



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0944MI-1 for Chandler Park Academy

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: All of the reforms listed are good ideas, but they seem general. The proposal does not provide a detailed vision of what the personalized learning environments, uses of technology (tablets), project-based learning, multimedia tools, and performance-based assessments will consist of, how they will be used in conjunction with each other, and what additional learning opportunities they will provide to students.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: All students in all three of the charter schools -- elementary, middle, and high school -- were selected to participate. As such a table on the demographics of students at all three schools adequately answered parts a, b & c.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: This section effectively establishes national, and local needs: 1) the national need to improve workforce competitiveness by improving STEM education, 2) the national need to close the achievement gap between students from low-income and high-income families, particularly in STEM fields, and 3) the local need to raise the scores of students who are scoring significantly below students from other schools in the state. It wasn't clear how the project goals of: 1) improving teacher and principal effectiveness, 2) accelerating student learning (especially in math and science) and 3) increasing the number of students who graduate from high school prepared for college and career success, was going to specifically address those needs. The proposal simply restated the needs in goal form without saying how those goals would be met. Similarly, "access to resources that facilitate teaching and learning -- i.e. tablet computers, interactive whiteboards, and web-based programs," would probably be valuable to teachers and students, but it isn't clear how they will use these resources or how these resources will help the school meet the needs established in the first part of the section.		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: Goals are articulated clearly. But it wasn't clear how the goals articulated in A3 were likely to result in meeting these goals of improved student learning and performance. Some of this score was due to lack of clarity in section A3.		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	4
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: In place of a clear record of success on the listed criteria, the proposal presented a general plan for use of testing data to inform faculty development.		

Student scores on MEAP, ACT, PLAN, and other tests were significantly lower than those of other students in the state. Goals for improvement were articulated in section A4, but there was little evidence of improvement on tests to date. Changes to the MEAP "cut" scores (raised proficiency targets) made it difficult to determine improvement on state tests, but students from CPA seemed to score similarly below their state counterparts in both the old and new "cuts." The pattern was similar for other tests, such as the ACT.

Section B1 presented a general description of how the CPA was using various tests, and was using the data "to engage teachers in the interpretation and analysis of the numbers" through whole-staff, grade-level, and/or departmental "forums." Little or no evidence was given on how the CPA had "achieved ambitious and significant reforms."

Similarly, the only evidence given on how the district had the "ability to make student performance data available to students . . . and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services" was a statement that "a School Annual Education Report is sent to the parents and guardians of Chandler Park Academy families" and that "the most recent MEAP results are given."

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The proposal details that CPA holds a Budget Hearing each June and discloses a general budget. There was no evidence that it provided personnel salaries, or that it aggregated the salary expenditures as required by (b) and (c). There was no evidence that the district had alternate means of making school-level expenditures public for those who could not attend the June meeting.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The proposal states that the CPA is in compliance with all state requirements.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 The three principals met. Two teachers from each building -- the elementary, middle, and high school -- collaborated in two separate working groups for two days, and then presented the project to their colleagues. There are also appendixes of signed support from over 90% of teachers in each building. Parents were surveyed. The appendix contains letters of support from a parent and from several educational organizations that interact with the school.
 Engagement seemed present, but not extensive.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant has identified a gap in science and mathematics. This section provides data that shows low test scores in these areas. But it doesn't provide a description of how these gaps will be addressed (apart from a general focus on STEM).

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 The proposal lists several strategies for personalized learning environments (Pleas) that sound promising, but still seem general and don't seem integrated.
 The student progress teams consisting of the student, parent(s), one teacher, and one counselor sound promising, as does the use of an increased focus on multiple intelligences. Although the proposal states that these will be used, it provides very little

detail about how they will be implemented with students. Similarly, the proposal lists opportunities for individual instruction via tablet learning, small group instruction, individualized instruction, a Career Day, and experiential learning, but it doesn't detail a comprehensive curriculum or pedagogy that would employ all these methods and resources. The only concrete example of individualized curriculum involved using the game "Operation" to introduce concepts of anatomy to a kindergartner who wants to be a doctor, but anyone familiar with that game might wonder how much using tweezers to remove an "Adam's apple," "spare rib," or "brain freeze" might teach a child about human anatomy.

Mostly, the strategies described in this section are all pedagogically sound, but the section seems to present a list of possible strategies, rather than an integrated plan to improve student performance through personalized instruction. Because of this, while there is some evidence that the proposal would start to meet criteria a ii, b i, b iv A & b iv B, it isn't clear how meeting these criteria would generate the outcomes required in criteria a i, ii, iii, & v, b ii, v, and c.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There are plans for educator training in STEM and other topics that are consistent with the schools' previous trainings and current goals. In addition, they plan to have a five-day teacher's academy that will focus on strategies for creating personalized learning environments (PLEs) [a i, a ii, c]

A cornerstone of the proposal involves the use of tablets for each student and teacher, combined with programs such as Study Island and Edline, that will help personalize instruction for each student and provide teachers with real-time data on each student's progress [a iii, b i, bii, b iii, c i, & c ii]. These programs and technology will be used to provide individualized curricula to students and frequent assessment data to teachers. But the proposal doesn't thoroughly describe how the data will specifically be used to create processes and tools that meet student needs [a iv, and b iii].

Part d is only addressed in a two-sentence statement that highly-effective teachers will serve as mentors and share best practices.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a & b) The proposal describes how CPA will use a Project Director, Data Coordinators, and instructional Specialists to help implement its reforms.

c & d) The proposal discusses the use of PLEs for all students, which will be accomplished by allowing students to move through "learning centers" and project-based and collaborative learning activities. It states that teachers will employ "alternative ways of assessing by providing varying opportunities for students to demonstrate their understanding of subject matter."

c) The proposal describes an "articulation system" for eighth grade students to earn high school credit, and for high school students to earn credit at a local college.

d) The proposal explains that "assistive software that levels the 'learning field' for students with disabilities will be acquired."

e) The proposal discusses using these strategies to meet 21st Century learning goals and to monitor students, disseminate textbooks and other materials.

While the proposal addresses all the the criteria in a general way, it doesn't fully articulate what the exact curriculum will be, and it seems to have goals but not an integrated plan to meet them.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This proposal focuses on providing each student and teacher with a tablet and accompanying software to individualize

curriculum. This system would make content more accessible to students, parents, and teachers. It isn't completely clear what the content will consist of, apart from a focus on STEM. Apart from receiving training in using tablets, it isn't completely clear what resources and information they will use the tablets to access apart from basic grades, scores, and work. Because of the general nature of these proposals, it is unclear what ensuring students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders will have access to [a]. It states that students and parents will use tablets, but doesn't provide a plan for technical support and maintenance [b]. It does state that parents will receive training on data analysis and using tablets, and that they will have access to student data on the tablets through the Administrator's Plus program, and that students will be able to create electronic portfolios. [c]. The Administrator's Plus program provides some evidence of a plan to use inter operable data systems, but the plan is not described apart from this brief statement.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The proposal states that there will be Monthly Project Milestone Meetings and that the Project Director, principals and assistant principals, literacy specialists, and Instructional specialists and teacher consultants will provide ongoing feedback, recommendations, and professional development. There is not a more detailed plan to monitor the uses of tablets, pedagogical reforms, or collection of student score data, or to monitor how those reforms could further contribute to students' learning opportunities.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: This section briefly added to the previous section by stating that the project would be updated weekly at staff meetings, in reports to the Board of Directors, newsletters to parents, and a link on the district website. Furthermore there would be parent and family workshops, career expos, and open houses. While the proposal made clear that information would be communicated, it didn't make clear what information would be communicated.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: The proposal provides numerous tables with detailed growth targets on multiple testing and other measures. But it does not include a narrative that answers parts a, b, & c.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: The proposal stated that it will use a "broad range of tools" to determine: 1) the extent to which teachers develop a greater understanding of the Common Core standards, b) the extent to which teachers develop the content expertise and pedagogical skill to personalize instruction, c) the extent to [which] principals implement personalized learning environments and STEM education, and d) the extent to which students are on track for being college and career ready. It also states that "Evaluators will provide data briefs on each data collection activity within two weeks of the completion of data collection." While the proposal states it will take these measures, it doesn't explain how they will measure these goals or what data they will collect. Since most of the measures described in the previous section involved goals on tests, it isn't clear how the district will evaluate goals that cannot be measured by test scores.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

The budget is in sufficient detail. Additional funding sources, such as Title I A and Section 3 1 a funds are also included. c ii isn't described in detail. Because the proposal included a large variety of goals and initiatives, there were numerous and varied expenditures. The proposal seemed to be for a broad collection of improvements to the school rather than for a specific and detailed reform.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The budget plans for 4 years. It is not clear how they will maintain or replace technology such as tablets after that. Presumably, pedagogical changes such as multiple intelligences and project-based learning could continue long after the project, but this is not discussed in this proposal.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

None given.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The application primarily discusses using tablets to personalize instruction while teaching 21st Century skills.

Total	210	114
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0944MI-2 for Chandler Park Academy

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Chandler Park Academy District (CPA), a K-12 charter school district chartered by Saginaw Valley State University, presents a coherent vision to restructure its educational program with a focus on personalized learning that will prepare all the district's students for success in college and careers. The district notes that project components align with the four core

educational assurance areas.

The CPA District articulates a realistic approach that is designed to address the academic needs of all students K-12. The project's components reflect personalized learning environments where each student will have an Educational Development Plan (EDP) beginning in kindergarten; the use of technology to construct lessons, deliver instruction, assess student progress, and give students resources adapted to their individual needs and learning styles; a strengthened curriculum in alignment with Common Core State Standards and ACT College Readiness Standards; and increased opportunities for students to pursue individual interests, with a special emphasis on STEM areas, where women and minority populations have low representation.

The vision includes teacher professional development as a key component to advance student achievement but is not specific in terms of assuring and assessing teacher and teaching effectiveness.

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

10

8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Chandler Park Academy (CPA) District gives a clear picture of the district and the groups of students and educators who will participate.

The district, consisting of three schools (elementary, middle and high schools) located on the same campus, bordering Detroit. The CPA has an enrollment of 2,448 students, more than 80% of whom come from low-income families and are considered high need. All students in the district will participate in the project. The application provides a table listing participating schools with the total number of participating students and educators, and the numbers of participating students from low-income families and the number designated high-need. The district does not discuss how its selection of all students will support implementation of the project.

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

10

6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

All CPA District students and schools will participate in the project with its impact monitored, assessed and incorporated district-wide. The district's plan and logic model presents a broad but incomplete picture of how the project will support district-wide improvement for students and embed reform throughout the district.

The district's proposal, citing the lagging proficiency of its students in math and science along with national data showing the nation's low performance in international comparisons, does make a strong case for the project's focus on increasing STEM education and career exposure in elementary and secondary schools, particularly to address underrepresentation of women and minority population in STEM careers. The district's curricula in these areas will increase in rigor with alignment to the Common Core State Standards.

The district's plan articulates goals and activities to improve teacher and principal effectiveness, accelerate student learning especially in math and science, and increase college and career readiness. Specific components are not evenly addressed in relevant areas on implementation, timelines are not clear for all elements of implementation, nor are the specific parties responsible for particular reforms.

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

10

8

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The CPA district will implement the project in all schools in the district. It provides varied targets for student achievement and growth in performance (an ambitious 10% year over year for grades 3-8; 5% for high school), describes the methodology for determining growth, and explains the reasons for the different projected targets. The district acknowledges that the 10% growth projected is higher than the historical pattern. "It is viewed to be achievable because of the implementation of personalized learning environments for all students," but no specific evidence supporting that view is provided.

The district uses a combination of State, district and national assessments appropriate to grade to assess performance and growth in areas of English/Language Arts, Math, Science, and college and career readiness. The project will employ a specific kindergarten readiness tool, and several measures used in secondary school are geared to assessing aspects of college and career readiness (the PLAN and ACT national assessments; Workkeys, a jobs skills assessment). The district is responsive in presenting the student data and projections disaggregated by grade and relevant subgroups, including gender, since one of the aims of the reform is to increase performance and participation of girls in math and science.

The district provides baseline and goal projections of graduation rates for each year through 2016-17 (post-grant) and for

each of the relevant subgroups. Achievement gap data are provided by year and by gender, as are baseline and projections for graduation rate improvements and college enrollment. The district expects to meet the 100% graduation target this year. College enrollment also is high and projected to increase for each subgroup by 1% annually.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The CPA district details deliberate and extensive efforts that utilize data to inform all aspects of everyday instruction and how that approach has fostered improved student learning and achievement over the last few years. All instructional staff is engaged in data-based decision making using state, district, school and classroom assessments. The district makes sure they are prepared to engage in the process, and able to understand and analyze individual student and classroom performance data by providing experience with all levels of data and guides to help with interpretation and analysis. The district focuses on ensuring that critical areas of need identified through performance assessments are addressed in the curriculum, and communication about the curriculum is encouraged across grade levels and the district as a whole. Students achieving at low levels and their teachers receive targeted additional support. It is unclear how students overall and parents are engaged in the process.</p> <p>A range of evidence supports the approach and improved student results. Examples of Instructional guides, best practice directions and other submitted materials illustrate the district's focus and measured approach. Student results on State assessments show improved student achievement in English/Language Arts and Math since 2008 for elementary students. The district does not identify any of its schools as low-achieving. All schools in the district made adequate yearly progress in 2011 and 2012, and the middle schools have made Adequate Yearly Progress in reading and mathematics for the past 9 years. The district publishes the results in an annual report and provides various information on its website.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district provides an outline of expenditures for the district and the local budget process but does not describe how it makes publicly available the required information on school-level expenditures or refer to a source which might contain that information.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The CPA district is an independent, autonomous charter school district under Michigan law. The district reports compliance with federal and state curriculum requirements and has demonstrated improved student progress at all school levels, including making adequate yearly progress in all schools for the past two years.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Proposal development does not reflect engagement of the full range of considered stakeholders. It engaged teachers and principals from each of its 3 schools, as well as parents, and partner organizations in various ways. The district did not report student participation or input that would lend support to the proposed personalized learning approach. Teachers were the most engaged in a collaborative fashion through participation in two Working Groups to address particular sections of the proposal. The district surveyed parents and sent partner organizations the project abstract and solicited support.</p> <p>The charter district does not have collective bargaining representation. The district provides signed support from more than the required 70% of each schools teachers and letters of support from a parent, and partner organizations.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The CPA district describes the data that reflects current gaps and needs (e.g., proficiency levels of CPA students lower than their Michigan counterpart in all subjects, especially mathematics and science), but does not describe a separate plan or include reference to existing efforts or system geared to the analysis of needs and gaps. The data-driven instructional efforts that the district employs do lend support the identification of areas of student need and gaps in the curriculum, and ways to tackle.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The CPA district describes a broad and multi-faceted plan to meet the goals of accelerating student learning, especially in mathematics and science, and to increase the number of students who graduate from high school prepared for college and career success. The plan does not provide complete details required by a high quality plan.

The district does explain that the elements (alignment to rigorous common core State standards; creation of Educational Development Plans for all students and establishment of personalized learning environments using technology; differentiated instruction, age-appropriate career-related experiential learning activities, web-based career development and project-based learning) individually and collectively will contribute to deepened student learning and college and career readiness. The district cites a variety of research in support of these approaches that will serve to enrich the current data-driven instructional strategies by engaging students directly and dynamically in advancing their own learning based on their interests and quality experiences. The proposal does not clearly describe the training students will need and receive to track and manage their learning, only that they will receive some.

The district importantly notes that the project will reach all students in age- and developmentally appropriate ways. Kindergarten students who express interest in a career field, for example, will learn about it through games and picture books. High school students have the opportunity to participate in a dual enrollment program with a community college. The district plans supplemental support for students who are struggling that would build on the additional support that is currently provided.

The district describes a limited approach to access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives relying solely on coursework exposure.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	9
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The CPA district presents a plan that contains several important elements to increase the capacity of educators to improve teaching and leading that will support all students graduating and becoming prepared for college and careers. The project's implementation schedule give a good overview of the array of activities. The description provided for plan elements -- training on specific content issues for implementation (emphasis on math and science), learning new approaches to instruction and monitoring student progress (e.g., personalized learning environments and educational development plans) and learning new technologies -- vary in detail and raise questions about implementation. CPA district educators have experience with a data-driven instructional approach that has shown success. However, the components of the proposed project represent a number of new moving parts that have to work together well for successful implementation. The planned week-long teacher training that will cover many different aspects of the project may not be sufficient to ensure that teachers understand all the issues and techniques sufficiently to implement the project and to support students in their changing roles as well.

The district does not describe its teacher evaluation system in adequate detail to convey how it differentiates performance or is used to improve instruction in the district. The district notes that all teachers and principals have Individual Development Plans "to help them develop their skills and achieve their career goals," with annual modification. The district's plan for the grant indicates that student and classroom data will be used to measure teacher effectiveness, but does not describe how that takes place currently or will be structured for the grant.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district does not completely describe how its infrastructure and authority will operate to implement the project. The district plans to establish a Project Management Team (Project Director, 4 Data Coordinators, and 4 part-time math and science Instructional Specialists) to oversee implementation of the project, monitor its progress and impact, and provide project-related services and supports to teachers and schools. The district does not specify if overall authority for the project and its budget will rest with the central office or the Project Management Team and how those functions, as well as reporting (fiscal and other), will be carried out.</p> <p>The lines of responsibility and authority are clearer at the school level where administrators and educators have authority and responsibility for implementing the project. Administrative staff in each school collaborate and have capability to determine calendars and schedules, which they can adjust to meet student needs.</p> <p>The district does not specify policy that allows credit based on demonstrated mastery, although teachers will be encouraged to explore alternatives. Dual enrollment opportunities for high school students are available. The district's plan to address accessibility issues for students with disabilities by acquiring assistive software may or may not be sufficient, depending on what other tools and instructional accommodations are already in place and what the new plans might require.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district has an effective mechanism to provide needed tools to all students engaging in the project. The grant will support each student having a tablet computer with instructional applications that accommodate individual needs and is a good resource to support personalized learning.</p> <p>Training will be provided but the adequacy of the training and the time to provide it are not clear for teachers and others who will assist students, and for the students themselves, who also have to learn the technology and data systems and use them in acquiring content, monitoring progress and employing the resource beneficially overall. Students will have access to a range of supports -- their teachers, classroom peers and other, and online assistance. Parent will be able to access student information as well.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district provides a confusing and inadequate description of plans for continuous improvement.</p> <p>The district identifies a Project Advisory Team, different from the Project Management Team that will include the Project Director, school leaders and teachers from each school, and an evaluator. This Team will track the progress of the project. Roles and functions are generally identified, but do not address evaluation adequately. The district indicates that project successes will be documented to "replicate best practices," but does not specify what would be the subject of documentation, how such documentation would be accomplished or how it would be shared with stakeholders and the wider public.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district does not have a full-fledged communications and engagement strategy. Several activities are identified to distribute information: weekly updates on the project in staff meetings across the district, regular reports to the Board, and newsletters to parents. The district will place information on its website, and feature in parent and family workshops and other events.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The CPA district identifies 14 reasonable performance measures based on the project's goals, but does not address how it will review and improve measures over time in order to ensure the effectiveness of measures to assess progress and inform</p>		

improvements.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district describes a limited plan to evaluate the effectiveness of investments. The effort will rely on data from a variety of inquiry and performance assessments. These include surveys of students, teachers and administrators, and the performance and other indicators that the district has presented for the evaluation overall. It is unclear how measures will be improved, if needed.

The district indicates that evaluators will prepare data briefs to report findings, although it is unclear who will be considered an evaluator (and whether they are beyond members of the Advisory Team that is identified to oversee this process and has one designated evaluator). The applicant proposes more comprehensive analysis and reporting every six months.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The CPA district's budget identifies all funds that will support the project that include Federal Title I and State funds that support individual or small group tutoring to struggling students. The budget is clearly presented and comports with the goals of the proposed project.

Given the needs for teacher training and support, and related support to students especially around the use of technology for personalized planning and learning, the proposed resource allocation may or may not be sufficient. A one-time investment in tablet computers, and software will support project implementation for students to improve learning in personalized environments and for teachers and staff to assist them and create new systems throughout the district is highlighted.

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

10

4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district presents a limited sustainability plan. It appropriately takes into account the benefits of beginning early in in kindergarten and the expected improvements in student achievement and learning overall in helping to make the case for sustainability. Students will have new strategies and tools to via personalized learning environments to gain great interest in and direct their own learning. The district plans to document those improvements and seek additional funding from public and private resources to sustain the effort. The application does not detail a plan.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The application does not contain a competitive preference priority.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The CPA district applicant meets the priority based on its current practices of data-driven instruction and improvements. The district threads throughout the application and the plans for the project the overarching goals to strengthen opportunities for students to improve their learning and achievement through the establishment of personalized learning environments, along with the focus on college and career readiness with attention to STEM areas.

Total	210	111
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0944MI-3 for Chandler Park Academy

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's goals are ambitious, clear and specific with explicit strategies to accomplish goals which are aligned to the four core educational reform areas. The primary goal of the project is to strengthen the relationship between educators and students. The Applicant presented areas in which the plan will personalize learning environments for all Kindergarten through 12th grade students to address their academic needs in the following areas: (1) classrooms will be restructured (2) technology will be used by teachers to construct and deliver instruction and access student understanding of content (3) students will be equipped with technology to help them manipulate tools and have access to resources to accommodate individual learning styles. (4) instructional strategies will be expanded to include performance-based assessments (5) STEM Education will be enhanced (6) extended day activities will be available to students (6) beginning with Kindergarten, each student will have an Educational Development Plan to guide them in selecting careers.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant showed evidence of the plan's approach in implementing the program. A table was provided depicting the School District Demographics. The data reveals a need for funding due to the number of high-need students which totals 2,079.1 out of the district's total of 2,448 students of which 83% are eligible for free or reduce lunch. The Applicant listed participating schools but there was not evidence that a process was used in selecting schools to participate in the plan. 		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant provided evidence of implementing Summative Assessments that will provide immediate feedback for helping teachers and students during the learning process. The Summative Assessments are implemented at each grade level throughout the school year. The Applicant cited conditions that justified the plan's need which are: Achievement levels for Michigan students in Mathematics and Science are very low which are noted on Tables: 2011 MEAP Mathematic Proficiency and MEAP Science Proficiency. The Applicant provided evidence of the plan's methodology for determining student growth over the course of the project. The SY 2010-11 MEAP data will serve as a baseline for determining student growth for 3rd and 9th grade students and 		

monitoring the growth trend measured by MEAP for the previous three years which average 3% in Mathematics, Reading, Writing, Science and Social Studies.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant describes it's Performance Measures on summative assessments at each grade level throughout the school year. The 2010-2011 MEAP data serves as the baseline for determining student achievement growth (grades 3-9 and grades 10-12) over the four years of the project.
- . The Applicant provided achievement growth rate charts however evidence was not noted in the three school district's graduation and college enrollment rates.

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	8

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant provided evidence of advancing student learning over a four year span which is noted in the school's performance data. All instructional staff are involved in data-based decision making ,communicaion and articulation about the curriculum which is a high priority for the entire district.
- . The Applicant did not address how the lowest-achieving and low-performing students will achieve the ambitious and significant reform in the plan.
- . The Applicant did not show evidence of how student performance data will be made available to students and parents.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant has provided evidence in the plan for increasing transparency in the school district's practices, processes and investments. Budget hearings will be held at the Board of Directors meetings to present the budget at the end of each year of the grant funding. Beginning of the school year, each school will host meetings to present the budgets both federal and state funded.
- . The Applicant provided a chart that outlined the district's expenditures (Personnel and Non- Personnel expenditures)

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant provided evidence of successful conditions, autonomy and state, legal statutory reguatory requirements to meet the plans goals to implement the personalized learning environments. The districts are in compliance with federal and state curriculim requirements and have made their school's yearly API.
- . The Applicant cited the school district's successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal,statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments as followa : 1. All three of the district's schools (elementary, middle, high) have made yearly progress in 2011 and 2012. 2. The district has shown a 96% and 99% high school graduation rate for the first two years of their high school, 3. The school district has established effective communication among all three schools, 4. The school district has made and followed detailed plans to make and exceed adequate yearly progress (AYP).

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant provided evidence of the stakeholder's participation in the development of the plan. Signatures of the teaching staff were shown that indicated their support of the plan.
- . The LEA's collective bargaining representation was not evident in the plan.

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

5

4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant identified the needs and gaps that the plan will address which are: (1) the proficiency levels of the three school district's students are lower than their Michigan counterparts in all subjects especially in Mathematics and Science. (2) The 2011 MEAP data reflected very low Mathematics proficiency level for Michigan female students and remarkably low for the plan's three participating school districts.
- . Tables were provided to illustrate Science and Math Proficiency levels between grade levels, male and female students both in the Michigan School District and the CPA three participating school districts.
- . The Applicant did not give evidence of the three school district's current status in implementing personalized learning environments.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant provided evidence in the implementation of instructional strategies for all participating students to accelerate learning that is align to college and career ready standards and college and career ready graduation requirements..
- . The Applicant provided evidence that the plan will include an approach to implement instructional strategies to enable students to pursue a rigorous course of study for college and career ready standards and graduation requirements.. Opportunities will be provided for students to deepen their learning through small group instruction, cooperative learning and independent learning, Students will learn how to analyze their achievement data along with teachers and parents.
- . Student Progress Teams will be developed and comprised of students, parents and teachers and a counselor whose job will be to address student's developmental needs.
- . The Applicant provided evidence that supplemental instructional support will be provided to address and support high need students to achieve their goals. Support will be provided in various ways : (1) employing two teachers in Kindergarten classrooms, (2) employing additional 1st grade teachers to support early intervention (3) student will receive academic support from Classroom Resource Intervention Specialists (tutoring will continue after school through the school day and in summer programs.

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

20

20

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant provided evidence of the support of personalized learning environments and the strategies that meet each student's academic need by : establishing a Teacher Academy for all teachers to receive training on strategies for transforming classrooms into personalized learning environments.
- . The Applicant provided evidence of educators having access in knowing how to use technology, tools, data and resources to accelerate student's progress toward college-career ready graduation. Data will be used with the school's School Improvement Teams for setting goals and teachers will be trained in analyzing data.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided an organizational structure which explained key personnel job descriptions to manage the program. . The Applicant adequately describes the District Project Management Team which will be established to oversee the implementation of the plan and monitor the effectiveness of personalized learning environments as they relate to learning and teaching at the participating schools. . The Applicant provided evidence that students will have opportunities to progress and earn high school credit through an after school program. . The Applicant did not provide evidence of resources and instructional practices that address Student with Disabilities and English Language Learner Students. 		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence that all stakeholders have access to content, tools, learning resources in and out of school to support the plan. Training will be provided to stakeholders in the use of equipment and technology to accerate student learning. . The Applicant describes the function of the district's Administration Plus System which is a web-based exploration tool that will enable students to create electronic portfolios to document their work. Students, teachers and parents will be able to track student progress toward college-career readiness. . The Applicant describes the parent usage of the Administrator's Plus system which connects parents to school and enables parents to have access to their child's attendance, report cards, schedules and invoices. . The Applicant did not provide evidence of an interoperable data system 		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Appicant provided evidence of how the plan will be monitored and measured during implementation funding.. An Advisory Committe comprised of the Project Director, Principals and Assistant Principals from each of the participating schools will be formed to oversee,monitor and provide feedback regarding the progress of the plan. Monthly milestone meetings will be schduled for the Advisory Committee to track progress of the plan. . The Applicant provided evidence of support for organizational structure and distribution of key personnel to bring the plan to scale (See Personnel Resumes in Appendices). Key personnel's job description of specific tasks reflect are qualified to implement and manage the plan. . The Applicant did not provide evidence of how the plan's funded investment information will be shared with the public. . The Applicant did not give evidence that regular feedback meeting regarding the plan's progress will continue after the term of the grant, 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence of implementing strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with all stakeholders (internal and external) . Communication and engagement strategies will involve : weekly updates in staff meetings, reports to Board of Directors, newsletters to parents, parent and family workshops, and updates featured through a link with the district website. 		

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence of achievable performance measures by subgroups and annual target. required during the funding of the grant. . The Applicant met the requirement of presenting the required numbers of performance measures. The measures for each subgroup indicated projected growth during and after the grant is funded. . The Applicant provided a chart that reflected a rationale for selection of additional performance measures and provided relevant information and a review for improving the measures overtime. . The Applicant did not provide evidence of how the performance measures will be reviewed and improved over time if it is insufficient to guage the implementation progress. 		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence of how the effectiveness of the plan will be evaluated in order to improve results. The evaluation of the plan will be aligned to the plan's goals and performance measures. Surveys and a broad range of tools will be used to gather data from all stakeholders. Teacher effectiveness and student achievement relative to personalized learning will be evaluated using district-wide and school wide assessments and standardized test. . The Applicant provided evidence of timely feedback being provided of the evaluation data summaries by implementing Data Briefs, a method of data collection. 		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided a reasonable and cost effective budget to support the implementation of the plan, and identified all district, state and federal funds to support the plan. A Narrative Project Budget Chart was outlined and The Budget Tables: Overall Budget Summary Table and Overall Budget Summary Project List were evident in the plan. . The Applicant provided thoughtful rational for the use of the plan's funding to support personalized learning environments. Funds will be used to purchase tablet computers for students, purchasing positions to support and provide training in data analysis proving Mathematics and Science content, purchasing additional teaching positions for early intervention instruction, and providing a Project Director to oversee and monitor the plan. . The Applicant provided evidence in the plan that the grant funding should support the plan during and after the funding ends. The grant funding will support the school's staff to be more proficient im implementing and supporting personalized learning environments. 		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence that the plan will be sustained and scaled up by : 1. maintaining the current staff postions with the exception of the additional Kindergarten and 1st grade teachers, 2. documenting professional development for teachers through videos to be used in the future for newly hired teachers and for refreshing existing staff and 3, archiving project artifacts as reference materials. . The Applicant shows evidence of the project's sustainability by actively pursuing additional funding from public and private foundations, corporations and requesting funding from Michigan Department of Education to support and sustain the plan's goals in implementing personalized learning environments for Kindergarten through 12th grade students to enable them to address their academic needs. ..The Applicant showed evidence of the plan to develop a budget for continuing the plan's goals three years after the grant 		

funding.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant did not submit the Competitive Preference Priorty.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The plan shows evidence of how the participating schools will build on the core educational assurance areas to improve learning and teaching through personalization of strategies, tools, support of students and educators and the alignment with college-career ready standards and graduation requirements. The plan addresses accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning , and increasing the effectiveness of educators. The plan showed evidence of steps to decrease the achievement gaps across student groups and in increasing rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total	210	160
-------	-----	-----