Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0634CA-1 for Animo Leadership Charter High School

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Ánimo Leadership has shown that it has created a successful urban inner city school model that could dramatically improve student experience and outcomes.

Although "Everybody Knows My Name", was included in the vision section, it was not stated as a vision. However, there was a mission statement with clear and concise goals. A mission is different than a vision. The applicant did not address the vision criteria.

There is a very bold mission, which is to encourage every student to strive for and succeed in college and life. By working strictly with turnaround schools identified as among the lowest 5% of Title I schools in California, the applicant has taken on a bold reform effort as its task.

There is evidence that every student receives strong individual support from adults on campus, which supports their mission. Staff seems intent on preparing each student for college. These specific beliefs that drive instructional process support the goal of accelerating student achievement.

The model for individualizing the instructional process based on the emphasis of student respect is a very important way of showing how at-risk youth can be better learners.

There is a comprehensive list of goals designed to build on a four core educational assurance areas including: quality teaching and instruction, a master schedule that meets the needs of students, data-driven decision-making, and a college-going culture articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is a strong organizational consortium model that includes 18 local educational agencies that comprise the Consortium of Green Dot Charter Schools with Ánimo Leadership Charter High School acting as the Lead LEA. With 18 schools enrolling more than 10,300 high-need students, there was sufficient evidence that each LEA member and each participating school far exceeds the eligibility threshold

There is a specific process used to select students from high-need schools, and all of the participating students meet the eligibility requirements.

There is a list of the total number of students identified served by end of the project from the consortium, with the two participating pilot schools being selected based on capacity to implement a teacher evaluation system.

Included was a description of this model being carried out as a pilot, which is being implemented in two local educational agencies. The pilot has resulted in evidence from quantitative and qualitative data that if the program is carried out in the 18 schools, it will be successful.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

There is a strong over-site management structure for the Ánimo program, which includes a Project Compliance Manager responsible for developing a consortium-wide management, evaluation, and communication strategy, and for harnessing school-site accountability systems. Also included is a Project Compliance Manager who will ensure fidelity to the goals of the proposal, manage the implementation process, and evaluate progress. The project includes school leadership teams, with administrators, parents, students and teachers who will offer valuable feedback to the management team during the life of the program.

There is a well-designed high-quality plan using the Locke Turnaround Model, which has proven successful to reform traditional instructional practices at Locke High School in Los Angeles. The model resulted in turning around Los Angeles Unified School District's lowest-performing high school and the lowest-performing middle school in California. Part of the success can be attributed to leverage the highly effective Administrator-in-Residence program, which includes the recruitment and training of turnaround leaders for placement in failing schools.

There is supporting evidence that the applicant will be able to reach its stated goals and how the model will help improve learning outcomes

for all students served by the consortium. Two specific outcomes were addressed: personalized learning environments; and the use of technology to guide decision-making and continuous improvement. The Appendix included the Model's theory of change (visual Appendix I, p.300), which strengthens the way to develop, refine, and expand key instructional strategies and whole student support systems.

There is a strong college and career readiness component that will help each school expand on ways to encourage students to become college ready. Included in every aspect of daily instruction is an ongoing emphasis on inspiring each student to set ambitious yet achievable goals of college, leadership and success in life. Setting high standards for students attending the lowest performing schools is a very important part of this project.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There are well-defined ambitious yet achievable annual goals for each proposed initiative that are likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity. Each target exceeds California targets performance goals for each student sub-group. Additionally college persistence, college acceptance and college graduation of participating students will be tracked electronically. Data (National Student Clearinghouse, as well as alumni feedback) will serve as a baseline from which to create meaningful targets for postsecondary attainment rates.

Detailed data tables for each of the 18 LEAs in the areas of proficiency, growth and achievement by grade and subgroup show how the percentage of participating students who belong to low income families generally rises over the school years.

Shown is an ambitious goal with 94% targets for cohort group graduation, which is extremely high. Schools with more stable student populations are expected to exceed this rate.

Also included are ambitious targets whereby student performance will to be equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the participating local educational agencies, overall and by student subgroup, for each participating local educational agencies by: increasing student performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth). Also included in the charts are ambitious targets addressing the increase of student achievement in each participating school using proficiency assessments, and ambitious targets for decreasing achievement gaps.

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	15

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There is strong evidence that Green Dot schools have successfully raised student achievement and created pathways to college and careers in some of the highest need communities served by Los Angeles County. Data show that over a twelve-year period, student achievement has been successfully raised and at the same time for students who are from some of the highest need areas of Los Angeles County.

There is supporting documentation showing the model program's success in advancing student learning and achievement while increasing equity in learning and teaching. There is evidence that program participants have been provided pathways to college and careers. Data show that there is evidence of the significant advances that occur when participating students who complete the entire program. At least 25% of the model program graduates are more likely to graduate from high school (91.8% as compared with 66.5% of comparison schools);

Data show that students from the turn-around model school are five times more likely to graduate with the A-G requirements needed for acceptance into the University of California and California State University systems, are more than twice as likely to be proficient in math, and average more than 76 points higher on the California Academic Performance Index (API).

Included is significant documentation related to the improvement of student learning outcomes while close achievement gaps, including improving student achievement, high school graduation rates , and college enrollment rates.

Included is evidence that the model will be able to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in the persistently lowest-achieving schools served.

Statewide data show that although gaps for educationally disadvantaged students have increased dramatically on achievement tests since academic year 2008-2009; however, students currently participating in the model program are graduating at higher rates than public school students when they are matched by similar location and demographic characteristics.

Data show the same is true when sub-group data are disaggregate across all sub-group categories, program students graduate at higher rates than their counterparts.

Using goals that focused heavily on academic and social/emotional supports and on school safety and beautification initiatives, there are demonstrated remarkable gains in retention, rigor and results. In 2012, three-year results showed that students were 50% more likely to graduate and 269% times more likely to have completed coursework that prepares them for college. Students gained in ELA and math (55% and 338% increases, respectively), and ratings of proficient or advanced in math more than quintupled since 2008 (from 37 to 242 students).

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is evidence of transparency in the budgeting and financial reporting process. The transparency is shown by: making budgets available to the public; soliciting input from the teachers union, parents, students, and other stakeholders during budget preparation; and presenting budgets and financial results in sufficient detail to allow school-level review of key categories of revenue and expenditures.

Documentation is substantiated when each participating Board of Directors for each participating school develops the school-level budget following California open record laws. Transparency is shown by School Board meetings that are open to the public, quarterly reports that are submitted to key stakeholders, including: senior management, AMU (the teachers‘ union), lenders, funders, the finance committee of each Board of Directors. Meetings and materials being open to the public substantiate the required level of transparency.

There is adequate documentation of the extent to which the four categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds are addressed including: the required reporting of actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff based on the federal classification of local government finances.

Transparency is show with each participating school maintaining an open records budget, with personnel expenses broken down by professional, other certificated pupil support staff, administrators, and classified staff. Non-personnel expenditures must be detailed using state coded categories including facilities, equipment, books and educational supplies, services, and other office costs at each school. Revenues must be broken down and reported by source (federal, state, local, and private fundraising) and purpose (general purpose, special education, and other restrictions).

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The application includes evidence about how California state charter laws gives Green Dot schools autonomy to implement the personalized learning strategies described in its proposal. There is a good description about how the personalized learning services will be coordinated with state requirements in the areas of labor-management, scheduling, academics and governance.

The unusual freedom from state regulations provides a means to set up new reforms that could become the model for educating students in high-need communities and schools.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There is evidence that project members have been having productive meetings with the Community Engagement Team including 45 parent representatives from Ánimo Watts and Ánimo Jefferson Middle Schools. The district also conducted surveys of students, parents and teachers.

There is significant evidence that parents and teachers support for programs and services included in the application. A tiered feedback process that ensured the representation of a wide cross-section of stakeholders during the application development process showed that the model has strong support. Surveys and focus groups solicited input from students and parents at participating schools. Community Engagement Teams convened 45 parent member focus group helped develop project goals followed by facilitated discussion in English and Spanish regarding the reform strategy.

There is sufficient evidence that the different groups were directly involved in the development of the proposal; however, there was insufficient evidence to show that the applicant made any modifications to the project because of their input. Included is valuable feedback from the community with evidence that the project was revised to include more Power School trainings for parents as well as training on how to use mobile devices to monitor and support their child‘s education.

There were letters of support from stakeholders including all unions representing the schools included in the proposal with evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposal from teachers in participating schools. The letters of support from such key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education provided the evidence that many different areas of the community were involved.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Included was valuable supporting documentation of the educational gaps, the needs identified and how they will be addressed.

There is sufficient documented evidence that a significant educational discrepancy exists among different racial groups in core subjects and a need for services included in the proposal.

There is demonstrated evidence related to implementing personalized learning environments, based on the proposed high-quality plan, that would be an outgrowth of the well developed, well-documented strategic planning process. Carrying out a thorough review of external trends and consortium-wide internal practices was evident and was reflected in the quality of the proposed plan.

Through an annual review of student achievement and outcomes at each school site, including reviews by department of the management

teams at each school, and feedback from parent and student surveys, valuable specific strategic priorities were set that included the ability to provide: outstanding academic results; system-wide reform; and organizational health.

Included were documented ways to revisit and update the high quality plan based on discussions about needs and gaps that arise when carrying out personalized learning.

A gap analysis resulted in revised curricular strategies and support services that were based on individual leadership and life needs, the two key components of the mission of the project.

Although students from different racial and ethnic groups will benefit from program services, there is no specific proposed solution shown that relates the personalized services for the different racial groups affected.

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 a clear and concise description about how the series of programs are designed to promote college readiness and how the project will offer in-depth learning personalized learning experiences for high needs students. The total program description shows a commitment to a more focused approach to developing higher-order thinking skills through an program that emphasizes instruction and has a unique approach, especially in the area of Mastering Critical Academic Content and Developing Character-Building Traits.

Included are an array of services for improving learning by personalizing the learning environment that provides participating students the support they need to graduate college- and career-ready. Documentation showed the ability to prepare participating high-need students so that they are able to enroll in college at a rate that is significantly higher than public schools in California and the nation. The applicant documented the rate of student academic success by showing that the four-year college acceptance rate for students was 57.4%, significantly higher than the state average acceptance rate of 17.7%.

The model has shown that it can work in struggling schools and neighborhoods. There is documentation that through offering SAT preparation and college counseling services to low-income high school students, their SAT test scores increased over 200 points after completing taking the preparation courses.

Included is an well-documented implementation of instructional strategies for all participating high-need students that enable them to pursue a rigorous courses of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and college-and career-ready graduation requirements while accelerating learning through individual support.

The model provides support for personalization, including small schools, small classes, and an Advisory curriculum embedded in the school day. Individual and group responsibility is emphasized, and the ability to learn is emphatically promoted.

The term ‘college persistence” is dramatically emphasized as part of the total program, which shows a strong program and strategic commitment to students. Every student is taught to expect to go to college and every student is trained to believe that he or she is college bound.

Frequently updated individual student data is used to measure progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards. On an instructional level, all students are enrolled in the A-G courses that meet UC and CSU admission requirements and that are aligned with California State Standards . Students are required to take four years of ELA, math and science, three years of history, and a minimum of two years of foreign language—exceeding the A-G requirements in terms of the number of courses. Data are collected all core content areas and is mapped against college-level standards. Students are expected to enroll in Advanced Placement (AP) courses. Courses such as advanced technology, graphic design, robotics, and performing and visual arts challenge students to reach higher academic levels.

Ongoing and regular feedback is well documented and includes evidence of frequently updated individual student data used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards and career-ready graduation requirements within a Personalized learning environment. For example, under Goal 2 in the proposal, the applicant identifies building a system to track and support college persistence. The model includes building networks of support for graduates—both as a means to extend the personalized learning approach beyond graduation and to improve instructional practices that support of college readiness. There is evidence that the advisory activities that are organized around school culture and safety, academics, social life skills and civic engagement show promise of encouraging students to learn in a positive school climate.

Project activities used to carry out high-quality strategies for high-need students are well documented. For example, the pathways component in the model is designed to provide students with the individual supports and curricular choices they need to be prepared for college, and involves: 1) increased instructional time, 2) course sequences aligned with college-level requirements, 3) frequent checks for academic understanding and 4) intensive coaching for teachers.

The emphasis on the software programs: 21st Century technology, Use Technology to Accelerate and Deepen Student Learning as support tools can be considered the beginning of an important part of the program as a a real commitment to blended learning.

This model, combined with proposed wraparound services are valuable mechanisms to help students understand how to use the resources available to them in order to take responsibility for their own learning. Additionally there other quality services included that help students gain knowledge of the tools available to track and manage their learning. For example, students will have access to a web-based student

information system, PowerSchool, to review their attendance, homework and test scores and disciplinary incidents. They will be able to analyze assessment reports to determine areas of strength and weakness. They can participate in closure activities designed to gauge their mastery of the learning objective. They will have tutoring or teacher office-hours to address any gaps in understanding. And, students will receive training and support to use this platform to advance their personal learning goals.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is substantive information about which teachers will be trained, supported and regularly evaluated using the College Ready Teaching Framework, a tool to measure highly effective teaching. A valuable array of in-person and online professional learning opportunities for individuals and groups is part of the process, with the goal of increasing student performance and closing historic achievement gaps. In collaboration with AMU, the teachers‘ union, there is a rigorous process for teacher evaluation. There are a set of training strategies to improve every teacher‘s effectiveness using five domains that address the key factors necessary to ensure success for all students including: 1) Data-Driven Planning and Assessing Student Learning; 2) The Classroom Learning Environment; 3) Instruction; 4) Developing Professional Practice; and 5) Developing Partnerships with Family and Community. The Teacher Evaluation System uses multiple measures to determine a teacher‘s effectiveness: including: Classroom Observations: 2. Student Growth, 3. Stakeholder Feedback and 4. Compliance.

There is a quality Leadership Evaluation System, which evaluates principals based on their ability to improve academic achievement for all students and to increase the effectiveness of their school.

There is specific evidence that teachers and principals participating in the proposed components will be engaged in training that measures student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards, or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and uses data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators. All administrators, instructional leadership teams and School Advisory Councils will benefit from a range of trainings designed to drive effective teaching and, in turn, to deepen student learning.

There is a valuable approach for administrators to observe successful school leaders in bi-weekly, two-hour sessions at the school site. They also will be given the opportunity to visit another school within their cluster to observe instruction.

Principals will be able to attend unified monthly professional development sessions focused on teacher coaching and evaluation, participate in annual retreats and receive coaching support from designated Principal Mentors.

There is specific evidence that teachers and principals participating in the proposed components will be engaged in training that improves teachers’ and principals’ practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the teacher and principal Charlotte Danielson‘s A Framework for Teaching evaluation tool that includes frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness, as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement.

Educators will have access to a significant number of data tools to identify optimal learning approaches and obtain student demographic and assessment information. In addition to regular classroom observations and coaching, individually tailored professional development will be supported by a system that connects evaluation to an online portal, which offers a secure and centralized location for teachers to locate their position in the evaluation cycle; set personal goals tied to Teaching Framework indicators and monitor their progress toward those goals.

Teachers will also have ongoing access to a variety of high-quality, self-driven professional development tools that are aligned to every indicator in the Teaching Framework, such as such: educational research, and videos of teaching best practices.

There is documented information about the processes and tools used to match student needs or how to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the requested resources in meeting student needs.

Educators will have valuable tools to measure students‘ ongoing progress towards meeting college- and career-ready standards. They will have access to Data Director, a data warehouse that includes information regarding a student‘s past performance on CSTs benchmark results.

There is specific information related to how participating teachers and administrators will have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. As a result they have an extraordinary amount of information that helps each identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests.

Participating school leaders and school leadership teams will have appropriate resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (or college- and career-ready graduation requirements. Teachers will be provided with coaches so that they have access to even more individualized guidance and support in delivering lessons and structuring the classroom environment to support personalization.

The model significantly increases the number of students who come from hard-to-staff schools, who will receive instruction from highly effective teachers (especially in mathematics and science) and be lead by highly effective principals. There is evidence that project leaders will recruit and hire highly effective teachers and administrators with experience and success serving high-need communities. Teachers will be provided with a substantial number of curricular tools, will be subject to increased observations and coaching, and will use sophisticated data systems to track and help students.

The project will utilize a Leadership Evaluation System, including piloting the system that defines teaching and school leadership success based on the number and percentage of students who are college-ready (determined by the percentage of 11th graders deemed college-ready by math and English Language Arts Early Assessment Program scores, as well as the percent of graduates accepted to a four-year

university). For middle schools, college-readiness will be based on the percentage of cohort 8th graders reading at grade level, as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory and Northwest Evaluation Association growth targets.

There is evidence that the program will focus on the skills required to address the intensive needs of educationally disadvantaged students in the highest-need communities across Los Angeles by partnering with LAUSD to launch a pilot program that will to train a dual cohort of leaders.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There is a good description of how the application will facilitate personalized learning by providing the school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets. There is evidence that principals have flexibility in scheduling, staffing decisions, curriculum, and budgeting including adjusting class schedules to allow additional time for student learning as well as for teachers to collaborate.

Included is a well-designed documentation that shows the organization of central office and how it will provide support and services to all participating schools using a management team that is part of a three-tiered organizational model - consortium, cluster and school-levels facilitation of personalized learning. Included is a commitment to provide flexibility to student populations to use select, evidence-based online learning tools that enable them to progress through the curriculum and earn credits at their own pace. Software intervention programs, like Read180, utilize adaptive technology to individualize instruction. They also is Apex Learning and AdvancePath , which also allows students to advance at their own pace.

There is evidence of policies and practices that gives all students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. Based on a model of earned autonomy to promote increased responsibility and ownership by school site leaders, they will be charged with focusing on teaching and learning, while senior education and management professionals and staff members take responsibility for facility renovation and usage, and other operational and legal considerations.

There is a commitment to principals that after two to three years of quality performance, they will be empowered to refine their own school model and to make independent decisions about school operations.

There is also documented description of a high-quality plan designed to give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times using learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is evidence that the use of technology, including roving desktops and mobile devices, will be available students. Students will be allowed to take laptops home. The education specialists, instruction technology coordinators and a knowledge management team will offer regular training services to staff. Parents will be encouraged to follow student progress through the Power/School system. Student homework, grades, and test scores can be reviewed at any time.

The infrastructure supports administrators and teachers so they can generate customizable reports with school, department and individualized teacher-level data through a shared data warehouse to track student and class progress and to design lessons that address areas of student strength and weakness. Quality software such as Bloomboard and Connect offer online professional development and networking support to teachers.

There is an adequate discussion about the use of the Internet to allow (a) all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders to have access to content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the program. It is a tool, yet not convincing as a resource for the strong program proposes.

However, there wasn't sufficient evidence showing that the applicant has a good working knowledge of blended learning, an approach to instruction mentioned in the program outline. Blended learning requires a unique set of hardware, including I Pads which allow teachers and students to carry out interactive instruction. The fact that the hardware was not requested shows a weakness in the design of program infrastructure.

There is adequate evidence that the use of the software including Powerschool and Cornerstone on Demand show that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support provided through a range of strategies and other information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems.

There is sufficient evidence that the technology used and proposed (d) allows the applicant and participating schools to use data systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and a system instructional improvement data.

However, the proposal has previously described how students will use an instructional model that requires technology resources, such as blended learning, to carry out the instructional process. Blended learning requires the use of special technology that is not described or included in the detailed budget. As discussed, the infrastructure will not support the ambitious program services necessary to carry out part of the program.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The use of a dashboard tool to track progress towards project was documented to be an effective vehicle for measuring project progress and for identifying areas that must be adjusted.

It is also well-described as an effective tool that can be used for continuous improvement at the central management, school and classroom levels. It supports the strategy described in the application for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward meeting goals set for the district.

There is documented evidence that the applicant has developed a strategy that addresses how the project will monitor, measure the project's progress, and how it proposes to publicly share information on the quality of the project. The strategy includes a continuous improvement process that draws on feedback from school and project-level stakeholders and then used to improve project goals. The Project Compliance Manager will use the dashboard tool to track progress towards project goals. The principals will be encouraged to identify site-specific barriers to implementation and make suggestions for improvements. Progress and outcomes will be provided on a quarterly basis. The Management Team will review progress against metrics and implementation milestones and academic targets. As a result, the continuous improvement cycle of implement-gather feedback-redesign-implement will serve as the process used to develop, monitor and evaluate all strategic initiatives.

The model supports opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Included are appropriate means involving input from educators, students, parents and community members. Project staff will have the ability to consistently communicate with and engage internal and external stakeholders to carry out the project. The system was modeled on the Teacher Evaluation System development process, using teacher focus groups to solicit teachers' perspectives.

There is a Project Compliance Manager who can meet with each school principal to solicit feedback and suggestions. Teacher union representatives, principals, SAC members and other education practitioners will meet to share program progress and evaluation findings. There will be a monthly newsletter, The Green Dot Difference, sent to 5,300 external community stakeholders. And there will be Board meetings where detailed information about finances, and program results will be presented.

There is sufficient evidence that staff will use periodic internal and external surveys, school open houses, parent/teacher data meetings, its main website, school websites, daily/weekly school e-newsletters, and community-based organizations.

The strategy for ongoing communication and engagement is well-documented with the description of involvement of internal and external stakeholders through the External Affairs Team, a committee of participating schools.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

There are sufficient data in the application document and in Appendix T showing achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures.

The documentation show the number and percentage of participating students who are from low income families and are considered high-need, as well as the percentage of participating students who will graduate from high school Data also show the percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness, as well as the the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, whose teacher of record and principal rated as highly effective; the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, whose teacher and principal are rated as effective. Data also showed the number and percentage of participating students who are listed as eligible for Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

However, there was insufficient data related to the grade-appropriate academic leading indicators used to measure success of the plan. The applicant provides data related to career readiness but insufficient documentation of the number and percentage of participating students who are or are on track to being career-ready.

The model does not tell why it has only three performance measures per level that were listed under E3. The project is very ambitions and should include several indicators with measures of student growth. Also needed is a rationale for selecting specific performance measures and how the measures are supported by rigorous, timely, and formative information tailored to the proposed plan. There was also insufficient documentation on how the review could be used to improve the measure over time to gage the implementation progress.

Additionally, the number of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness was not adequately addressed. And, documentation of grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan was not adequately addressed.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The use of an external evaluator to conduct assessments of project progress is necessary to measure project performance objectively. The internal evaluation process is necessary and well coordinated, however the use of an external unbiased person lends significant strength to project monitoring.

There is no substantive discussion about how the applicant proposes to evaluate funded project activities such as professional development and the activities that employ technology,

There is evidence that there will be performance measurement of teachers (the TIF grant) but very little discussion about how the project will evaluate productively of project management staff. While specific activities will be carried out by expert project leads within support departments for the school sites, the Project Compliance Manager will be responsible for tracking and coordinating implementation across initiatives at all school sites. He will also monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of project investments during and after the term of the grant. However, there is insufficient documentation as to how that person's effectiveness is measured.

There is significant documentation about the use of other resources proposed to improve results, such as the improved use of technology, measuring effectiveness of working with community partners, evaluating the quality of the proposed compensation reform. Yet, the evaluation of the organizational structure overseeing the charter schools has little project oversight.

There will be a team of finance and data specialists, who develop reports on grant implementation and project results. There is no evidence that their progress be measured by the dashboard tool.

Additionally, the external evaluator will assess only three (out of five) goal areas because of complex statistical analysis. There is no evidence that other areas will be evaluated using independent unbiased measurement.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There is a quality detailed description of how it that it will use a combination of grant, state and local funds to (a) support the project.

Funds (ii) that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during the grant period, as they were described in the proposed budget and budget narrative were fully justified.

There is a (i) detailed description of the use of Federal funds that it will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including the proposed use of total revenues from all sources.

There is also evidence that the costs proposed were, under (b) reasonable for the program proposed and sufficient to fully support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal.

A thoughtful rationale (c) for investments and priorities as part of the budget narrative were described adequately.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The approximately $8.5 million used as a one time focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments was supported by documentation in the proposal.

With almost 44% of the total grant for supplemental services, there is no clear evidence that shows how the consortium group will pay for the supplemental services they will need to continue the project after the grant ends. Funding these ongoing costs through new funding sources as well as modest projected increases in existing sources was not justified. In fact, letters from foundations included in the application did not include any commitment to funding for any reason at any time in the future.

The use of potential private partners, as described, does not show a commitment by any foundations or partnerships.

The high cost of this project is very questionable if it is to be sustained.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

There is a good description about how the applicant proposes to scale key components of the Locke Wellness Center (LWC) model—its place-based, wraparound service model—to all participating schools as the proposed planning process that will engaged over twenty local organizations.

The newly introduced concept provides a confusing picture of how it proposes to integrate public or private resources as part of a partnership designed to augment the project's resources. It shows how it can provide additional student and family supports to schools by addressing the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students, giving highest priority to students in participating schools (all high-need students). It does not provide a clear picture of its relationship to the services proposed in the first set of questions.

The description about the LWC or the five Locke High School LEA members was not adequately addressed or if the partnership that was formed is coordinated with services of public or private organizations, such as public health, before school, after-school, and social service providers.

There is no coherent information about how LWC integrated student service providers; businesses, philanthropies, civic groups, and other community-based organizations; and postsecondary institutions were coordinated to support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1.

The services provided that: (a) track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all students in the consortium and at the student level for the participating students; (b) use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students; (c) include a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students to at least other high-need students and communities in the LEA or consortium over time; and (d) improve results over time were adequately described.

There is a clear description about (4) how the partnership would, within participating schools, integrate education and other services for participating students.

There is a clear description about (5) how the partnership and consortium would build the capacity of staff in participating schools by providing them with tools and supports services that (a) assess the needs and assets of participating students that are aligned with the partnership's goals for improving the education and family and community supports identified by the partnership; (b) identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports identified by the applicant; (c) create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results; (d) engage parents and families of participating students.

There is a adequate description about the decision-making process that result in solutions to improve results over time and in addressing student, family, and school needs; and (e) routinely assess the applicant's progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems.

The (6) annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe the desired results for students was adequately addressed.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposed a series of supplemental services as part of a reform effort clearly designed to improve instruction within the schools serving high-need students. It showed a strong commitment to address the use of the personalization of services and tools that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards and/or career-ready graduation requirements.

The proposed project clearly is designed to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by identifying and addressing the academic needs of every student. The proposal clearly documented project staff's desire to increase the effectiveness of teachers and the need to expand student access to the most effective educators.

There is evidence that the proposed services can decrease achievement gaps across student groups and significantly increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and/or careers.

There is evidence that project activities would reform traditional approaches to learning by coherently and comprehensively addressing how it will build on the core educational areas using new and significantly realigned learning environments as well as an oversight management structure that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching.

It is not clear how the four-year cost of the project can be paid after federal funds end, especially in California and in the Los Angeles area.

However, the project definitely meets the spirit of the federal program and could be a valuable tool for reform.

Total	210	192

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	15

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The additional funding to pilot a collaborative turnaround leadership-training program with Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) is fully described. The award would directly support the training of 16 (10 in the project) turnaround leaders as part of the project's school model and the operational and instructional initiatives outlined in the consortium's application.

The structure of the program where Green Dot will manage the training of LAUSD employees (with the superintendents commitment to the project) is an extremely valuable way to develop school leaders and to help them understand the cultural differences and needs of students in the classroom. Having had the proven success by the applicant, the program would be very successful. The applicant charter management organization has a success record of turning around low-performing schools in the Los Angeles poorest communities. It also has a proven track record of training educators to set high expectations for high-needs students, convincing students to want to go to college and then providing them with an education that prepares them for college and careers. With such proven success, training school more leaders to carry out the concept is needed and very innovative for today's urban school systems.

The proposed budget is very reasonable for the proposed services and is adequate to support the development and implementation of activities that are proposed.

The project clearly shows how and when it will train 16 leaders and community participants and it shows a clear rationale for the specific population that the project will address.

A viable plan for how it could carry out activities that would be co-developed and implemented among participating schools was clearly described.

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0634CA-2 for Animo Leadership Charter High School

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Green Dot Charter Schools clearly presents a comprehensive and ambitious vision, "Everybody Knows My Name: Community Schools of Excellence for the 21st Century," dedicated to supporting the four core assurance areas. Within this vision, GDCS provides a clear vision that students will be a unique, individual rather than a mere number within a large school district too overwhelmed to be concerned with learning individual student names. With a proven track record of turning around the lowest achieving schools and improving student learning outcomes, GDCS delivers exceptional results for high-needs and at-risk students in both academic and social arenas. Additionally, GDCS shows its commitment to education reform by ensuring that all students have access to high-quality teachers by implementing best practices and a teacher evaluation system to evaluate, support, and retain teachers. Although a specific statement of how teachers will be evaluated or the measures by which they will be evaluated is not stated in this section, GDCS does state it is piloting a performance-based compensation plan that rewards effective teaching.

GDCS identifies 4 common core elements as its driving force and that correspond to the 4 core educational assurance areas:

- Quality Teaching and Instruction: provides a teacher and administrator support and evaluation system
- Master Schedule that meets student needs: provides a college-prep curriculum with intervention and accelerated courses for high- and special-needs students.

Data-driven decision-making: utilizes technology to collect and disseminate student data to guide all stakeholders with the information needed to personalize student learning.

- College-going culture: requires all students to complete A-G requirement needed for college acceptance and customizes graduation plans to ensure each student graduates on time and college-ready.

In addition, GDCS have codified its Turnaround Model for use nationwide in the hopes that more students, parents, and educators may benefit from its proven model, thereby potentially effecting reform across the nation and providing thousands more students a fair and equitable education that prepares them for college and career.

Finally, GDCS identifies 5 key investment areas it will support with RTTD funding: leadership and life curriculum, an academic and character trait curriculum to support college- and career readiness; college persistence, a support network for graduated students in college; whole student support, social and health services; core pathways to develop and implement curriculum maps and trajectories for history and science; and 21st century technologies to accelerate student learning and promote real-time learning and understanding.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a-b) GDCS has identified all of its charter and turnaround schools (18 total) as participating schools and all of its students (10,300) as participating students. These include 4 middle schools and 14 high schools.

c) GDCS has 94% overall eligible students through Free and Reduced Lunch; 87% overall ED students; and each campus has a minimum of 65% or higher ED population. The proposal provides a demographic breakdown table of each of its participating schools by number of participating educators, participating students, participating high-needs students, participating low-income students, and percentages of students from low-income families by school and by total consortium population.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal states that the Lead LEA applicant (Animo Leadership) will recruit a Project Compliance Manager who will develop RTTD management, evaluate implementation and outcomes, and ensure fidelity to the goals set forth in the proposal. There is strong support from school leadership teams, community, parents for the proposal. The proposal (in Section C) also provides extensive and detailed plans with goals, deliverables, and timelines for each of the proposal's 5 goals. Two crucial points in GDCS's theory of change are personalized learning environments and use of technology to guide decision-making and improvement. The proposal specifies GDCS's aim to further develop, refine and expand key instruction strategies and whole student supports to ensure progress and success in college, leadership, and life for every student in the consortium.

The proposal provides convincing and comprehensive support for meaningful reform beyond the participating schools. In addition to impacting the 18 schools in its consortium, 6 new charter middle schools outside of the consortium will adopt GDCS model and best practices, while 2 participating consortium middle schools will expand enrollment. Additionally, GDCS shares its practices and activities with other schools in California and in the US. Recently, GD LEAs entered a consulting agreement with Sacramento City USD to problem-solve issues the system is facing in turning around schools. Too, Carnegie Corp of NY awarded a grant to Green Dot Locke LEAs to codify their Locke Turnaround Model into a practical guidebook for reform models. Finally, as a result of its success with Locke HS, Green Dot has been invited by Los Angeles USD to turnaround David Starr Jordan High School and Henry Clay Middle School (as reported in part B1b). LAUSD is also partnering with GDCS to utilize their Administrator-in-Residence program to recruit and train leaders for placement in failing schools.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal has established ambitious yet achievable goals for each initiative in its proposal, all of which exceed state targets, for each participating school in its consortium. These goals are based on past student performance, a review of school-level data from other LEAs serving similar demographics and who have made significant gains, and estimates based on accelerated teaching of GDCS. An overview of goals and targets are provided in the proposal, while a more exhaustive and detailed table for each of the 18 LEAs in the areas of proficiency, growth and achievement by grade and subpopulation are provided in Appendix T.

a) a table provides extensive baseline data and goals for students earning a score of Proficient or above on the CST for each of the four core areas (ELA, Math, Science, and History) overall and for each subgroup (Hispanic, African American, ED, ELL, and SpEd). An average of 3% growth is expected in each grant year for all core areas and in each subgroup. The baseline percentage of students earning proficient or better scores are rather dismal overall (all under 38%, with individual subgroups showing even lower percentages). Therefore, a 3% growth each grant year is evidence of an ambitious yet achievable goal.

b) achievement gaps are determined by comparing percent of consortium students scoring Proficient or better on CST to the percent of White and Asian students scoring Proficient or better statewide. Only the CSTs that consortium students take are included. The achievement gap in all core areas reflect significant discrepancies for overall consortium students in baseline SY2011-12: ELA 41%, Math 32%, Science 39%, History 27%. The proposal states an average decrease of 3 percentage points in the achievement gap each year of the grant and the post-grant year, thereby reducing the achievement gap by nearly half in almost all cases by year 5. This clearly demonstrates ambitious yet achievable goals.

c) the proposal offers comprehensive tables for each of the 18 participating schools in their consortium (note: tables are provided for middle schools even though they have no graduation). Among schools that have been in operation for several years, the overall graduation rates are

high (in the 80%s and 90%s) in the baseline year of 2010-11. The ultimate goal for each of these schools' graduation rates is 94% within one year of the grant administration. Among schools recently started or classified "turnaround," graduation rates are much lower (in the 70%s and some even lower in the subpopulations). Baseline years change as determined by first graduating class for these schools. For these schools, graduation rates will reach 94% by the end of the grant period, except Animo Locke 2, whose baseline graduation rate is 74% and is expected to reach 89% by 2016-17, and Animo College Preparatory Academy, whose baseline graduation rate is 74% for SY2012-13 and is expected to reach 86% by 2016-17. In each case, this represents a 3% growth each year. In every school in the consortium, the graduation rate growth represents an ambitious yet achievable goal.

d) GDCS already shows an impressive college enrollment rate ranging in the 80s to the high 90%s, even 100% in some subgroups. Here, as with graduation rates, GDCS proposal offers a 94% college enrollment rate for each of its graduating classes in the consortium. Among schools recently acquired, college enrollment rates are expected to grow by 3% each year, indicating a system that is already achieving ambitious and achievable goals.

e) no data is available currently for postsecondary attainment rates; however, the proposal calls for building its current data systems to track college persistence, and during the first grant year, will collect data from existing data systems, National Student Clearinghouse, and alumni to establish a baseline to create targets for postsecondary attainment 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	15

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

GDCS convincingly and thoroughly provides strong proof of a clear record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching.

a) comprehensive, convincing, and thorough proof justifies GDCS's claim that they have "successfully raised student achievement and created pathways to college and career in some of the highest needs areas of Los Angeles County." Students at GDCS are 25% more likely to graduate than their peers at comparison schools (91.8% v 66.5%); 73.5% of GDCS students graduate with the necessary A-G requirements for acceptance into UC and CSU (college) systems when compared with 15% at LAUSD; students score 76 points higher on CA Academic Performance Index than comparison schools, and in 2 of the consortium schools (Jackie Robinson and Pat Brown), students score 200 points higher, all of which is between a 9%-11% 3 year API growth in each subgroup. These numbers clearly indicate a closing achievement gap on statewide tests and graduation rates. Additionally, GDCS graduate students at a higher rate (81.6% in 2009-10 and 87.2% in 2010-11) than comparison schools (63.9% in 09-10 and 69.1% in 10-11) and LAUSD (62.4% in 09-10 and 61.1% in 10-11). Lastly, college enrollment rate in GDCS in 2011-12 was 57.4%; yet, compared to Los Angeles County (19.2%) and statewide acceptance rates (17.7%), GDCS convincingly shows it is impacting student learning and achievement, as well as increasing equity in learning. It is important to note that all of these successes have been accomplished with nearly $3000 less per-student in funding than the national average and $1000 less than LAUSD average funding.

b) The Green Dot school model is a "turnaround" model designed to work in struggling schools and neighborhoods. Their methods are justified through the turnaround of Alain Leroy Locke HS. GD schools worked with community leaders and staff to successfully petition LAUSD to cede control of Locke HS. Before GD restarted Locke, graduation rates in 2008 were 28% and 90% of students were performing below or far below basic on CST. Using their Restart Model (the school never ceased operation), GD LEAs restructured Locke into several small schools, replaced existing administration, and required all teachers to reapply for their jobs. Locke served a larger sped community, a returning juvenile detention population, and large numbers of over-age under-credited students. In addition to changing the school climate, academic and social/emotional supports were put in place. In four years, Locke students were 50% more likely to graduate and 269% more likely to have taken college preparatory courses than they had been before GDCS took over. In addition, since GDCS has taken over, the Locke schools have shown a 55% gain in ELA scores and 338% gain in math compared to students prior to the take over, and the total number of students rated proficient or advanced in math has gone from 37 to 242 since 2008. While GDCS recognizes these rates are still low, it does clearly indicate significant progress and success. Furthermore, an indicator of their success is that LAUSD invited GDCS to replicate their model in at David Starr Jordan HS and Henry Clay MS, the lowest-achieving schools in Los Angeles. In <u>one year</u>, the middle school (divided into 2 smaller academies) showed 6.1% gain in ELA and 10.4% gain in math, while the high school showed a 1.4% gain in ELA and 9.8% gain (from 2.3% to 12.1%) in math.

c) GDCS utilizes PowerSchool, a web-based student information system, to share information with students, educators, and parents. PowerSchool contains data on attendance, test scores, disciplinary incidents, and school-level data. Entering students are trained on how to use the system. GDCS offers workshops at the start of each year to parents on how to access and understand their students data in PowerSchool. Currently, only 25% of parents taking advantage of the trainings. The proposal plans to increase the frequency of PowerSchool training and provide increased support for parents from campus data developers and parent coordinators. Furthermore, educators have access to PowerSchool, Connect (a knowledge-sharing platform used by the consortium to give access to all GDCS various data systems), DataDirector (assessment results), and Bloom Board (calibrated professional development resource). Connect provides educators with real-time student and school level data for teachers, counselors, administrators, and other staff. More than 20 specialized reports with test scores, student growth percentiles, and attendance rates are available through Connect. While GDCS provide technology that supports ease of use in culling data, it also recognizes a need to improve these technology resources to make them more accessible for parents, ie. through additional trainings, mobile applications, etc., and intends to utilize grant funds to remedy this.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

GDCS maintains high levels of transparency in all processes, practices, and investments, including making all budgets, monthly financials, teacher salary schedules available to the public. A FY13 Budget is included in the Appendix and lists all expenditures. All four reporting areas required by RTTD are publicly available.

In addition to making budget and financial reports available to the public, GD also solicits input from the teachers union, parents, students, and other stakeholders while preparing the budget and presents the budgets in sufficient detail to allow school-level review of key revenue and expenditure categories.

GD also reports quarterly to key stakeholders: senior management, teachers union, lenders, funders, Finance Committee of the Board of Directors and the full Board of Directors. The teacher union president also sits on the Board of Directors and lends a voice to school budget discussions. GD has a School Advisory Council of teachers, parents, students, and community members who are elected to their positions. This SAC committee also reviews school budgets and comments or makes suggestions prior to Board approval.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Under California law, charter schools must participate in statewide assessment tests; must be nonsectarian; cannot charge tuition or discriminate against any student on the basis of ethnicity, national origin, gender, or disability. Outside of these laws, charter schools are exempt from most laws governing school districts.

GDCS documents sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning strategies described in their proposal, including new labor-management frameworks, wherein GD signed with the teacher union a 3 year contract negotiating no tenure, teacher performance evaluations, professional work days, and flexibility to adjust the contract over time, as well as allowing school leadership to hire and fire all staff within union contract parameters; flexible master-scheduling to support and build in interventions into the school day; curricular autonomy to meet the needs of the students; and governance via Board of Directors for major strategic and policy decisions related to the schools to support continuous improvement.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a) Parents and students were surveyed and focus groups were solicited at participating schools. In partnership with PIQE's Parent Education Program, GDCS Community Engagement Team convened 45 parents from 2 schools and presented the RTTD goal areas in both English and Spanish. GD asked parents specific questions about technology and supports and interventions they would like to see incorporated into the school day. Parents affirmed the need to increase classroom supports in the 4 core areas and to integrate social/emotional learning into the day. Concerning technology, 2/3 indicated they had Internet access but only 1/3 used PowerSchool to access their child's grades and other records. As a result, GD revised its RTTD proposal to include more PowerSchool trainings for parents and training on how to use mobile devices to monitor and support their child's education.

For those parents not part of the focus group, GD issued surveys at SAC meetings in Sept and Oct in English and Spanish (survey templates and findings provided in Appendix G & H). SAC was chosen because it was an elected body made up of students, parents, and educators that represent key school stakeholders. 101 elected parents and 32 student leaders were surveyed. Both groups identified after-school programs and tutoring as important needs. Additionally, technology and college persistence were ranked as most important. Based on these results, GD incorporated technology initiatives (upgrades and mobile device purchases) and expanded college persistence plan into its proposal.

GD recognizes the weakness presented by the limited and select group of highly engaged parents and is seeking measures to increase family involvement of all families being served by the schools.

Teachers were surveyed and a focus group was formed to solicit feedback on RTTD proposals. Additionally, 2 teacher union site representatives from each school and the CEO and Chief Academic Officer of the Lead Applicant attended the AMU (teacher union) Site Representative meeting. Site representatives and teachers validated the direction of the proposal and offered feedback to improve the goal areas. Some of these included a senior transition program for HS graduates, even more academic interventions than were already being used (because the ones in place were so effective), and improved technology and data.

b) tremendous support is evident for GDCS RTTD proposal. More than 330 pages of letters of support from federal, state, and community legislators, national foundations, community foundations and programs, union leaders and representatives, teachers, students and parents are documented in the proposal.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

GD schools convened a strategic planning process that reviewed external trends and consortium-wide internal practices. The findings from student achievements and outcomes, reviews from each school, and feedback from parents and students informed the reform vision in this proposal. The RTTD planning discussions unearthed a number of needs and gaps related to personalized learning within the plan, namely the need to accelerate GD's curricular strategies and supports around leadership and life, and to identify curriculum-enhancing technologies and data systems to advance student achievement. These elements are now addressed in GD's updated Strategic Plan and specific

goals/solutions are in place to address 5 key areas: teach leadership and life curriculum, track and support college persistence, support the whole student, expand the personalized pathways model in science and history, and use 21st century technology.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

GDCS describes a comprehensive plan for a personalized learning environment that provides all students the support to graduate college- and career- ready and enables them to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to their personal college or career goals through GD school model that combines small schools, highly effective teaching, data-driven decision making, master schedule flexibility, and a college-track culture.

a.i-iii) Students are enrolled in rigorous college preparatory courses that meet A-G graduation requirements for university admissions, including face-to-face AP courses and online AP courses in cases of special interest not available at GD schools. Students understand that the curriculum they study is necessary for college- and career-readiness, and meet individually with their counselors twice a year to assess and reassess their individual learning plans. Additionally, GD schools offer electives that complement the core content areas and provide deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest, such as advanced technology, graphic design, robotics, and performing and visual arts. After-school programs offer help with homework, SAT prep (through CollegeSpring), and provide academic and college counselors who support students and families with all aspects of college admissions and acceptance processes, as well as after-school programs that provide outlets of interest such as Latin dance and urban painting.

The proposal calls for additional technology that will allow students more opportunities to pursue their academic goals and master content at their own pace and that will monitor student progress in their learning goals. The proposal also calls for continued support beyond HS graduation of its students to help them transition to college and ensure they receive the supports and resources they need for college persistence.

a.iv) GD educators expose students to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives through the curriculum and offer students many opportunities to engage critical reading, writing, and thinking skills as they consider and re-evaluate their own assumptions, viewpoints, as well as evaluate their learning. The proposal states that GD teachers must demonstrate competency in delivering instruction that is inclusive, respects diversity, and provides access to the core curriculum for all students; in addition, education teams help teachers identify gaps in student learning opportunities, assess inequities in their classrooms, and utilize strategies that address existing inequities. However, the proposal does not state specific strategies GDCS take to ensure competencies or to identify gaps and inequities.

a.v) An advisory period is built into each student's schedule and is designed to be a structured environment where students reflect on their learning and connect their learning to life-long success. Advisory activities are organized around four areas: school culture and safety, academics, social life skills, and civic engagement. During this time, students receive support from their advisor and peers, learn test-taking and study skills, engage in college prep lessons, and explore issues related to their school experience.

b.i-v) Students at GDCS currently have many avenues to success through personalized learning sequences, high quality instructional environments, and content and tools to graduate on-time and college- and career-ready.

With the help of a counselor, students develop and revisit a graduation plan twice a year that specifically caters to the student's personal learning objectives and path. It is unclear how GDCS intends to help parents become involved in their students' educational progression or graduation, especially parents who are either uninvolved, are unable to be wholly involved because of work demands, or who feel overwhelmed by the system.

Currently students and parents have access to PowerSchool that allows them to monitor their progress; however, there appears to be limited digital learning resources. GD's RTTD recognizes this deficiency and has allocated RTTD funds to expand students' curricular choices and to give teachers access to coaching and technical support through computer-based adaptive learning programs and assessment tools in order to intervene early and often.

Teachers are taught how to differentiate instruction. Students receive differentiated instruction including a mix of large group, small group, and individual learning opportunities; varied assessments based on need; accommodations and modifications as necessary. GDCS has developed a RtI Initiative that matches student needs with specific services and resources that may include whole group, small group, or individual instruction, as well as referral to specific social/emotional services.

Furthermore, GDCS has identified 5 goals complete with activities, timelines, and responsibilities in their RTTD plan to further deepen and personalize learning: leadership and life, which teaches critical character building traits; college persistence; whole student support with "wraparound" services extended to all schools in the consortium (currently only at Locke schools); extend and further personalize core pathways, which meets students where they are academically and builds them up to meet college- and career- standards and graduation requirements; and integrate 21st century technology to complement caring, responsive student-educator relationships. No technology programs except *6 to 16* have been identified as possible resources.

c) Students receive annual training and are given updates on their progress frequently through PowerSchool; students analyze their assessment data with the help of their teachers and counselors in order to learn how to self-monitor their progress without the direction of an educator. Students are taught to take responsibility for their learning and to revisit their personal learning goals. There is no evidence that students will be monitored on their "self-monitoring"--in other words, it is not apparent how reluctant or unmotivated students are encouraged

to study their personal data and how they are continually monitored or supported in doing so.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

GD schools clearly demonstrate a commitment to recruit, train, and develop effective teachers and leaders to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student achievement in college- and career- ready standards and graduation requirements. Instructional leaders are trained through a 12 month multiple school site rotational Residency and learn an "entrepreneurial style of leadership" that supports the school learning environment through local-decision making; budgeting that is responsive to student needs; effective teaching in every classroom; engagement of the community; and management that breeds transparency and accountability. Teachers are trained, supported, and evaluated according to the College Ready Teaching Framework, and all teachers are member of AMU, a teacher's union that works with school leadership to prioritize the needs of the students. Education teams of educators, coaches, and counselors are in place at each GD school to offer expertise in targeted interventions that inform individualized Graduation Plans for each student.

a.i) The proposal states that GD schools provide educators with face-to-face and online professional development opportunities, although no specific examples are provided of online PD. GD schools use master schedules that include common planning and training opportunities. Within departments, teachers have a weekly common planning period, and departments meet once a month on late-start Wednesdays to discuss progress toward goals and curricular pathways. Grade levels meet once a month to develop intervention or acceleration plans for students based on their needs. Teachers are assessed using the Teaching Framework (explained in a.iv) based on their ability to differentiate instruction to suit student needs and learning styles. Administrators conduct 6 observations per year and analyze the teacher's lesson plans, classroom management & environment, and instruction by collecting evidence aligned to the Framework; however, only student and parent random-surveys are identified in section a.iv as the kinds of evidence collected. Additionally, the proposal states that administrators organize school-wide PD to reinforce student-centered teaching and learning standards, but no specific examples of PDs offered are stated. Teachers participate in consortium-wide "Collaboration Days," during which identified master teachers, mentors, and instructional coaches plan and facilitate content-area specific PD focused on areas of growth as identified through classroom observations. No specific examples of past PDs offered are stated. On some campuses, "lesson-tuning protocol" is utilized wherein a single teacher provides a lesson plan template, returns after 2 weeks with a revised lesson plan and examples of student work as a means to assess alignment between lesson objectives and student mastery.

a.ii) The proposal states that teachers are trained and assessed on their ability to differentiate instruction and provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks in response to their needs, such as discussion, collaborative work, projects, videos, audios, or manipulatives; yet, no examples are provided in this section to support this statement. In the Appendix for Student Surveys, student responses to what they like about the after-school programs indicate GD schools provide forums for discussion and projects through various clubs and interest groups. However, evidence of implementation in the classroom in these areas is lacking.

a.iii) Teachers rely heavily on assessment data to measure student progress toward academic and college- and career-ready goals. The proposal states ongoing diagnostic assessments inform instruction and promote continual improvement at the school sites, but specific examples of this are not provided. GD utilizes benchmark assessments 4 times a year in ELA, science, and history to evaluate individual student learning. Department chairs and administrators lead data analysis and teachers examine results to identify areas for remediation. Specific information regarding data analysis protocols is lacking.

a.iv) Teacher evaluations (supported by AMU and GD) derive from a research-based framework by Charlotte Danielson *A Framework for Teaching*, which addresses five domains as key factors necessary for student success: data-driven planning and assessing student learning; classroom environment; instruction; professional practice; and partnerships with family and community. There are 19 standards and 45 performance indicators within these 5 domains. Appendix K and L provide complete details and an outline for this rigorous evaluative system. Multiple measures are used to gauge teacher effectiveness, including classroom observations (6 total by administrators each year) followed by reflection and summative conferences; student growth that ties individual student achievement according to student growth percentiles to the teacher; stakeholder feedback, which provides twice yearly opportunities for students to explain "classroom life and teaching practices as students experience them" and parents to rate the teachers on measures of personalization and responsiveness to parent/student requests (no specific examples of the kinds of questions given to students are offered); and compliance, exclusive to special education teachers.

Supports are built into the system of evaluation through education teams that provide individual coaching to teachers. Novice or struggling teachers receive coaching from curriculum specialists and mentor teacher in their content areas. Demonstration Classroom Teachers open their classrooms at least 4 times per semester to provide professional learning opportunities for their colleagues. For SY2012-13, a second assistant principal was placed at each campus to "increase touch points with teachers; reduce teacher caseload; and allow more time for coaching and support."

A Leadership Evaluation System, piloted in SY2012-13, evaluates leaders based on their ability to improve academic achievement for all students and increase the effectiveness of their teachers. Six measures across 2 categories exist: leadership performance and school-wide student achievement. Specific evaluation measures or examples of evaluation system (as provided for Teacher Evaluation System) is not provided.

Throughout the grant period, the proposal plans to build increased coaching supports for history and science teachers, and curriculum specialists who will conduct regular observations to support teachers' ability to develop and deliver differentiate instruction.

b.i-iii) Information, tools, and resources are available for teachers and GD schools to use to respond to individual student needs and to provide feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs. In addition to classroom observations and instructional coaches, individual PD is supported by the online portal BloomBoard, which allows teachers to locate their position in the evaluation cycle, set personal goals tied to the Teaching Framework evaluation system, and to monitor their PD progress. The proposal also states teachers have access to "high-quality, self-driven" PD aligned with the Teaching Framework and includes educational research and videos of best practices. Specific

examples of these PD resources are not offered.

A data warehouse DataDirector provides teachers with individual students' test scores on CSTs and GD's benchmark tests in order to track and monitor student growth and progress toward college- and career-ready standards and goals. Teachers can scan classroom-based assessments into the system for analysis by class and by individual student, as well as by question and by standard.

The online social-networking site Connect allows educators to generate real-time student and school-wide reports, including student performance reports on state tests, student reports that include student growth percentiles, and a "literacy Dashboard, which includes CELDT level, CST by band, language status, Scholastic Reading Inventory score and ELA class grades."

The proposal states that the end goal of data analysis is to improve instruction; grade level and department educators study student data to identify standards that need to be remediated and to develop future lesson plans based on student growth. The proposal further states that teams consider how the learning environment needs to change in response to students' strengths and weaknesses, yet it is unclear what this entails. Departments collaborate to determine the scale of remediation needs (whole class, small group, or individual) and how best to achieve these needs.

Finally, the proposal states that a portion of RTTD funds will be used to identify and invest in research-tested adaptive assessment programs and knowledge-sharing platforms so teachers can access student data and monitor student progress in one integrated system, as well as to develop and use common, standards-aligned interim assessments to gauge student understanding and modify instruction. Trainings will be provided to train educators in the use of these systems. While GD recognizes a need for such a localized technology investment, the proposal offers no possible program or platform examples GD may be considering for use.

c.i) The proposal states that school leadership receives training, has policies, tools, data, and resources that enables them to structure an effective learning environment that meets student needs and accelerates student progress. Such trainings and evaluations for administrators occurs when senior education team leaders observe school leaders in bi-weekly 2 hour sessions on site. These sessions include time for administrators to receive training and offers oversight to ensure administrators are evaluating classroom observations consistently across school and LEAs, as well as provide administrators with PD in an area he/she has indicated as an area for growth. To facilitate information-sharing and networking across GD schools, administrators also visit other schools to observe instruction, attend monthly PD sessions focused on teacher coaching and evaluation, attend a 2 day annual retreat, and receive coaching support from designated Principal Mentors. Additionally, administrators have access to and training in the full range of data tools and how to use them. Instructional leaders are trained in how to train teachers and provide instructional support based on research-based best practices, and department chairs are trained in how to lead a data protocol that uses student assessment to drive classroom instruction. While specific examples of administrator trainings are provided, the evidence and kinds of training provided to instructional leaders and department chairs remains vague.

c.ii) Instructional and student achievement targets and goals are set by a team prior to the beginning of each year. State test results, graduation rates, subgroup performance, Early Assessment Program (a state initiative established for HS juniors to measure their readiness for college-level English and math and improve these skills their senior year), and SAT scores are utilized to set these goals and targets, all of which must exceed state benchmarks goals and targets. This team evaluates each school's progress toward these goals each semester by analyzing data related to the goals and targets to determine areas of need and next steps. This review process includes an assessment of the schools' learning strategies and tools. Administration and education teams convene annually to conduct a program review based on student data and stakeholder feedback to assess efficacy of the school model and create a forward-sighted "roadmap" to significantly increase student achievement.

d) GDCS has a rigorous recruiting program for both teachers and administrators to ensure that greater numbers of students have access to effective and highly effective teachers and principals. Teachers are recruited and hired after a comprehensive vetting process that includes an online assessment, phone and in-person interviews, and demonstration lesson and writing assignments to identify candidates who possess the qualities sought in effective teachers as outlined in the Teacher Framework. Once in the classroom, teachers are supported through individual and collective PD. Lastly, GDCS is piloting a performance based bonus system to retain educators in SY2012-13 with full-scale rollout expected in 2014. With all of these systems and strategies in place, GD estimates the number of teachers rated "effective" will increase from 65% to 88% consortium-wide by 2014-15. Administrators are recruited and trained through a 12 month multi-school Residency program with mentor principals. The program focuses in learning the skills required to address the needs of educationally disadvantaged students in high-needs communities. This program is so successful that LAUSD is partnering with GDCS to train leaders for the lowest performing LAUSD schools. A pilot program is used to evaluate administrators according to the Leadership Evaluation System, which takes into consideration college-readiness and teacher effectiveness scores, as well as the percentage of teachers the school leader recruits, retains, or promotes to leadership positions who are rated Highly Effective I or II.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1.a) GD LEAs describes a 3-tiered support and services system at the consortium, cluster, and school level to ensure effective management and consistency within and across all school sites. A management team comprised of 4 departments, education, which offers PD and oversees teacher evaluation, curriculum and instructional support, and after-school programs; operations, which supports IT services, data management, administrative recruiting and HR support, contractual services for areas such as security, transportation, and food, and facilities management; finance and accounting, which handles budgeting, financial analyses, payroll and contract management; and external affairs and strategic planning, which oversees fundraising, marketing, community engagement, community partnerships, and student enrollment, provide

consortium-wide academic guidelines and operations support in order to free campus administrators to focus on classroom and school climate. Smaller cluster teams employ Shared Cluster Directors and Cluster Business Managers for GD LEAs within close proximity to each other. These directors and managers provide individualized support to campus administrators, including directors who provide twice monthly individualized coaching sessions regarding supervision of instruction for administrators, design and deliver monthly PD for principals, administer Leader Evaluations, and support annual school strategic planning, and managers who provide budgetary, financial, and operations assistance to principals. Additional cluster supports include EL and SpEd program administrators, clinical supervisors, security coordinators, and athletic directors. These specialized groups ensure efficacy and consistency throughout the school cluster. At the school level, principals have ultimate responsibility and decision-making authority for the school.

1.b) GD specifies that school leaders earn autonomy for the critical decisions at their respective sites within the first two years of a school's opening. In the first year, support teams provide extensive assistance in facility renovation, use, operational, and legal considerations, while the principal focuses exclusively on teaching and learning at the school. After the second or third year of "demonstrated performance," principals are given the autonomy to refine their school model and work on continuous improvement. At this time, principals are also given complete autonomy in school decisions such as recruitment, personnel, budgeting, etc. In making these decisions, a School Advisory Council (SAC) comprised of school leadership, staff, community, and other stakeholders works in conjunction with a principal to ensure commitment to personalized learning through a school plan that creates and implements curricula, instructional strategies and materials responsive to the individual needs and learning styles of students, such as ELL and LEP students, special needs, and advanced students. The SAC also determines the academic calendar and makes school budget recommendations.

1.c) GDCS employ several online intervention tools and programs that individualize instruction by giving tier 2 RtI students the opportunity to gain mastery and credit recovery. Students 2 or more reading levels behind use Read180 to improve their reading comprehension and bring them up to grade level. GD schools also utilize Apex Learning for credit recovery, Agile Mind to support math and science skills, and Advance Path for students at risk of dropping out. These programs allow students to work through the curriculum and advance at their own paces. At this time, it does not appear that GDCS have many outlets for on-level students to progress and earn credit based on mastery. The middle schools use computer-based adaptive learning assessments created by NWEA to assess students' skills, and in 2013-14, GDCS plan to pilot Mastery Connect, which shares common formative assessments and tracks mastery of state and CCSS. Part of the RTTD proposal is to research and implement other computer-based adaptive learning tools and supports to differentiate instruction for all students.

1.d) GDCS states that it provides students with multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery and that teachers are evaluated based on their ability to differentiate instruction, assess individual students' mastery, and adjust lessons accordingly. It also states that students may retake assessments until they demonstrate mastery. However, specific examples of these opportunities are not given and the evidence remains vague. The proposal does state that teachers are "exploring" different assessment tools such as writing portfolios and short-answer constructed responses to assess mastery and reinforce writing skills, that schools would like to move to a model that emphasizes mastery and standards-based grading, and that 2 schools are "piloting mastery-based grading." Evidence beyond these statements is not presented.

1.e) GDCS provide targeted academic interventions to ensure all students graduate on-time and college-ready, and utilizes the GD LEA RtI to ensure a systematic way to identify and support students with unique learning needs. Specific examples of these interventions are only generally addressed in another section. Special education students receive a combination of consultative support, co-teaching in the general ed classroom, and direct instruction outside the gen ed classroom. They also receive specialized support such as mental health counseling, transportation, and transition specialist to augment academic support. No specific evidence outside of this statement is given. Specific academic interventions for ELLs is lacking, although the proposal does state that each school with more than 20 ELL students must have an elected EL Advisory Committee and schools with more than 50 ELL students organizes a district EL advisory committee with a minimum of 3 parent members. These committees meet 3 times a year to advise and make recommendations to principal and SAC on the implementation and evaluation of the school's ELL services. The only accommodation that appears to be in place is that at least one school employs only teachers who are bilingual in order to support core mastery for students in English and in Spanish.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

2.a-b) GD schools have limited access to learning resources such as computers for students to use. The schools have roving laptops for classroom use, but do not currently have laptops available for home use. GDCS recognizes a need for such devices and has allocated a portion of RTTD funds to be used to purchase such technologies and to offer trainings for parents and students on how to use these devices. The school utilizes PowerSchool for parents and students to access homework, grades, and test scores, as well as direct links to teacher emails, but currently only offers annual trainings. RTTD funds will also be utilized to provide more frequent PowerSchool and digital learning tools trainings, and information about how to ask educational and data-driven questions in parent-teacher conferences for families. Educators have access to a shared data warehouse in order to create customizable reports to track student and class progress and to inform instruction. Teachers may ask for additional assistance in using these technologies from their campus support teams. BloomBoard and Connect offer online PD and networking support for teachers.

2.c) Currently, GDCS use PowerSchool as its primary vehicle for students and parents to retrieve student data. GD recognizes a need and has allocated a portion of RTTD funds to purchase a "unified knowledge-sharing platform that links together all data from GD schools." They anticipate that this platform will allow families to obtain a more comprehensive view of the student's overall educational experience, including activities, assessments, discipline records, feedback from teachers, grades, attendance, etc. No platform for potential purchase has been identified in the proposal, although it does state they anticipate using Cornerstone on Demand (the company that developed their Connect program) to design the platform.

2.d) GDCS does not have a comprehensive interoperable data system in place, although they do have a data warehouse focused on student and teacher data and can use Tableau reports to share this data with stakeholders. The proposal calls for a build out of the data warehouse to include all GD schools within its framework and to provide for a more seamless user experience through single sign-on. Currently, the pilot

program Mastery Connect (a platform that encompasses all schools) is a potential replacement for DataDirector.

While GDCS recognizes a need for technology programs and devices, it has not provided specific programs or devices (outside of laptops) they intend to purchase or are considering for purchase with RTTD funds.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

GDCS shows evidence of a continuous improvement process currently in place with a detailed plan for ensuring all grant activities are subject to consistent stakeholder review and improvement across the consortium. The Lead LEA Applicant (Animo Leadership CHS) will house the RTTD Project Compliance Manager. The manager will convene primary responsible parties for each goal area on a quarterly basis and will use a detailed dashboard tool (Appendix O) with strategic priorities (i.e. advisory standards, research best practices, develop tools to measure success, build the scope of sequence of curriculum, pilot curriculum, revise curriculum, and expand the program) and initiatives for each priority that provides goals to be met each school year, lead and team members, as well as quarterly targets to be met, progress updates, and status for each priority and initiatives within the priorities. This dashboard tool will gauge progress and flag areas requiring extra attention. In cases of delay or other unforeseeable issues, the manager and project leads will problem-solve and/or recalibrate expectations in line with data. All participants will leave the quarterly meeting having agreed in writing on the priorities for the next quarter.

The project manager will also solicit feedback from school principals in conjunction with SACs each semester to report on implementation in the schools. Principals will be asked to identify site-specific barriers to implementation and make suggestions for course improvements. The Project manager will report to the Management Team at Animo Leadership on progress and outcomes on a quarterly basis. The management team will review progress against RTTD metrics, including implementation milestones (detailed in section C1 and E3) and will initially focus on implementation metrics and incorporate project-related academic outcomes beginning in Y3 and Y4, as they realize it takes time for programs to "take root and impact student outcomes." The management team will also assess interdependencies, consortium capacity, financial/budgetary resources, and initiative progress to ensure it is approaching its work in a holistic and coordinated fashion.

GDCS identifies this continuous improvement cycle as the process that all GD schools use to develop, monitor, and evaluate all strategic initiatives. As such, their experience in using the model is proven through their record of success in other initiatives, such as the Teacher Evaluation System, a first of its kind in California.

Stakeholder feedback and input ensures that decision-making is responsive to the needs of everyone who works, studies, and learns within GDCS and to the communities the schools serve. Stakeholders include students, families, community leaders, teachers, administrators, school management, and Board members, and are key parties to ensuring all RTTD initiatives are implemented with fidelity. New information from various sectors will inform progress, adjust course when necessary, and recalibrate goals. To ensure transparency, the External Affairs Team at the Lead LEA will share results from the continuous improvement process and the RTTD goals and implementation plans with previously mentioned stakeholders and outside evaluators in the following manner: press releases to program partners and local and national news outlets, update at least quarterly the Accountability section of its website (which received 10,000 unique visitors a month and 550,000 page views per year) with a detailed description of RTTD initiatives, dedicate a section of its Annual Report to RTTD progress, and develop annual individual school report cards that include RTTD performance measures and that respond to the information needs of parents in the communities GD schools serve. Report cards will support personalized learning by increasing schools' accountability for its results, policies, and practices.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Appropriate strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with all stakeholders is documented in the plan.

- Educators' feedback will be (and has already been) solicited regarding the efficacy of RTTD investments, and feedback on RTTD investments and progress will be solicited during monthly AMU Site Representative meetings. Additionally, GD educators and support staff gather for a day of sharing, learning, and goal-setting at the start of each academic year, and the project manager will meet with each school principal once a semester to get feedback and suggestions regarding RTTD implementation. Updates will be shared in the network newsletter distributed to teachers and staff on a weekly basis.
- Student, Parent, and Community Members' feedback will be informed via annual meetings with union rep's, principals, SAC members and other education stakeholders to share program progress and findings. Quarterly breakfasts at schools and community centers will provide a forum for community members to ask questions, hear GD practices and policies, and to engage pressing issues facing the community. Monthly newsletters are distributed to 5300 external stakeholders and will incorporate RTTD updates in each newsletter. Open Board meetings will include a review of RTTD investments to maintain transparency.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

GDCS identifies 14 required and applicant-proposed performance measures with a rationale for selecting each applicant-proposed measure in a chart; however, support is vague and extremely limited for "how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading

information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern" and is completely lacking for "how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress." The chart identifies a rationale for having chosen applicant-proposed performance measures and offers the relevance to the proposed plan. In many cases, the performance measures are "repeats" of grades 6-8 in grades 9-12. For example, the performance measure for grade 6-8 "% Students who are not credit deficient," as well as its rationale "students cannot graduate and progress toward careers and college when they are credit deficient" and its relevance to the proposed plan "GD organizes specific interventions designed to help students earn credits so that they can graduate on-time and college-ready," is repeated word for word for grade 9-12. Other performance measures are identified similarly.

In a more detailed chart of the performance measures, baseline year percentages and numbers are identified with targets for growth for each grant year and one post-grant year. For example, the performance measure "The # and % of students taking CSTs who scored Far Below Basic on either their ELA exam, Math exam, or both" offers baseline data of 2130 and 27.8% students for SY2011--12. For SY 2012-13, it offers 1981 and 24.8%, 2013-14: 1784 and 21.8%, 2014-15: 1538 and 18.8%, 2015-16: 1292 and 15.8%, and 2016-17: 1046 and 12.8% for its overall participating student population. This represents a 3% overall decrease each year. Additional performance measures include an approximate 3-5% growth for percent of schools which increase their SGP; a 4% increase in the percent of teachers who are "effective or above;" a 10% increase in the % of principals rated "effective or above;" a 7% increase each year in the number of students 6-8 who are not credit deficient; a 4% increase in the number of students grades 6-8 who are Proficient or Advanced in ELA and Math; a 6% reduction in suspension rates among students grade 6-8; a 3% growth in percent of grade 12 students who complete and submit a FAFSA; a 4% growth each year among grade 9-12 students on track to graduate with A-G measures; a 3% growth among students grade 9-12 who are not credit deficient; a 4% growth among grade 9-12 students scoring Proficient or Advanced on ELA and Math CSTs; and a 3% reduction among among grade 9-12 students in suspension rates.

The performance measures overall lack ambition but indicate achievability; however, a few individual performance measures are ambitious and achievable, such as a 10% increase in effective or above principals and 7% increase in grades 6-8 students who are not credit deficient.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Internal monitoring and evaluation will occur, but GD has plans to hire a designated RTTD Project Compliance Manager to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of RTTD investments during and after the term of the grant. As detailed in E2, the manager will team with finance and data specialists to create accurate and timely reports on grant implementation and results to be shared on a regular basis with the Lead LEA, all other participating LEAs, and key stakeholders. In addition to internal measures, GD will contract with a 3rd party to assess the 3 out of 5 goal areas: Leadership and Life, Whole Child Support, and 21st Century Technology. These areas require complex statistical analysis, which the 3rd party contractor will study and help establish causal links between RTTD inputs and activities and student outcomes.

While this section does not delineate these plans specifically, other sections (E2 and D2, among others) provided detailed analysis of these measures.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1.a) In Section XI, GDCS provides thorough, extensive, and exhaustive budget narrative and tables (50 pages) that identifies all funds that will support the entire project for each grant project year, and which is further copiously broken down by the 5 key goals identified the the proposal's vision, specifically Leadership and Life Curriculum budget and narrative, College Persistence budget and narrative, Whole Student Support budget and narrative, Core Pathways budget and narrative, and 21st Century Tech budget and narrative.

1.b) In review of the budget and narratives, the proposal appears to be both reasonable, sufficient, and sustainable throughout the grant years and beyond.

1.c) a rationale for each investment and priority is provided overall and by the 5 goals/projects areas. Each project level goal identifies comprehensive cost description, cost assumption by grant year, and total costs, including those that are one-time costs vs. ongoing costs, as well as those whose funding will come from unrestricted State and local funding. An additional budget is given for project compliance and evaluation costs to monitor, assess, and manage all terms and targets of this proposal and required by the grant. The proposed budget and budget narrative offers little information *in this section* regarding long-term sustainability; however, section F2 provides some evidence of this.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The cost of the goal areas provided in the proposal includes a combination of one-time investments in technology and supplies, which GD identifies as not surpassing the grant period and which will reduce other ongoing operating expenses; existing personnel and resources focused on personalized learning which can be funded by existing sources after the grant expires; and new, recurring costs that can be funded through increases in existing sources and new funding sources.

The proposal states that 30% of the funds from the grant will be used for one-time investments in technology and supplies and include purchases such as mobile devices and wireless networks, curriculum materials for 4 core areas, technology infrastructure and equipment, technology consulting and training development, evaluation of program effectiveness, curriculum materials and online tools for Leadership and Life, and "other devices and materials." Each of these areas has a budget allocated to it. The proposal identifies specific purchases that will reduce ongoing costs of supplies, equipment, and physical media, materials, and textbooks that are replaced by digital resources. Computerized adaptive assessments will reduce the need for physical testing supplies.

The proposal states that 26% of the grant will be used to focus the consortium's existing personnel and resources on improving personalized learning through proposal initiatives. These resources include curriculum specialists, technology and knowledge management personnel, student counseling and wellness service providers, and teachers dedicated to implementing personalized strategies. Beyond the grant period after initiatives have been developed and implemented, the school site personnel can manage programs more easily and less expensively. Resources and costs needed to be continued beyond the grant period will be funded by current funding sources.

44% of the cost of the initiatives represent new, ongoing expenses. These total $13 million throughout the life of the grant and $4.2 million per year in ongoing costs. These new ongoing costs will be funded through new funding sources as well as modest projected increases in existing sources. The goals described in the proposal will increase GDCS ability to raise monies from philanthropic sources who invest in new ideas and visionary leaders in education. In the past, GD has raised between 5%-15% of their annual budgets from foundations and corporate and individual donors that have been instrumental in developing prior projects such as teacher evaluation and compensation models, new paradigms for labor-management relations, community organizations that empower parents as advocates, codification and dissemination of practice-based models to turnaround low-performing schools, and administrator training programs that impact student success, among others. At the Locke Wellness Center, GD LEAs have leveraged a federal grant to coordinate more than 20 non-profit partners that provide free health and wellness services to the Locke community. Past successes in fund-raising make it reasonably sure that GD will be able to fund ongoing costs with new fundraising. Current relationships exist between GD consortium members and major philanthropic organizations such as Broad Foundation, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, The Michael and Susan Dell Foundation, Carnegie Corp of NY, and the Walton Family Foundation. However, the ability to gain new funding sources and citing probable increases in existing sources cannot be guaranteed. An apparent weakness is that the applicant appears to rely upon, at least in part, current contributors as committed sources of revenue when no contract of continued support exists.

In spite of this weakness, the proposal does state that not all funding needs to come from fundraising. GD provides ample evidence that the projects undertaken in this proposal are sustainable beyond the grant period. Revenue and expense forecasts show modest assumptions for growth in state and local public funding that will ensure sustainability. The proposal further shows entire operating costs during the grant period and for 3 years thereafter. Total revenues show a slight decrease after the grant period but the gap is recovered through other funding sources. Offsets are expected as well, which will also forecast a decline in supply, equipment, and other operating expenses.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1) GDCS has a pilot program called the Locke Wellness Center--a place-based, wraparound service model--in place now and expects to extend this service model to all participating schools in the consortium over the course of the grant period.

The 5 Locke High School LEA members, in partnership with multiple community organizations and LAUSD, and with the support of the USDE Full Service Community Schools Program and the California Wellness Foundation, launched the LWC, located across the street from the Locke schools, in 2011 to serve the Locke schools. The goal of the LWC is to provide a comprehensive and integrated set of wraparound services and supports to students, families and community members. Since its opening, it has served over 3000 students and 600 parents with programs and services including vision screenings, sex health education and services, teen dating violence prevention, juvenile diversion programs for high-risk youth, academic and college-readiness supports for youth in foster care, resource navigation services, and adult ESL classes.

The impetus for the LWC derived from the acknowledgement that students face challenges outside of the learning environment that inhibit learning and stall academic achievement. The planning for the LWC engaged over 20 local organizations with established track records of providing high-quality, culturally competent services to area students. Some of these organizations include LAUSD School of Mental Health, Watts Healthcare Corp, Planned Parenthood LA, and Break the Cycle. The design process involved a comprehensive needs assessment and the creation of an Advisory Committee comprised of teachers, parents, and community members to ensure community-driven solutions.

2) GDCS identifies 6 population desired results:

- for students' family and community benefit, 75% of students who engage in sexual and reproductive health education will have increased knowledge of protection against STDs and unplanned pregnancies
- for students' education benefit, disciplinary issues among students who engaged in behavioral or mental health services will decrease by 15%
- for students' education benefit, suspension among students who engaged in behavioral or mental health services will decrease by 15%
- for parents' family and community benefit, 80% of those who have engaged in or accessed services will report feeling welcomed by the school
- for students' education benefit, students who engage in violence prevention services will have a 10% decrease in disciplinary referrals

for students' education benefit, students receiving services from the School Services and Attendance Counselor will have a 10% increase in attendance.

Each of these results achieves education outcomes by ensuring students have the best chance at graduating on-time and college-ready by improving family support and decreasing drop-out rates.

3.a-b) GDCS utilizes a proven software system, Social Solution's Efforts-to-Outcomes, to coordinate service delivery and outcomes tracking across multiple organizations. It is highly customizable and is in use with over 40 Promise and Choice Neighborhoods awardees. The system tracks outreach, intake/demographics, assessments and survey data, program attendance, services provided to families, and outcomes with the specific purpose of measuring impact and improving program performance. The software allows GD to track services for individuals and families from multiple providers and to create and publish reports to share with the Advisory Committee and other stakeholders. GD schools are also able to collect and aggregate de-identified student and family data in compliance with privacy laws. All reports are available in real-time, accommodate user-defined data parameters, allow specific data, and are printable and exportable. The Community Schools Coordinator will generate reports by ESEA and program-identified subgroups to identify and provide services to children and families with the highest level of needs. The criteria for "highest level of needs" is not defined in this proposal.

3.c) GDCS intends to utilize the Locke model and scale to all its schools. Their strategy is described in 4 parts. Each model will include a designated Community School Coordinator, who will assess students' needs and connect students and families to local health, wellness and social services, and a Student Services and Attendance Coordinator, who will function as an advocate and provide direct individual and family counseling and other interventions to chronically truant and high-risk of drop out students. Additionally, each GD Cluster will have a Planning Committee of staff, admin, students, and parents to undertake a needs assessment to prioritize program offerings, devise a referral process, and support marketing and outreach. Each Cluster will also utilize the ETO software to track program services once a month that have been inputted by service partners, and will review program data to more effectively target resources and serve students and families with highest level of needs. Lastly, each Cluster will ensure ongoing outreach and marketing to build general awareness about the Wraparound Model and increase participation in specific programs/services.

3.d) The ongoing improvement of the Wraparound Model begins with a comprehensive evaluation of the LWC every 3 years. It is currently in its 3rd year. It is designed to identify and codify best practices in order to support expansion to other school sites. The evaluation includes annual interviews and focus groups with all stakeholders, and the third year will focus on collecting and analyzing program outcomes with particular emphasis on participation and user satisfaction measures. All Clusters will adopt the program improvement model currently in place, which includes monthly data reports, quarterly progress meetings, and 2 program observations per partner each year to support program refinement.

4) The model is designed to integrate educational and non-academic supports for participating students. Services are brought to the school site and the schools refer students and families. Coordinators also work with school leadership and clinical teams to imbed wellness into the academic model. One example is that Planned Parenthood LA provides sexuality education and Break the Cycle offers dating violence prevention programs during Advisory periods. Similar opportunities are being explored to introduce social/emotional and health education into existing courses.

5) Targeted support and training is provided by community school coordinator, student services and attendance coordinators to staff members in their assigned cluster in order to build their ability to assess student needs and identify the appropriate channels of support. One example is the Safe and Civil Schools Training that helps school staff improve safety and civility across all school settings. Teachers also use the RtI model to identify students who need academic or wellness support. An Advisory Committee includes stakeholders from each school site within a Cluster. It undertakes needs assessments and reviews data, focus groups and survey information to identify school-level priorities. Once in place, the committee will provide ongoing guidance for services, marketing, and outreach efforts; approve new partnership opportunities; review program reports from ETO system to evaluate the contributions of existing partners; and ensure that ALL stakeholder perspectives are reflected in the implementation.

6) Performance measures and desired results are the same as previously mentioned in E3 and are broken down by subgroup for each year of the grant and one post-grant year. These include a 7% decrease in suspension rates among 6-8 graders; a 3% decrease in suspension rates among 9-12 graders; a 3% increase consortium wide of students proficient or advanced in ELA and Math; an approximate 5-7% increase in Student Growth Percentile; a 7% increase in students on track for college- and career readiness in 6-8 grades, and 3% increase among 9-12 graders; and a 3% increase in the number of students consortium-wide on track to receive an A-G diploma. There is no separate description of the desired results outside of the performance measures goals.

GDCS provides an ambitious goal in implementing their wraparound services that, if successful and sustainable, not only has the potential to completely change the function of the school in students', families', and the community's lives, but also has the potential to significantly alter students' lives who may not otherwise perceive a connection to, engagement with, or investment in their community and society.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly, comprehensively, and completely addressed each of the core educational assurance areas in their plan to create learning environments and supplemental social supports to improve students' learning, achievement, and readiness for the next stage of their

lives, as well as improve teaching and educator effectiveness. GDCS plan has an ambitious goal that has the potential to become the true model of education reform across the nation and one that could make the difference in so many students' lives by providing a vision and a lifestyle alternative to the cycle of poverty that plagues so many.

Total	210	194

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	15

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

A detailed and comprehensive budget narrative is included that provides strong support for the development and implementation of the initiative's objectives and design. If approved, the project has the potential to positively impact the educational and learning experiences of hundreds of thousands of students, educators, and families in LAUSD, as well as codifying programs and objectives for use by educational leaders nationwide.

The Consortium of GDCS is seeking an Optional Budget Supplement of $2 million to directly fund a collaborative program with LAUSD to recruit, train and place 10 turnaround leaders to lead the turnarounds of the persistently lowest-performing schools in LA. Turnaround leaders will be selectively recruited and trained in a rotational residency at high-performing GD schools in order to develop the expertise to reverse cultures of low expectations and engage teachers and students in the creation of personalized learning environments that prepare students for college, leadership, and life. The collaboration will build turnaround leadership in LA where 40% of all schools are defined as persistently low-performing by the federal SIG fund. The goal is to train 16 turnaround leaders (7 within LAUSD, the others within GDCS Consortiums) in 3 years, whereas the larger vision is to train 56 leaders by 2018. The Optional Supplemental budget supports GD RTTD vision of prioritizing strong leadership, effective teaching, and personalizing education for the most educationally disadvantaged students through a focus on academic, social, and emotional learning responsive to the student's individual needs. The Weingart Foundation has committed an additional $660,000.

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0634CA-3 for Animo Leadership Charter High School

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant succinctly sets forth a comprehensive and appropriate reform vision that builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas. They identify their vision in reiterating "Everybody knows my name" as a school reform motto which is clearly focused on individualized and personalized learning and support. This is articulated in a strong and credible approach to the goals of personalized learning which is aptly evidenced in: accelerating student achievement; deepening student learning; and increasing equity through personalized student support which is grounded in common and individual tasks based on student academic interests. This is coherently evidenced in a logic model which effectively articulates an extensive and sequenced Green Dot Theory of Change. This theory is clearly and coherently articulated as a Personalized Learning Environment model.

The program appears to be well positioned to advancing at-risk youth to succeed in college, leadership and life and aligned to the four RTTT D core educational assurance areas.They applicant identifies their human capital and efficient management system to ensure student achievement and deepening student learning. These are detailed in short term goals and three long term outcomes. Three long term goals are delineated as: success in college; success in leadership and success in life.

The past successes of the applicant is highlighted in a decade of educational reform in their turn-around schools model which has emerged as national leadership standard in school reform. They detail their collaboration with the California Teachers Union to evidence support in implementing a robust Teacher Evaluation System. This system is identified as a successful model to evaluate, support and retain highly effective teachers. In addition, they detail a performance-based compensation initiative that rewards multiple tiers of effective teaching.

In summary, the applicant is applying for a grant in order to implement focused strategies and practices that will: deepen and accelerate learning for 10,300 educationally disadvantaged students in inner city communities; and influence the education of tens of thousands more students by sharing its best practices model. Their vision is based on their experience of what works, coupled with an understanding of the increased personalization required for America's best performing students to be able to compete with the best and in a global economy.

The applicant has taken a student's view to frame their vision, asserting "Everyone Knows my name" to affirm a personalized approach to learning. The applicant considers their approach as substantial and sustainable in changing the way education is happening. The four pillars of their reform vision encompass: leadership and life curriculum college persistence whole student support; core pathways by developing curriculum maps and learning trajectories for history and math to expand current programs in language and math; and 21st century technology.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A. The applicant identifies a strong approach to implementing a reform initiative by identifying 18 LEAs as comprising the Consortium of Green Dot Charter Schools to collaborate in implementing a comprehensive and sequenced turn-around schools vision. The reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation plan. The plan aptly details a description of the process to be used to select schools to participate and collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements. All of the schools in the consortium meet the eligibility requirements as evidence in the schools enrolling over 10,300 high needs students who far exceed the eligibility threshold for the percentage of low income families, whose children are eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch program services.

B. The applicant presents a chart which clearly identifies a list of each of the schools in the consortium hat will participate in grant activities.

C. The applicant presents a comprehensive chart which clearly identifies each of the 14 participating LEAs, the grade levels of participating students and the raw data and the actual numbers of: participating educators; participating students; participating high needs students; participating low-income students; total number of low income students in each LEA; total number of students in each participating school. A cohesive chart is presented which further expands the data indicating the percentage of: participating students from low income families; participating students from the school and the total LEA or consortium low income population.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The application effectively details a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled-up and translated into meaningful reform to support change throughout the consortium schools and beyond the participating schools. A very clear and comprehensive logic model describes the applicant's theory of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all participating students.

The applicant details an ambitious and achievable high quality plan describing how the reform plan is translated into meaningful reform for the participating school. For example, LEA wide reform and change will be implemented in programs services focused on: leadership and life curriculum; college persistence; whole student support with wrap-around services; core pathways which expand personalized learning pathways model and 21st century technology. For example, they identify to transform educational experiences for students harnessing technology to provide opportunities for students to pursue their academic interests and master content at their own pace. In addition, the proposed reform initiative calls for a more focused approach to developing higher order thinking skills that enables students to recognize and respond to social problems. This is advanced in the Leadership an Life curriculum designed to promote self confidence, creativity and character strength.

The applicant asserts their commitment to scaling-up reform beyond its network of participating LEAs. This is evidenced by their plan to increase enrolled schools up to six new charter middle school LEAs. These schools will adopt the model and its best practices, in member schools in the consortium and substantially expand enrollment. By expanding services to additional middle schools they will develop a replicable seven year pathway to college, helping dramatically to raise rates of college readiness across Los Angeles County.

The applicant effectively identifies their strong management plan to ensure the effective implementation program activities. They specify that implementation will involve all 18 LEAs in the consortium. The proposed initiative will catalyze meaningful reform as it relates to two crucial inputs in the Theory of Change: personalized learning environments and the use of technology to guide decision making and continuous improvement. The reform and change proposed will create best practice base frameworks or schools across the entire city of Los Angeles.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant effectively details a vision that is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious goals that are equal to, and in specific areas exceed state-level proposed targets for the each of the 12 Consortium LEAs. This is clearly evidenced in performance assessments indicating proficiency status and growth. The applicant justifies the establishment of each of the targets by basing each on past student performance and a review of school level data from each of the participating LEAs. The applicant presents a chart which details raw data of participating schools demographics

(b) The applicant presents a chart outlining the performance on summative assessment and proficiency status and program goals which clearly focus the proposed program endeavors on decreasing achievement gaps. This is evidenced in identifying the overall baseline for all subgroups in performance on English Language Arts as 32% and proposes a goal to increase this performance to 46% by the end of the grant period.

c) The applicant presents a concise chart which indicates the present graduation rates and their proposed goal for student progress. This is evidence in the fact that in 2010-2011 92% of students graduated and with rigorous services and resources proposes to increase the graduation rate to 94%. Of note; the applicant early identifies the need to sever ELL students whose graduation rate in 2010-2011 was 79%. The applicant's reform initiative propose to increase this to 94%.

(d) The applicant presents data which identifies that overall, among the participating LEAs between a 69% to 94% range of students are enrolled in college. The applicant details strategies to advance learning for all participating LEAs specifically for the lowest performing school to advance the 69% college enrollment rate to 81% by the end of the grant period.

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	15

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant copiously details an effective twelve year track record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and in increasing equity in learning and teaching. This is evidenced in the applicant detailing a comprehensive turn-around school initiative which is well positioned to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps including: raising student achievement; high school graduation rates; and college enrollment rates. They document their abilities to raise student achievement and create pathways to college and careers in some of the highest need area in Los Angeles County. They offer comparative data noting students in the Green Dot Independent Charter Schools are 25% more likely to graduate from high schools, than those in comparative communities. This is based on the fact that they presently graduate 91.8% among their schools, as compared to 66.5% of comparison schools. They provide documentation from the California Academic Performance Index which asserts the applicant's schools average more than 76 points higher than comparable public schools in similar neighborhoods. A chart of Green Dot Schools API scores by subgroup is presented. For example, this specifies an average API score for African American students as 628 in October 2011 and proposes to increase student achievement in this subgroup by 66 points or 11.8%. Graduation rates among all sub groups are also clearly charted.

(b) The applicant details their success in working with the Locke Family of Schools which replicates their turnaround school initiatives and working with their high school, which is identified as the lowest performing high school in Los Angeles. Data from student performance and progress in their schools clearly evidenced in their ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools. They aptly reference that in 2007, the applicant worked with community leaders and staff and successfully petitioned the Los Angeles Unified School District to cede control of the Locke High School. This school is described a massive comprehensive high school that had become emblematic of the widespread failure of urban inner city education. Of note, this was the first time than an independent LEA had been granted control of an LAUSD school. At the time of the takeover, students demonstrated a 28% graduation rate and 90% below basic performance levels on the California Standards Test. They effectively detail their take over and restructuring process. As a result in 2012, data published from a three year quasi-experimental matched pair evaluation, conducted by UCLA National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing identified Green Dot students were 50% more likely to graduate from high school and 269% times more likely to have completed course work that prepares them or college, as compared to similar schools in the state of California.

(c) The applicant details the use and deployment of PowerSchool, which is a web based student information system which captures and shares information with students, educators and families. This nationally recognized program makes student performance data available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. This system also includes accessible information on attendance, test scores and discipline issue. To support students in the use of the system, a Summer Bridge program is offered to entering students. In addition, at the beginning of each school year, parent training is offered in all partnering schools in a series of individual school organized workshop. They estimate that 25% of parents attend the training.

The applicant also identifies collaborating schools to launch the Connect program, which is a knowledge sharing platform that will be used by the consortium to provide professional development and communication for educators across the consortium school. The Connect web based program is succinctly detailed to enable staff to access DataDirector or assessment results an the Dash Board for coordinated professional development resources.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant asserts they are committed to a high level of transparency in processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. They define making available to the public its budgeting and financial reporting including: making budgets available to the public; soliciting input on financial matters from the teacher union, parents and other stakeholders and presenting financial results to allow school level reviews.

The applicant identifies a Board of Directors for every Green Dot school and who serve to approve school level budgets. They assert the Green Dot Schools management teams report quarterly financial updates to key stakeholders and to the teachers unions and Boards of Directors. They also identify open access to budget details and on-going financial activities through the school boards an through each school's designated School Advisory Council. This Council is made up of teachers, parents, students and community members, who are elected to these positions on an annual basis. One of the responsibilities of the School Advisory Council is to review and offer comments on the annual school budget.

The applicant states that they do not publish individual salary information but that the seniority based teacher schedule is available online as a part of a publicly available teacher's union contract. They identify that they strive for transparency of all school level financials and plan to include matrices such as teacher costs which will allow public reviewers to easily determine average teachers' salaries.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

As a consortium of 14 public charter schools, applicant clearly identifies successful conditions and sufficient autonomy which exists for each school in compliance with state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments. They clearly reference the California regulations for public charter school which requires participation in the statewide assessment tests and the fact that they charter schools must be nonsectarian and cannot charge tuition or discriminate against any person's ethnicity, national origin, or disability. Beyond these regulations they identity that state charter schools are generally exempt from most laws governing public schools. The identify that the consortium schools are afforded sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning strategies.

The applicant clearly identifies the core freedoms of the schools. These encompass: New labor-management frameworks; scheduling; academic autonomy and governance. In the realm of academic autonomy, they specify the schools comply with the California Department of Education standards and have autonomy in terms of curriculum choices. They identify that academic flexibility supports personalized learning because it allows educators to design curriculum and structure professional development in ways that best meet the needs of the students. They specify a 19:1 ratio in their schools make it possible to be responsive to student needs in school sites. This is referenced in budgeting and in effective financial management, and in the fact that educators develop personal relations with students and adopt instruction based on their students strengths and needs.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A. The applicant demonstrates clear evidence of stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and their on-going input and support for program endeavors. This is evidenced in a tiered feedback process which ensures the authentic representation of a wide cross section of stakeholders in the RTTT D application development process. They adequately identify stakeholders to include: students; teachers; support staff; administrators; parents and civic and community leaders. They adequately detail a description of the process specifying how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal. For example, the applicant surveyed parents and students in focus groups and on-line and paper surveys to solicit input. In addition, they identify their partnership with the Parent Institute for Quality Education, which is a unified Green Dot Schools Community Engagement Team, which convened meetings with 45 parents from the participating schools. In addition, the applicant references meetings with SAC groups from each school representing teachers, students and parents. They aptly document hosting focus groups in English and in Spanish to discuss the reform strategies.

They detail example of parent input to assess needs including the need to increase classroom support in core areas and to integrate social and emotional learning into the school day. Of the parents present in the meetings, two-thirds indicated they have access to the internet but only one third uses PowerSchool to see their children's grades and attendance. The applicant evidences incorporating parent feedback into the program design by including the scheduling of expanded school and learning hours to facilitate parents' access to PowerSchool and to other school digital tools for information. In addition, input is referenced from SAC teams comprised of teachers, parents and students. On example of input from the SAC focused on increasing technological resources.

It appears as though limited parents and parent audiences were surveyed, evidencing a lack of meaningful engagement. For example, they state that parents on the SAC were surveyed, but lack information on surveying all parents for a more comprehensive input of information.

B. The support of the teachers and the educational community is detailed as evidenced in hosting focus groups and distributing surveys to engage their input in the application development process. In addition, they reference a meeting host on October 1, 2012 with the CEO and Chief Academic Officer of the lead Applicant, Animo Leadership and two teachers' union site representatives from each school (36 totals.) An overview of tis meeting references providing a detailed overview of the proposed new RTTT-D initiative and the solicitation of feedback and suggestions from teachers. They note that site representative validated the direction of the application and offered suggestions to improve in goal area. They evidence the incorporation of the educators' ideas in noting the college persistence program which will now include a new Senior Transition program to prepare seniors for college and life after graduation.

The applicant has included more than 200 letters of support to advance their initiative. These include letters from the California Teachers Association, Regional UniServe Director, and the Los Angeles Unified School District in support of the program.

Numerous other letters of support are included from key stakeholders such as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, the business community, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education. For example, letters of support are included representing the: mayor; state and federal congress persons; Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; the Broad Foundation; Watts Healthcare Corporation and the Parent Institute for Quality Education. Additional letters from local community groups are evidenced from: United Friends of Children: Planned Parenthood; Shields for Families and the Partnership for Los Angeles Schools. Letters of support from institutions of higher education are included from Pepperdine University and Loyola Marymount University

While letters of support are included, many of them appear to be similar and voice a general support for the program and lack specificity. For example, letters from the Weingarten Foundation and from the Partnership for Los Angeles Schools are the exact same content as the letters from the Green Dot Schools staff letter. These lack specificity in noting how and when their support will be offered.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates evidence of a high-quality plan for the analysis of the current status in their consortium schools in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the proposed initiative. This is evidenced with the applicant's identification of the reform vision as an outgrowth of an intensive strategies planning process initiated by the management of all the Green Dot LEAs, as well as extensive strategy discussion among senior leaders and key stakeholders. One example of analyzing the current status is adequately detailed in notes from a meeting conducted in February 2011. This meeting was launched by the Green Dot schools management team and teacher union representatives from each school, as a part of their strategic planning process to thoroughly review external trends and consortium-wide internal practice. In addition to teachers union representatives input, the Green Dot management teams gathered data from annual reviews of student achievement and from each school annual performance report.

To summarize the findings, the applicant details a comprehensive chart of existing gaps and proposed solutions. For example, the existing gaps are noted as a lack of research-based curricular resources, lesson plans and assessments to cultivate important character strengths which are crucial to college persistence including: learning; leadership, and life skills. In addition, the review of gaps determined the consortium schools indicate a lack of alignment with social services to provide a wrap-around model to connect students and families to existing community resources to address the needs and barriers which inhibit learning and achievement. These needs and barriers are identified to include the poverty, violence, poor health and family instabilities which characterize the communities they serve.

While the applicant states they will implement a wrap-around model in their proposed school reform initiative, information is lacking detailing the specific services to be integrated into the model.

Please note, that while the applicant evidences the neds of different racial groups enrolled in their schools, specific strategies to address the needs of students in these groups are not detailed. In addition, information is lacking detailing interventions, strategies and services to address the needs of Special Education youth.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A. (i) The applicant details a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate and become college- and career-ready. They specify their current success and accomplishments in advancing student learning and describe structures currently in place to support personalization of student learning. For example, they currently provide creating small schools, small classes and an Advisory Curriculum embedded in each school day.

(The proposed initiatives incorporate states to ensure students understand what they are learning as key to their success. This is evidenced in details of the proven model which is presently implemented in all of the schools. The effective features combine: small schools and small classes, highly effective teaching; data driven design making, a master schedule that meets students' needs and a robust college going culture. They identity that the school curriculum is aligned with the California State Standards for graduation. In this realm the success of their program model is evidenced in the schools graduating 73.5% of their students as compared to a 15% graduating rate in the Los Angeles Unified Public School District.

(ii) This applicant demonstrates the design of a well-developed plan which is framed in past success in advancing student learning and developing empowered and engaged learners with meaningful curriculum. They express their openness to explore additional strategies and structures to further advance their structures and strategies to better serve their students. They aptly detail a well-developed plan that highlights a comprehensive approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students in the 14 LEA schools, which will enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards, college- and career-ready graduation requirements and accelerate student learning through support. Student support is noted in small class instruction and intervention and in individual instruction and intervention. The proposed plan continues the work of the applicant and s showcases engaging and empowering all learners, particularly high-need students, in an age-appropriate manners to motivate, support and advance learning.

They identify the fact that their school maintains a lower than average counselor to student ratio of 275:1 as compared to the national average of 457:1 and the state average of 817:1.The applicant identifies counselors meeting with each student twice a year to design an individualized learning plan and to help students and parents complete financial aid forms.

(iii) The applicant identifies that the grant will enable the participating schools to transform the educational expiring for the students they serve and harness technology to foster students' opportunities to pursue their academic interests and master content at their own pace. The specify a proposed venture for students to use data from the unified data system to monitor their own progress and to foster their own academic and personal decisions. They delineate expanding and offering support beyond high school through a Senior Transition program that builds life skills to manage the transition from high school to college and through a college persistence program to connect student to the people and resources on campus that help ensure the success. In addition, they detail the Leadership to Life curriculum which is incorporated to promote students' self-confidence, resilience, and creativity.

They assert their commitment is based on providing deep learning experiences that spark and advance student academic interest. To this end, they specify the offering of electives to motivate and address each student's interest. Electives include technology, graphic design, robotics and

visual and performing arts. They aptly identify the fact that many of their students do not have the resources to access independent SAT preparation programs. To this end, the applicant addresses the need and has created high quality small group SAT preparation programs and individual tutoring at school sites in partnership with CollegeSpring. In addition, the applicant specifies all students participate in a unified College and Career Conference hosted annually with representatives from colleges across the county.

(iv) The applicant presents a well-developed program that successfully addresses students' needs and exposes them to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives to motivate and deepen individual student learning. They clearly identify classroom discourse that encourages students to read, write, speak and listen as they consider viewpoints outside their own and relate what they are learning to their own experience. One example is noted specifying engaging students in learning about civil rights movement and explores how this impacts their lives today.

(v) The applicant has developed a well thought-out plan and procedures that foster students' mastery of critical academic content and develops skills and traits such as: goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving. This is evidenced in specifying that the cornerstone of their school's social and life skills development efforts is included in an Advisory Period, which provides students multiple times a week to meet and work individually and together on both personal and academic matters. This period serves as a structured time and space for students to reflect on learning and discuss connections between school learning and life. This period serves to advance the schools approach to personalization and to foster a sustained and positive school environment. This period is dramatically strengthened with the Leadership and Life curriculum that draws on research-based strategies in character education.

B. (i) The applicant has designed a comprehensive and well developed initiative that directly incorporates the support of parents and educators, ensuring strategies and avenues for each student's access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable each to achieve his or her individual learning goals and guarantees each student ability to graduate on time and experience a high level of college- and career-readiness. This is evidenced in the approach of an Individual Graduation Plan for each student which is revisited twice a year. As a part of the RTTT D initiative this approach is proposed to be enhanced by expanding the plan wherein students and counselors anticipate the type of academic and social opportunities and support students will need to persist in school, and expand the plan beyond high school.

The applicant lacks a comprehensive and effective training program for parents. For example, only one on-site training is specified. While additional web-based trainings are offered on-line, training is not offered to parents who lack internet access.

(ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments are evidenced throughout the proposed initiative wherein teachers are expected to use an effective mix of direct instruction, cooperative learning and individual student practice for all lessons. The applicant set forth the fact that teachers are evaluated based on their ability to create enriching learning experiences for all student and design lessons that accommodate different learning styles. They specify that with the RTTT D grant the range of services and support will be available at every stage and build out the wrap around service model to provide students and their families with crucial interventions and strategies. In this plan, academic areas are addressed in addition to offering health, violence prevention, mental health support services and counseling.

While teacher training is specified, the applicant lacks information to detail strategies to evaluate teachers' demonstration of competencies.

(iii) The applicant succinctly details the goals and objectives of their proposed initiative and outlines their work plan. The high-quality plan includes digital learning and instructional content aligned with college- and career-ready standards and career-ready graduation requirements. They clearly detail and coordinate each of the proposed program's five goals, charting the rationale, timeline and persons responsible. As an overview the goals encompass: leadership and life skills to develop leadership and life curriculum; college persistence to build a system to track and support college persistence; whole student support to support the varied realms and needs of students with wrap around services; core pathways to expand personalized pathways model and 21st century technology to use technology tools to accelerate and deepen student learning.

(iv) Ongoing and regular feedback is charted and is evidenced in approaches providing for frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards and career-ready graduation requirements. This is evidenced in details of the web based student information system, PowerSchool which enables students to view attendance and academic progress. The proposed initiative documents the structure of quarterly benchmark exams and student assessment reports to indicate strengths and needs. For example, they identify the fact that personalized learning recommendations from teachers are based on student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards and career-ready graduation requirements. These are identified as significant elements in the proposed model focused on instructional approaches and supports which include student led parent-teacher conferences to encourage students to take responsibility for their learning.

While the applicant specifies students self-monitoring to instill ownership of learning, details are lacking to specify how this will be overseen or how staff will support students' endeavors in this realm.

(v) The applicant has developed a successful instructional and learning model that provides accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and career-ready graduation requirements. This is evidenced in offering AP courses and dual enrollment and in enabling students to work ahead at their own pace using digital learning tools.

(c) The applicant details the fact that comprehensive mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. This is evidenced in training offered to the students and to staff.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A. The applicant has developed a high-quality comprehensive plan, with a proven twelve year track record for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This plan includes an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students, which enables each to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements. Effective strategies and procedures are evidenced in detailing parent engagement and the support of teachers, educational support staff, innovative interventions, and differentiated instructional strategies. In addition, continued assessment of, and feedback to each student is promoted to empower and accelerate learning. Collaborative learning and assessment are detailed to enable an instructional model to succeed in scaling barriers to learning by implementing structured support systems. This is evidenced in Teaching and Learning Program strategies which detail a scaled approach to teaching and learning. Staff Reflection activities are identified as an approach to help educators improve instruction and increase their capacity to support students' progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and career-ready graduation requirements. The proposed model to instruction and learning enables the full implementation of personalized learning and meaningful and effective teaching for all students.

The applicant clearly identifies progress made in their initiative and reform model of change. This is evidenced in detailing the development of effective teachers and empowered and engaged learners. They highlight school leader's recruitment strategies and pinpoint the dynamic and entrepreneurial style of leadership that personalizes the school environment through local decision making and updating resources an instruction that is responsive to students' needs. The applicant sets forth a proposal to advance the proven initiatives are that are presently in place throughout the consortium schools and seeks to catalyze the elements of the Green Dot schools to ignite outstanding results for teachers and students.

(i)The applicant succinctly details the capacity building trainings and professional learning communities that are positioned to advance personalized learning. Commitment to professional development is evidenced in the school calendar which is designed to foster professional communities with the capacity to monitor student progress and adapt instruction in response to students' needs. The master schedule provides weekly planning time for teachers and monthly meeting provide time toward department goals and curriculum pathways. In addition, they identify the Teaching Framework where teachers are assessed based on their ability to differentiated instruction to address their different learning styles. In addition, professional development opportunities are aligned to assist each teacher to specifically address their individual areas of need. All participating educators engage in training, and work in professional teams and in communities that support their individual and collective capacity to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

While teacher professional development is stated, evidence is lacking detailing: 1. the specific topics of professional development and 2. how ideas and strategies gained in professional development are being implemented and carried out in the classroom. In addition, information is lacking detailing the areas of professional development offered to school administrators.

(ii) On -going assessment of student's mastery of concepts and teacher access to professional development time, resources and support are thoroughly developed and aligned throughout the proposed plan to facilitate adapting content and instruction, provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches.

(iii) The proposed initiative consistently details structured measures utilized by staff and students to access ongoing progress toward meeting college and career-ready standards and graduation goals as evidenced in teach and student meetings to discuss data to accelerate progress. For students this is incorporated in their individual learning plan. One endeavor for teachers in identified in fostering professional communities to develop teachers' capacity to monitor student progress and effectively utilize school support systems.

(iv) The applicant clearly documents using evaluation feedback to improve educators' effectiveness. They reference the research based initiative- A Framework for Teaching to guide this method. The Framework encompasses fie basic elements: data-driven planning and assessing student learning; the classroom learning environment; instruction; developing professional parties and developing partnerships with family and community. The applicant details the evaluation systems for both teachers and school administrators to be used with the end goal to improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by these evaluation systems, including frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement. It is to be noted the applicant details the new Leadership Evaluation system to be piloted in 2012-2013 which evaluates leaders based on their ability to improve academic achievement for all students and to increase the effectiveness of their teachers. Both the Teacher Evaluation System and the Leadership Evaluation system incorporates regular observations, coaching, structured professional development and peer supports to support and foster excellent teachers and educational leaders.

(b) (i) The applicant detail a well-developed and proven strategy that uses tools and data to respond to individual student needs and accelerate students' progress. This is evidenced in all participating educators having the access to, and capability to use tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. These resources include actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests.

Information is lacking related to the collection of input or surveys. For example, the applicant identifies random surveys to parents and students. This venue appears to be limited. In addition, information is lacking detailing how data will be analyzed and used.

(ii) High-quality learning resources are aptly detailed and the applicant specifies digital resources and a the plan specifies digital resources that are aligned to remedial and accelerated instruction for middle and high school participants and with college- and career-ready standards and career-ready graduation requirements. In addition, the applicant clearly states that educators have access to a number of data tools to identify optimal learning approaches and to obtain student assessment data and the tools to create and share new resources. They succinctly detail Data Direct which is a data warehouse that includes information regarding a student's past performance and also enables teachers to develop their own classrooms based assessment. They also outline the resources available to teachers through the Connect program which facilitates schools to share data in a new intranet based social networking site where staff can collaborate and generate customized reports in real-time.

(iii) Processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs are clearly specified. For example, the Data Director enables teachers to develop their own assessments and scan them into the system for instant class period work and individual student's results. The applicant directly identifies that the goal of all instruction and data analysis is to improve instruction. To this end they identify grade level and department teams to evaluate student data to identify standards that need re-teaching.

(c) All participating school leaders and school leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and career-ready graduation requirements. The training, policies, tools, data, and resources include information from such sources as the district's teacher evaluation system, which helps school leaders and school leadership teams assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement. They identify that school administrators, leadership teams and the School Advisory Councils benefit from a range of trainings designed to drive effective teaching and in turn deepen learning. The applicant specifies that administrators participate in a Key Results sessions in the various schools. They identify that school administrators visit other school within the cluster to observe instruction to enable information sharing and networking across the schools.

(ii) The applicant details staff training, and practices in an effort to continuously improve school progress toward the goal of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps .This is evidenced in the applicant's detailed description of the robust continuous improvement processes at each school which is structured to monitor progress towards student achievement. They specify that in advance of the school year, school leaders meet with parents and develop a Single School Plan focused on advancing student performance. The targets are viewed throughout the year and that progress must meet or exceed the target. They designate the SAC as responsible for monitoring each schools Single School Plan and applicable data and making recommendations.

(d) The applicant has developed and successfully implemented a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects and specialty areas. This is evidenced in the fact that the Green Dot consortium schools have the human capital management system to recruit support and retain highly effective teachers and administrators with experience and success in serving in high needs communities. The Human Capital Department of each of the schools in the consortium has developed a comprehensive process to recruit and hire the highest qualified candidates. They clearly identify the multi-dimensional hiring process which includes varied assessment and interviews and a demonstration of teaching. In addition, the applicant specifies that in the 2012-2013 school year, an interim performance based bonus system will be in place. This system is fully approved and ratified by the AMU, which is stated as the teachers union. In addition, they assert that their school anticipates launching a full scale Educator Salary Structure Based on Effectiveness in the 2013- 2014 school year.

The applicant identifies the Leadership Evaluation System which is designed to improve administrative practices and leadership effectiveness. They assert that the 2012-2013, a planning year will focus on developing a Leadership Evaluation system and anticipate piloting it in 2013-2014.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A. The applicant details a well-developed high-quality plan to support the project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructures that provide students, educators and levels within their education system with the support and resources they need. This is evidenced in a detailed description of existing practices, policies, and rules which are in place to facilitate personalized learning and is organized in the central office in each LEA in an effective governance structure to provide support and services. A multi-school network with local autonomy and entrepreneurial commitment to shared practices highlights the applicant's plan. The unique, innovative and successful structure employs a three tiered organizational model encompassing a consortium, clusters, and school levels that support effective management and execution across all school sites. They clearly specify that the management team of each school provides academic guidelines and operational procedures to ensure consistency and implementation of best practices. The management team is identified as four specialized departments that provide a range of services which include: education; operations; finance and accounting and external affairs and strategic planning.

The applicant aptly details services which are shared across the clusters to facilitate more effective targeted support and professional exchange of information. For example, as a part of ongoing professional development, principals visit other schools within the cluster to observe instruction. At the school level, the applicant identifies the principals as having the ultimate responsibility and decision making authority for the activities at the school site.

(b) The applicant clearly details strategies and procedures which ensure school site autonomy and provides school leadership teams in each consortium school with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors to affect a smooth running and efficient operation. For example, each school designs its school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and school-level budgets. The Green Dot school has developed a model of "earned autonomy" to promote increased responsibilities and ownership by school site leaders for the critical decisions at their school site. They also note that while the support offices for each school provide training and guidance, the school leaders determine how the school model will be implemented and which services and resources will be shared. Decision making at each school is detailed to incorporate collaboration among entities in the school including the SAC and the CST. As per the bylaws of the SAC, the SACs are responsible for developing a Single School Plan with curriculum, instructional strategies and materials which are responsive to the individual needs and learning styles of students and to a full array of instructional and auxiliary serves to meet the needs of non-English speaking or limited English speaking students and students with special needs.

While the applicant states they provide specific interventions and supports to address the needs of Special Education youth, details of any strategies are not identified.

C. The applicant details a plan which highlights learning progression based on concept mastery and giving students the opportunity to advance and earn credits based on demonstrated mastery, and not on the amount of time spent on a topic. This is robustly detailed in a description of the use of selected, evidenced based on-line learning tools that enable students to progress through the curriculum and earn credits at their own pace. Software invention programs are identified and include programs such as Reading 180 which is designated for students who are reading two or more years below the grade level. In addition, the applicant details the employment of the Apex Learning, that is a digital credit recovery program and the Agile Mind program, which is a math and science program which is individually paced, and the Advance Path program to motivate and serve the needs of students who are at-risk for dropping out of school and allows them to work at their own pace.

(d) The applicant copiously details instructional strategies that give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. For example the applicant details providing learning resources and instructional practices that are accessible to all students and delivers resources and interventions and accelerated paths to address each student's needs and strengths. They showcase a successful educational model which has in place and the personnel and governance structure to ensure a rich, accessible education for all students.

(e) The applicant details strategies they provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. For example, they specify that specialized resources are readily available, including mental health services, counseling, transportation and augmented academic support. Transition specialist is also identified to assist special needs students. Of note, the schools that demonstrate a high population of bilingual students employ bi-lingual staff and where needed English language skills are taught simultaneously to ensure students keep on track.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A. The applicant documents a high-quality plan which incorporates structured and accessible supports for personalized learning through policies and infrastructure that provides every student, educator and level of the education system with the support and resources needed to learn and to succeed and attain goals. This is evidenced in an infrastructure that ensures access to content and tools and appropriate levels of technical for all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders, regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support effective program implementation. For example, the consortium schools are currently equipped with roving laptop carts to provide students with computers and online access. Their vision is to facilitate increased access and purchase multiple devices for each school and coordinate a lending program to enable home use of devices. To support the use of technology for learning, they specify each school to offer on-site training and detail staff members in each school who are responsible for this. Furthermore, the applicant asserts their commitment to integrating parents/guardians into all aspects of their children's educational experiences and to provide necessary support for them. One example is to train parents in the use of and access to Power School, a web based program that contains information on daily homework and student progress and facilitates communications in a direct link with staff. In addition, they aptly reference the use of the Bloomboard and the Connect technology resources for staff to access professional development and networking.

The applicant lacks information detailing the specifics of blended-learning. The applicant appears to connect blended-learning to technology. In addition, the applicant lacks information of an effective infrastructure to support the elements of a blended learning approach to educational reform and personalized learning.

B. The applicant clearly asserts their commitment and allocations of resources to ensuring that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies. This is evidenced in integrating parents/guardians into all aspects of their children's educational experiences and to provide necessary support for them.

C. One example is to train parents in the used and access to Power School, a web based program that contains information on daily homework and student progress and facilitates communications in a direct link with staff. While the applicant specifies the purchase of technological resources, details are lacking to specify a plan to facilitate access to digital tools by all students , parents and staff.

D. The applicant clearly details strategies and resources which ensure that all schools use interoperable data systems identifying the availability to human resources data, and student information data. This is evidenced in citing the fact that the consortium schools are in the process of developing a plan to transition to a more interoperable data system. They identify that the consortium schools work through Cornerstone on Demand to connect to data systems and technologies. The effectively detail their vision to pilot the Mastery Connect system which supports sign –on and data extraction as a potential replacement for 2013-2014 school year.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

E.1. The applicant has developed a clear and cohesive plan detailing vital aspects in developing, implementing and evaluating a high-quality approach to continuous improvement of the program. Strategies are detailed to identify a rigorous and continuous process for improvement that provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. Specific actions and responsibilities are incorporated into the plan to ensure effective monitoring of progress and publicly sharing information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District. For example, adequate details are set forth delineating the fact that the consortium school has presently designed a continuous process that draws on feedback from school and project level stakeholders to inform and improve program goals over the course of the grant period. The specify the staff who serve at the helm of this endeavor and are responsive to ensure improvement across the consortium schools.

In this, they specify the Project Compliance Manager will serve to ensure that strategies and venues are in compliance with regulations and clearly focused on continuous improvement. This person is scheduled to convene the primary responsible parties for each goal of the program and meet on a quarterly basis. This person is also responsible to solicit direct feedback from the school principals once a semester. In a clearly detailed managerial structure, the Project Compliance Manager will report to the Management Team on progress and outcomes on a quarterly basis.

A comprehensive chart is presented with details on the governance structure of the Green Dot Charter Schools continuum. This correlates to the details of a continuous improvement plan which is aptly detailed and carted detailing activities to gather feedback for program improvement and obtaining data to develop a feedback loop to ensure current updates are provided to stakeholders. Teacher Focus groups are also identified to provide input to the Advisory Panel. In addition, a College Ready Framework Implementation Coordinator is referenced to solicit educators feedback to revise and improve the Teacher Evaluation system.

To ensure that progress is transparent the applicant has clearly identified an External Affairs Team for the lead applicant focused on adequately sharing the results of the continuous improvement process. In their the clearly outline: issuing press releases; updating the accountability section of the program website; dedicate a section of its annual report that includes RTTT-D performance measures and progress.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant effectively details strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders focused on the progress of the implementation of the proposed initiative. They evidence their proposed strategies to include on-going communications with educators, students, parents and community members. For example, modeled on the Teacher Evaluation System, a process for ongoing communications is scheduled on a monthly basis with the AMU site Representative. In addition, all school educators and support staff are scheduled to gather for a day long forum of sharing, learning and goal setting at the start of each academic year. Clearly delineating ongoing communications with students, parents and community members, the applicant details a major initiative to collectively host an annual RTTT-D meeting to bring together union representatives, principals, school leaders to share information and insight. Correlated to this is hosting quarterly breakfast meeting at the schools and community centers to provide a forum for community input.

The applicant aptly specifies ongoing communications through monthly newsletters and open Board meetings.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A. The applicant details a well-developed plan which demonstrates ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by each subgroup, with annual targets for specified program performance measures. The applicant details the processes to engage and involve stakeholders. This is evidenced in the applicant presentation of information detailing that students, parents, teachers, support teams, management and the Chief Executive Officers need common and unambiguous definitions for success. They reference the consortium as a data-driven organization wherein metrics serve as the mechanism to define success and to translate their strategic imperatives into measurable units. To this end, the applicant copiously charts each performance measure and aligns it to the proposed measure, the rationale for the proposed measure and its relevance to the proposed plan. For example, the applicant proposes at least one measure of career readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students who are on track to being career ready. The rationale is the fact that students cannot graduate and progress toward careers and college when they are credit deficient.

The applicant lacks information detailing specifically how they will measure gains and needs and follow up procedures to address areas of need. In addition, adequate details are lacking delineating the number of participating students in each sub group who are on track in college and career readiness.

The applicant lacks sufficient documentation of grade appropriate health and social-emotional indicators in the proposed plan.

B. The applicant clearly details a comprehensive chart listing each subgroup correlated to the baseline data, five year grant period, and beyond.

(c) The applicant has developed a comprehensive reform initiative which incorporates successful strategies to review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. This is evidenced in citing the Management Team in each school to convene on an annual basis to include a review of the RTTT-D program attainment and areas of need. At this meeting collaborating schools

will assess interdependence, consortium capacity, and financial resources and progress to ensure the schools are approaching work in a holistic and coordinated fashion.

The applicant details a total of 13 performance measures.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly documents a high-quality plan that takes into consideration the potential and possibility that program strategies may require adjustments and revisions during implementation. Highlighting this vital element, the applicant has developed clear and high-quality approaches to continuous improvement of its plan. This is evidenced in referencing the fact that in addition to internal monitoring and evaluation, the consortium will engage the expertise and services of an external evaluator to conduct continuous assessment of RTTT-D funded activities. The third party evaluator will assess three out of the five goals that require complex statistical analysis in order to establish casual links between RTTT-D inputs and activities and student outcomes. Goals to be assessed are specifically identified as: goal 1, Leadership and Life; goal 3 Whole Child Support and goal 5, the 21st Century Technology.

The applicant addresses developing plans to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology, and to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules, structures and decision-making. This is evidenced in the duties assigned to the Program Compliance Manager who is responsible to use a robust dashboard tool to monitor metrics and to build a strong organizational culture of effective management.

The lead applicant asserts that their LEA assumes the responsibility to designate a RTTT-D Project Compliance Manager to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of all RTTT-D investments during and after the terms of the grant. The Project Compliance Manager will be responsible for:

- monitoring and coordinating implementation across all school site
- and to create accurate and timely reporting procedures for all program activities and
- to share results with leadership teams and stakeholders.

The applicant lacks information specifying strategies to evaluate professional development programs.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

F.1 The budget clearly addresses each of the specified criteria as evidenced in the applicant charting a comprehensive budget composed of 6 sub-budgets, each aligned to one of the proposed six projects or components of the program. Each budget encompasses expenditures for the duration of the grant and specifies one time expenses and the total expenditures focused on long term sustainability of personalized learning environments. They succinctly detail the correlated LEA, state, federal and additional external funds to support the initiative. The budget appears reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal clearly aligns to a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities. An example of one time purchases to enable the implementation of the grant includes the purchase of mobile devices and wireless networks, technology infrastructure and equipment and technology consultants and training. The onetime expenses total 30% of the grant funds.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes a general plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. For example, they identify anticipated support from state and local government leaders and financial support in fund raising. The investment of RTTT-D funds propose a combination of: onetime expenses; existing personnel and resources being focused on personalized learning, which can be funded by existing sources after the grant expires and new and recurring costs which can be funded through increases in existing resources and through new funds. The grant budget dedicates another 26% of the grant to focus the consortium existing personnel and resources on improving personalized learning through the proposed reform initiative. These resources include the curriculum specialists and the technology resources. The applicant specifies using 30% of the grant funds for one-time costs related to new technology equipment and related training.

They identify that the plan will be sustained based on 44% of the budget representing new and on-going expenses. They identify an anticipation that the goals in the proposal, when successful, will increase the consortium's ability to raise money from philanthropic sources. In this realm, the applicant identifies past successes in garnering external funds, asserting that historically they raise between 5% and 15% of

their annual budget from foundations and corporate and individual donors. They identify that the successful initiatives of the proposed program will unlock the funding necessary to sustain the initiatives beyond the life of the grant.

While the applicant details their history of successful endeavors in grants and funding for prior programs, evidence of any current commitment by any funding source is not identified. For example, the letters of support do not specifically state any future funding for program continuation or expansion. It appears as though much of the funds for sustaining the program are anticipated from government funds and in fund raising endeavors.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Throughout the proposed initiative documentation the applicant comprehensively details program elements that address the Competitive Preference Priority. This is evidenced in detailing the proposed results of their theory of change which is aligned to resources and integrated services. The applicant identifies that the consortium of 12 LEAs and letters of collaboration affirm their collaboration as well as the applicant narration of varied levels of support. The applicant details collaboration endeavors specifying activities to outreach to community service agencies to integrate public resources in an effective partnership designed to augment the schools' resources. These will provide additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of the participating students.

The applicant details that their schools are located in the high needs urban areas of Los Angeles and meet this priority. This is evidenced in providing a description of their coherent and sustainable partnership that it has formed with other LEAs and health organizations, and community-based organizations, early learning programs; and postsecondary institutions to support the proposed plan.The applicant clearly details the collaboration of more than 10 populations in the consortium of LEAs. These are align with early learning and post-secondary centers and institutions of learning, and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top – District proposal.

The applicant effectively and comprehensively details how their partnership will track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the consortium to serve and advance learning for participating students. In this, they detail gathering, analyzing and using data to drive decision making to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students, with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty and transiency issues. The applicant has provided a clear vision and statement of intent to scale the model beyond the participating students to at least other high-needs LEA.

The applicant lacks a definition of who the students are who are categorized in the "highest level of need" category.

The applicant clearly delineates how the partnering LEAs will build the capacity of staff in participating schools by providing them with tools and supports to assess the needs and assets of participating students aligned with the partnership's goals for improving the education and family and community supports. Correlated to this are clear avenues to identify and inventory the needs and assets of the students in the 12 schools and align personalized learning to improve student progress. In addition, clear strategies are detailed which identify the consortium's annual ambitious performance measures for the proposed population-level and aptly describe desired results for participating students.

The applicant lacks information to effectively detail how service providers will collaborate with program staff in the participating schools to form a team to provide an integrated and coordinated approach to serve the needs of students. The relationship of the service providers to the program is not clearly detailed.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Throughout their responses to the various criteria, the applicant has comprehensively addressed the Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments. This is evidenced in coherently and comprehensively addressing how the consortium of 12 LEAs will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Program goals are aptly detailed and aligned to expenditures detailed in the proposed budget. For example, funds are allocated to ensure the development of personalized learning environments as evidenced in providing ongoing professional development, digital learning tools and an effective management team. In addition, the applicant identifies strategies and resources to align and ensure parent communications and

collaboration with the school ad active engagement in their child's learning.

Total	210	195

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	15

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has included an optional budget which appropriately supports an initiative to specifically address an area that is supplemental to the plan for addressing Absolute Priority. The detailed request for additional funding is designed to support a separate project that, if not funded, will not adversely affect their ability to implement its proposal and meet Absolute Priority. The supplemental program is well documented detailing the applicant's intent to pilot a collaborative turnaround leadership training program with the Los Angeles Unified School District and recruit and train 10 turnaround leaders in the Green Dot Consortium school model. In turn, the plan is clearly detailed to prepare a vanguard of effective new leaders to work in the lowest performing schools in Los Angeles. The applicant identifies the end result of the supplemental program will result in a codified set of operational procedures, instructional deliverables and evaluation approaches which are intended to assist districts/school operations. In addition, the plan will foster turn-key successful and evidenced-based endeavors in developing public/private partnerships which are focused on turn-around school leadership training.

The program deliverables are clearly delineated to include: curriculum; operational guides; training materials; support schedules and tools. The proposed supplemental program ambitiously engages the senior management of the consortium schools to sign an LOI to demonstrate their commitment to a public/private partnership focused on adapting and expanding the turn- around school program. This commitment will specify commitment to candidate training, focused on a whole-school transformation of the district’s most persistently low-performing schools. The rationale, goals, activities, curriculum, timeline, management team and deliverables are concisely detailed.

The budget represents a high quality approach to support an initiative to address the needs of low performing schools in a replicating turn around model