent) and licenses for technology solutions from reputable education technology solution companies.		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant will utilize the majority of the grant funds to make purchases of individual student technology, technology solution licenses and professional development designed to ensure effective implementation of its plan to create personalized learning environments for participating students. Most of these costs are one-time expenditures. For other costs, applicant indicates that they will be covered by local funds. The media centers will be paid for out of school budgets. The costs for technology solutions will be borne by the district as part of the operating budget and future costs for the technology itself will be paid for out of a local bond revenues. The applicant does not identify any state funds being dedicated to the proposal and does not provide any specifics about how it plans to ensure the costs of updating the student technology will be reasonable and can be covered by district funding.		

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score

<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
--	-----------	----------

**Absolute Priority 1**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>	<b>Met/Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has devised a plan that is consistent with the district's overall priorities to narrow achievement gaps and continue to improve overall achievement for all students by creating personalized learning environments for students. The plan to create personalized learning environments centers around giving students electronic tablets that will be loaded with curricular programs that will enable differentiated instruction and engagement by students and parents at home and school. The applicant will utilize RTT funds to purchase the tablets, as well as the critical technological support, curricular programs, professional development and personnel to implement each component of the initiative. The curricular programs being used will not only enable personalized learning, it will also facilitate the district's efforts to align the curriculum to common core and college readiness standards. The use of a program that focuses on strengthening the home-school connection is a vital component of the proposal in that it will ensure that the district's investment in technology resources benefits students when they are out of school and work to engage families in each student's academic program.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>132</b>
--------------	------------	------------