



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0512MI-1 for Macomb Intermediate School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Macomb County District Consortium proposal offers a vision for a personalized learning that is data driven. The LEA will identify key gaps in learning and aggressively intervene at the Middle School level "when risk factors are at a minimal level and our ability to instill good academic habits is higher." What is to be commended is that they go one better at implementing this vision through an Individual Learning Plan to be provided for every student in grades 6-8. The budget to purchase devices so to enable 1:1 equity when it comes to use of digital tools seems very sensible. The intensive work with Priority schools seems to make sense as far as bridging the equity gulfs. As far as the educational assurances are concerned --with respect to:</p> <p>Educational Assurance Area # 1: Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; the state has adopted college- and career-ready standards and measures student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements. One innovative feature of the proposal is that in grade 8, EVERY student will also take a blended online college course (to be developed in cooperation with Macomb Community College) to assist the student in understanding a particular career as it relates to expectations, content, etc. Additionally, "all four-year plans that are part of the student Educational Development Plan will include a planned post-secondary learning experience to be completed before graduation, i.e.: a college course, or occupational internship."</p> <p>Educational Assurance Area # 2: Building data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction; With the purchase of <i>PowerSchool</i> the district has "a comprehensive student information system that houses student information including but not limited to: demographics, attendance, grades, transcripts, membership reporting, fees, student activities, discipline, standardized and state achievement test scores, and a robust scheduling system."</p> <p>Educational Assurance Area # 3: Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most;</p> <p>The state thanks to new collective bargaining agreements has more flexibility to place teachers and principals in classrooms where needed based on their evaluations.</p> <p>Educational Assurance Area # 4: Turning around the Nation's lowest-achieving schools</p> <p>The state has used Title I funds in an innovative way for schools that have failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress for at least three consecutive years for academic reasons and the approach has met with some success.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Students in grades 5 through 9 will be the focus and priority recipients of services outlined in this grant proposal. There is a good argument to be made that middle schools are the proverbial weak link in the chain. There is a good deal of evidence to suppose that students either decide to drop out or go on to college based on their experience of middle school. The school district has carried out its own analysis and finds that "charts indicate achievement levels for the five assessments given in Michigan to students in grades 5-9 show decline in most areas between these grades. While the MISD along with local districts have seen some improvement especially in the area of reading, we are not satisfied with the overall achievement of</p>		

our students." It would have been helpful to see whether the evidence indicates that there are some particular subgroups that are particularly at risk and could have been the focus of more targeted interventions. Since there is only limited discussion on the rationale for choosing to focus the bulk of the resources on this population the narrative is also unable to answer the key question as to whether the exclusive approach to this set of grades alone will produce successful high school graduates and meet the other core assurance areas. While it is a good idea to prioritize within the middle schools on those schools with the highest level of deficiencies there are some concerns that a more comprehensive approach that includes attention to feeder schools both elementary and high schools will yield more positive results in terms of outcomes than an exclusive focus on grades 5-9. The one California study does not conclusively support such an investment, rather it merely suggests that higher performing middle schools "promotes academic improvements for all students and a commitment to high school preparation." More evidence is needed that this approach will be successful.

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

10

5

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

There seems a weak expectation that " the project implemented in the middle schools will be expanded into the high schools after the grant cycle."
 It would be helpful to have more evidence to base such an expectation upon. It seems unrealistic that all the career and college issues that children face will be solved by the time the students graduate from middle school. It is highly probable that students will need to be not just monitored and followed as they enter high school but that real interventions may also be necessary. All that Macomb ISD Consortium plans to do is to " track and monitor students through high school graduation, to determine if interventions from this grant had the desired results or not and what impact they had on grad rates, performance, and creating college and career ready students." Surely one of the functions of such monitoring would be to better identify what students could benefit from some interventions and the nature of those interventions as they progress through high school. There are few references to elementary grades K-4 and what preparations in these schools might be necessary for students to benefit from the middle schools in question.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

It is possible to concede that by focusing on literacy development at middle school increased student learning will result . But literacy development cannot be the only aspect to focus on. There are more than several other ways that teaching and learning can be strengthened --among them greater relevance, rigor and ability to apply content learned to real world problem solving. Citing one study that makes an important point about literacy development does not address how the various sub criteria: (a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth). (b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice). (c) Graduation rates (as defined in this notice). (d) College enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates. in any depth.
 The Individualized Learning Plan for each student in grades 5-9 in 20 school districts in the county seems like a good idea but there is only limited discussion of how issues found in the plan will be addressed in the school setting. Similarly the Literacy Plan is a good idea in that it focuses attention on identifying needs and challenges that the student should overcome if they are to be successful but what additional services and resources will be provided. There is only limited discussion of online learning in this context and how virtual resources might play a role. The proposal fails to offer enough specific actions that will occur particularly for students who are missing mastery of concepts or lack content knowledge.

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	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There seems no hiding from the fact that the district cannot rely on a clear record of success when it comes to achievement trends that have been in negative territory. The LEA concedes "As the charts indicate achievement levels for the five assessments given in Michigan to students in grades 5-9 show decline in most areas between these grades." The evidence to support improvements in college enrollment are also weak, although to be fair the applicant acknowledges that this year is the first year Michigan is producing this data. But the evidence for demonstrated success continues to be scanty. For example,

it would be nice to have confirmation that "over 90% of our high school graduates countywide report they are going onto higher education, since the LEA does "not know how many actually enroll." While the goals for the students seem ambitious and achievable, there is a lack of real evidence that they are capable of improvement since the lack of evidence to support the facts.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The state of Michigan requires the above information to be posted on the website.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The ISD has been given full autonomy since "the MISD and its partner LEAs are general power districts as determined by the Michigan constitution. These districts have elected Boards of Education who are permitted to make policies and decisions related to curriculum, scheduling and calendars." These statements appear to satisfy the necessary grant requirements.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

It would be fair to say that teachers and principals had some say in the development of the proposal. But teachers voices could have been more represented For example. the following statement "the Principals clearly bring both a teacher and student perspective with them as they interact with the teachers as well as in the classrooms and observe first hand those challenges from our students" leaves room for questions. It could be argued that the principals bring an administrative perspective to the classroom not purely a teacher or indeed a student perspective. This is clearly outweighed by the fact that both teacher unions the AFT and the MEA (who represent between them 100% of the teachers) are fully on board with the proposal. The strong parental support is also evident feedback with frequent surveys. The support from stakeholders is also positive particularly that provided by the excellent Ford PAS program.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Clearly the concept of the personalized learning plan is a work in progress. The LEA wants to move from identifying students' academic deficiencies to " placing a higher priority on identifying the social/emotional and health needs of our middle school students." There needs to be more specificity about what kinds of deficiencies might be best remedied by this approach and how that approach will work in practice. So far the planning in this area is not well articulated. For example, it would be helpful to know what kinds of students have been benefited in the past as well as what kinds of strategies have been successful. These sorts of issues are not well addressed in the narrative.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There are many indications that the applicant has taken seriously the need to personalize learning. For example, students start to create their own Educational Development Plans by 8th grade. This sends the message that the student is responsible for his or her own learning. The fact that students "are provided a framework for their study such as a desktop application or web-based service that includes links to web tools for research and networking" is a commendable feature as well. While these and other aspects of the plan are well thought through but the narrative lacks some clear illustrations as to how this approach improves deep learning rather than encourages superficial understanding. The the Multiple Tiers of Support are well integrated into this model with "All students undergo universal screening, using reading and math achievement assessments, perceptual surveys, and a profile that describes a student's social, emotional, behavioral, and physical status three times annually. Based

on this data, students are then assigned to specific tiers of instructional assistance." It is wise that students in the most need (Tier III) " will require the most assistance from teachers, counselors, advocates and community-based organizations. " In terms of keeping students mindful about careers there is good use made of the *Career Cruising* platform "a platform to connect students and adult career seekers with informed career dreams to career advisors, mentors and career development opportunities with local employers, and to enable local employers to connect with their future talent pool." It would have been good to read a more detailed discussion as to how these linkages relate to the curriculum and the teaching and learning of students in the middle school grades.

The applicant describes well the opportunities for students to earn college credit while still in high school in order to meet the graduation requirement of completing one college level course prior to graduation. It would be good to understand how this new facility relates to how courses are taught or how extra curricular work is recognized. What is strong about the approach is a recognition that a variety of supports and interventions will be necessary for schools and students. "We know that several components will be essential including a formative assessment of whole-child development, individualized and flexible text and curriculum, designed to close achievement gaps, co-teaching, personalized, individual and family support."

What is still a work in progress is how the system adapts to meeting these challenges --some of which involve professional development and some which require organizational changes. Additionally, some illustrations and examples of how the feedback systems work and would have helped strengthen this particularly as far as helping individual subgroups.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal strong point is that it understands the role technology can play in supporting a personalized approach to enable all students to become college and career ready. For example, "students are provided a framework for their study such as a desktop application or web-based service that includes links to web tools for research and networking." Students will also be given access to "Personalized Learning Supports" these are "personalized learning modules to be directly focused on specific student needs." The applicant provides an example whereby one student could be using "Read180intervention software to strengthen their reading and reading comprehension skills; another student could be working on leveled math skill acquisition software. During this hour the rest of the class might be engaged in a whole group extended learning activity that would not be critical if missed by a few students. "

The partnership arrangement envisaged between student and teacher seems to reflect the essence of where Race to the Top Schools need to be in the 21st century. A passage such as this reflects a vigorous understanding of the appropriate approach "Teachers will serve as advocates, advisors and mentors for students as they navigate through the educational process. Since students will be actively involved in the development of their own learning plan goals, they will have a clear understanding of how their actions are connected to success." A large number of resources are provided in terms of data tools to help identify students strengths and weaknesses, career planning software and high quality professional development. ACT's Engage 6-9 allows teachers to gain "actionable information" concerning their students. The ENGAGE Teacher Edition allows teachers or counselors the opportunity to provide feedback on a student's academic behavior. In terms of participating teachers have training to date that enable them to structure an effective learning environment it is clear that the Macomb ISD Consortium has a large resource of highly qualified teachers. It is stretching credibility to believe however that included in its database there is only one non effective teacher (there are 7,763 teachers and 7,762 of them are considered highly qualified.).

Policies seem to be in place to advance the technology training needs of the applicant. There is for example a strong evidence of partnership between The Instructional Technology program in the College of Education at Wayne State University and the school district. The district provides the Educational Technology Endorsement (NP) to P-12 teachers in the State of Michigan and teachers with 20 credit hour endorsement are expected to play leadership roles in selecting, planning, developing, implementing and evaluating technology applications in teaching and learning process. " Courses taken for this endorsement will require students to incorporate technology into lessons, select strategies that promote the use and transfer of technological knowledge and skills for their own students. This endorsement stresses field work by requiring applicants to use Information-age Technology with their own students and to support colleagues' use of technology -based resources. It is also helpful that " the College of Education has planned this program so that the credit hours taken for the endorsement may be used in a graduate degree - such as a Master's degree or Educational Specialist Certificate - in Instructional Technology or a Graduate Certificate in Online Teaching from Wayne State University."

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The ISD seems ready to provide the organizing structures to enable the program to work smoothly. The proposal states for example that "selected representatives from the consortium members and senior staff of partner organizations will form an Intermediary Executive Committee (IEC), to oversee and be accountable for implementation of each component of this comprehensive proposal to assure their resources are combined to support the plan."The district will enable students to demonstrate mastery and will be looking forward to professional development assistance that will enable that objective. The provision of additional time to master content is a good idea. Some thought needs to be given to what happens if the student still fails to master the relevant skills or knowledge. Within the structure of a personalized learning environment procedures will be put into place to allow that student additional time to master the content. At the other end of the spectrum students may accelerate with the same procedure. The applicant informs us that "Teachers will be provided with professional development to assist in the management of several students in various stages of learning," however, it is unclear to what extent this will help personalize the learning or manage the classroom better. The use of a 1:1 device could be used along with the flexibility of a student attending class with another teacher during this specific learning objective. With respect to ESL students the narrative excels. The sheltered learning center concept is a good one. Of note is that "a permanent bilingual tutor or tutors will be assigned to each center so that the tutor(s) are available throughout the day to provide tutoring services to the EL students, creating continuity for an effective learning environment. " The benefits of having an ELL Sheltered Resource Room are more student contact time to develop language and academic skills and more communication between teachers/principals/counselors and tutors. Equally important, there will be more collaboration and relationship building between the tutors, students and school staff/administrators</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The policies seem in place to support project implementation. The applicant makes superb use of available technology to increase both transparency and reach to groups such as parents and students. Noteworthy is the inclusion of a parent portal that will allow parent access to the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) , EDP and electronic dashboard. A new position--a ILP Coordinator "will assist students as they develop, monitor and implement their plan (1 ILP Coordinator/ 500 students)"Additionally, embedded in the system will be an "early warning dashboard" component that will provide warnings to teachers, administrators, counselors and support staff that a difficulty exists based on a set of programmed thresholds defined by the Macomb ISD Consortium. Further innovations include an online student information system (SIS), which will be used to organize, navigate, compare, and manage educational standards, student data and reports. The applicant also encouragingly employs a secondary liaison to the local districts who provides the link between ACT and Career Cruising. It is not clear whether the systems in use are interoperable.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The continuous improvement focus is managed through monthly School Improvement meetings designed to review "not only local strategies and goals but provide feedback for the county school improvement plan." This same process will be used to monitor and adjust the goals and objectives of this proposal. Additionally "Teachers and administrators in the consortium participating districts will have an on line forum to provide important feedback, questions, suggestions and challenges with the implementation of this proposal at their level. We know from research that change like as in this proposal will need complete fidelity at the instructional level. Comments from teachers and administrators in the buildings will be shared with the IEC related to specific challenges in the different aspects of the proposal. Since this is an</p>		

expansive consortium, the MISD technology department will create a system where teachers and administrators may share files with specific references to trainings, strategies, assessment (within FERPA compliance) results, and progress of students as an aggregate within each classroom – building – district. Parents will have direct access to their student's ILP along with grades, attendance, and comments from teachers/counselors/mentors related to the students' progress. This is already an available resource to parents in Macomb County through the PowerSchool program used countywide and supported by the MISD." A very reasonable approach.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is good reason to believe that because certain key data concerning the plan's implementation will be available through *Power School* and accessible by key stakeholders including students, parents, the steering committee and partners so they can become invested in the process. They will be able to see progress and make recommendations for changes and improvement. Parents, administrators, stakeholders and coaches will be invited to "participate in quarterly meetings to hear project updates, review data and share feedback." There is also a promise of "more frequent meetings" to be held "on an as needed basis." The intent is to develop "a continuous quality improvement model "that mandates both quantitative and qualitative input from all stakeholders to ensure that programs and resources are meeting all needs for growth/capacity building, learning, and sustainability." There is no reason to doubt these statements based on the letters of support received and the references to past meetings with key stakeholders.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The school districts in Macomb County do not yet have much experience setting performance goals and are just beginning to administer performance assessments on a consistent schedule. The intent is to begin to administer the NWEA (Northwest Evaluation Association) program for all students in grades 3-11. This seems like a good plan for the assessments will be administered 3 times per year and will allow consistent comparisons of data at the building, district and county levels. Additionally, the applicant will set the following targets "to increase in math the percent of middle school students (in all subgroups) meeting or exceeding state standards on MEAP from 34% to 61% by 2016. In reading, the Macomb ISD Consortium plans to increase the percent of middle school students (in all subgroups) meeting or exceeding stat standards on MEAP from 63% to 78% by 2016. As for graduation the plan is to achieve high school graduation rate of 95% by 2017, with an interim benchmark of 93% by 2014. The district adds a caveat by saying that "While the all students category is improving each year, all subgroups are showing a significant achievement gap." So with limited baseline data and a historic lack of appreciation for the efficacy of performance measures the applicant is starting from a weak position. That will be a primary focus for all educators and professional development in eliminating those gaps. The goals are ambitious but achievability of those goals are unclear given the track record of mixed results.

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

5

4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant seems to have had a long history with evaluation of teachers' professional performance. The school district will oversee the teacher assessment process and assist District LEA's in implementing the necessary interventions to assist teachers in becoming more effective teachers. There should be some confidence to believe based on this history that the ISD Consortium has (as it promises) "the capacity and staff to provide training as needed for all parties involved at the schools throughout the district. " Assisted by the Project Manager and Evaluator, the plan is to disseminate information to project staff and community partners " to reveal patterns, trends and best practices." Additionally, the intent is for the evaluator to assist staff in integrating the data into community communications and public forums . The evaluator will create quarterly evaluation reports detailing student results by school and grade level as well as sub-groups (ethnicity, poverty, gender, special needs, ELL needs, etc.) to highlight any gaps in performance that should be addressed. These results will be reviewed by the Consortium members, grade-level teacher groups, and stakeholders. The question will be in terms of use

made of the results whether there is an openness to change and to controlled experimentation.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: There seems a lack of outside funding and this is disappointing in a district . The budget is reasonable but there is a question of long term sustainability given the lack of outside business and foundation support.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Sustainability is not well addressed in this grant. There are only two references to sustainability. One is the expressed hope on the part of parents that this grant needs to be sustainable and a refence to continuing monitoring past the grant cycle because " we are committed to sustainability and hopeful that the project implemented in the middle schools will be expanded into the high schools after the grant cycle." There is no evidence other than these two references that the project will be sustainable as hoped or could be expanded to the high schools.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant does have an excellent set of partnerships with a variety of agencies and organizations in the county and state. The ISD sits on the coordinating committee and has a good basis for moving forward to work with schools on social and emotional and behavioral concerns. This is a large project and there is a question as to what the capacity might be to really engage parents and families in decision making and support. Noteworthy is the the development of plans for a "Multi-Tiered System of Support that will place a student in Tier I, II or III based on indicators in the above mentioned domains. " Another key partner will be the The Ford Foundation which through its "Ford PAS NGL builds a global network of Ford-affiliated communities, empowering them by creating a system of on-going community collaboration to transform teaching and learning. " The work to integrate these and other linkages to a program that prepares all students in schools to develop their learning so they can be career and college ready will be enormous but the district is well poised to attempt to reach these ambitious goals. However, doubts do remain concerning the program's sustainability over time.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant has made a coherent case for the shift from seat time to more personalized approaches to learning mainly through the assistance of new technology and data tools.		

Total	210	153
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0512MI-2 for Macomb Intermediate School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Macomb ISD Consortium proposes a comprehensive and seamless reform vision that is centered on individual learning plans, assessments, a multi-tiered system of support, personalized learning and intensive teacher and administrator professional development.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to meet the needs of middle schools students in grades 5-9 using an innovative multi-tiered support system to place students in one of three interventions depending on the severity of the learning gaps identified. Interventions will target potential obstacles to learning to include social, emotional, physical, health or learning based needs.</p> <p>The goals of the project are to prepare students to meet rigorous high school graduation requirements, reduce high dropout rates, and ensure that all students are or will become college and career ready.</p> <p>The vision is convincing and the applicant has outlined a clear plan to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through personal student support plans. The project will build on previous efforts to turn around low performing schools and restructuring magnet schools with a themed based approach. A new Springboard Language Arts program will be expanded to prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace. Students will continue to take the ISTEP and End course assessments that are align to the standards and provides valuable information in prioritizing curriculum and instructional planning.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant assures that all 21 public schools districts and 14 charter s meet absolute priority #4 and that 46% of the students in the consortium are from low-income families. To determine the eligibility of the participating schools the applicant selected the transition years between elementary and high school. Students in grades 5 through 9 will be the focus of this project.</p> <p>The estimated student population to be served by this project is 37,000. The applicant has provided charts indicating the total number of students to be served at each school by need and income.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the applicant provides general information related to processes such as a early warning systems dashboard, evaluation and analysis, and multi-tiered intervention levels, the narrative lacks sufficient detail regarding the ability to scale up.</p>		

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides detailed charts by subject area and subgroups outlining the performance goals on summative assessments for the grant period. The applicant has also provided a feasible plan of action to decrease achievement gaps among subgroups for the areas of reading, mathematics, writing, science and social studies. Detailed charts were also provided on graduation rates and college enrollment rates.

The applicant articulates its current plan to students to enroll in early college beginning in grades 11 and 12. Some schools in the district offer on site college classes for students interested in dual enrollment.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	9

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that according to the local Department of Education, student achievement on the MME shows positive one-year gains and even larger four-year gains in mathematics, reading, writing, and science. Additionally, the overall composite scores for Michigan high school juniors on the ACT college-entrance exam increased for the fourth consecutive year, as did the percentage of students who are career and college ready. The applicant provides detailed chart with raw student data to support its claim.

While the applicant details its plan to implement more targeted approaches to closing gaps, and increasing graduation rate and college enrollment by serving the whole child, insufficient data and details were provide with regard to a proven success record in the past four years.

The applicant asserts that lower achieving students will be placed in highly effective classrooms based on the yearly teacher evaluation process. Teachers will have access to tools, resources, and support that they need to be successful. Students will be matched to teachers through a match making process that will connect personalities, and teaching and learning styles to help ensure success.

Student performance data will be made available through a comprehensive data management and data warehousing system called Power School. The system will combine data from multiple assessments into one comprehensive online database. The system will include on-line student information system which allows for one-stop-shop with access to secure data.

The data will be accessible through "Power School" by key stakeholders including students, parents, the steering committee and partners so they can become invested in the process. Stakeholders will be able to monitor progress and make recommendations for changes.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates evidence of a high level of transparency by assuring there is a link on every district's home web page. Schools are required to provide its budget, most recent audit, salary and wage expenditures, retirement costs, and personnel and administrative costs. Schools also must report health care costs and provide links to all collective bargaining agreements.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant assures it is an active member in state organization and is frequently asked to take leadership on projects within the region. It has the autonomy to implement projects and activities as necessary to improve school and student performance.

Additionally, the MISD and its partner LEAs are general power districts as determined by the state constitution. These districts have elected Board of Education who is permitted to make policies and decision related to curriculum, scheduling, and calendars. All programs and services are implemented at the local level based on priorities defined by the local state Department of Education.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has evidence of support from both of the teachers unions. The two unions represent 100% of the teachers within the county and all participating schools. Feedback from parents' center on sustainability of the project once the grant funding is completed.

A review of the appendices documents letters of support from a variety of stakeholders to include, but not limited to, civic organizations, colleges, teachers unions, and legislators.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The MISD Five Year Strategic Plan includes a goal for personalized learning for all students, but specifically for students in grade 6-12. The applicant has provided a comprehensive proposal emphasizing as its major goal the development and implementation of an Individual Learning Plan for all students designed to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning and increase equity for students. The priority of the project is on identifying academic deficiencies while meeting the needs of the whole student.

The applicant also recognized the need to provide intensive teacher and administrator professional development related to the Common Core, leadership, the change process and instruction in the area of higher order thinking.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes that students will develop their own Individual Learning Plan no later than sixth grade. The plan must include at least 1 post secondary experience that can be completed through dual enrollment or internship. Each student will review, monitor, and modify the plan as necessary

Additionally teachers will serve as advocates and mentors for students to guide students through the process. The applicant however does not mention how parents would be involved in the development of plans. The narrative could have been strengthened by involving parents in the development of the educational plan.

To ensure all students are meet graduation requirements a new merit curriculum was implemented three years ago to ensure students have the skills and knowledge necessary to be competitive in the current job market and the global economy. In addition, the applicant describes how it will utilize an online career and academic planning resource to assist students in working towards meeting the goals they set in their Educational Development Plans and Individual Learning Plans.

The applicant also proposes to implement personalized learning environments that are student centered. Students are provided with a desktop application or web-based access that includes link to web tools for research and networking. Students have the flexibility to select and organize their own learning environment. The justification for this change is to shift from traditional classroom settings to a more flexible approach to learning. Students will also have the opportunity to participate in skill building workshops that focus on teaching them how to succeed in today's workforce.

To deepen learning experiences and academic interests, the applicant now offers students in grade 9 opportunities to earn college credit while still in high school. Classroom presentations will be provided by CTE faculty in specific disciplines (i.e., child development, engineering and/or automotive, etc) so student can learn more about the program and courses offered at the

community college. College tours will also be provided to students so they can be exposed to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives.

The applicant assures that data will be collected, updated, and analyzed to determine progress toward mastery of college and career-ready standards and career-ready graduation requirements. The applicant also proposes the purchase of one-to-one devices for students. With the purchase of the application these devices can be turned into a classroom response system providing feedback to teachers or classmates. The one-to-one device will also be used to differentiate instruction making it possible to allow for student choice and to capitalize on student's interest, strengths, and pacing needs.

The applicant will offer training for students through Blackboard. The applicant currently has over 6000 instructor accounts and 82,218 student parent accounts. Blackboard is available to every student and teacher in the county.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes its commitment to supporting teachers to become highly effective to meet the academic needs of all students. The applicant offers effective best practice professional development trainings, workshops, and continuing education opportunities. The applicant has a database for highly effective teachers in the county and all but one is highly qualified.

Teachers are involved in the process of student assessment and assist in the development of curriculum maps which address intervention for each grade and content area. To ensure teachers are familiar and knowledgeable of 21st century technology tools, the applicant has partnered with a local college to offer the Educational Technology Endorsement. The endorsement requires teachers to apply what they have learned in their classroom with their students.

The applicant briefly refers to assessment data, but the narrative lacks specificity regarding how the data is used to both inform the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice.

While the applicant thoroughly describes how teachers and administrators in the middle school will be trained on "strategies that work", it does address how it would use the teacher evaluation system to improve teachers' and principals' practice.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant sufficiently describes its policies, practices, and rules that facilitate personalized learning by proposing a governance structure and management plan. The Project Manager will oversee the day-to-day activities of the project. A project team will consist of representatives from each member of the consortium as well as partner. The group will meet monthly.

To ensure accountability for effective implementation of the project, the applicant will establish an Intermediary Executive Committee consisting of selected representatives from the consortium members and senior staff of partner organizations. The applicant also proposes to create open dialogue where teachers can have their say and provide input and feedback. Grade level teacher teams will be developed that include 1-2 teachers from each of the participating schools and they will meet monthly to discuss the project. Administrators, parents, coaches, and stakeholders will be invited to quarterly meetings to hear project updates, review, data, and share feedback.

The applicant assures it will put procedures in place to allow student additional time to master the content and students who may need to accelerate their learning will be afforded the same procedure. The applicant, however, did not address how it would afford students multiple ways to demonstrate mastery of the content.

The applicant outlines appropriate strategies to ensure all students can access the curriculum. The plan includes specific strategies for Tier II and Tier III students for special education. All teachers will engage in a five day reading training to equip them with the strategies to meet the needs of diverse students.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

To ensure all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have access to necessary content tools and other learning resources, the applicant proposes that teachers and administrators meet in an on-line forum to provide important feedback. The technology department will create a system where teachers and administrators may share file across a broad range of topics. Other plans include having teachers and student access information via Blackboard.

While the applicant identifies a detailed plan of action to ensure teachers are provided with training, consultation, and technical assistance, the narrative does not adequately address how students and parents will be supported. Additionally, a review of the professional development course offerings in the appendices revealed only one ELL training is offered to parents and a minimum number of trainings offered to students.

Parents will continue to use the parent portal to access their student's information and the teacher of record information.

The applicant did not address how LEAs and school use interoperable data.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has described a comprehensive plan for continuous improvement consists of a five year School Improvement Plan that includes Over 200 strategies to increase student achievement. Representatives from each district attend meetings to review not only local strategies and goals, but provide feedback for the county's school plan as well. The applicant proposes to utilize the same process to monitor this project. The plan, however, lacks specificity as to how it will be measured and how information will be shared with the public.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>To ensure ongoing communication and engagement, the applicant will have all consortium members regularly attend meetings, chat on-line, and evaluation reports will be shared with all members. ILP meetings will be held once a month. Teachers will share their insights at monthly meeting as well as online through Blackboard.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes to administer the Northwest Evaluation Association assessment to all students in grade 3-11. The assessments will b administered three times a year and will be compared against building, district, and count y levels. The rationale given for selecting this measure is because of the inconsistency in scheduling performance assessments throughout the county</p> <p>The applicant also has provided detailed performance indicators in the charts in Section A and additional performance measures were set to increase middle school students' mathematics and reading scores as well as increase high school graduation rates. All students in grades 7-10 will be required to take the full ACT Explore or Plan to provide necessary achievement data. Students in grades 6-9 will be required to take the ENGAGE assessment which provides comprehensive information about students that will help to improve student's academic performance.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant assures the outside evaluator will work closely with the Project Manager. The evaluation will consist of multiple methods to include the logic model, surveys, questionnaires, interviews, and other methods.</p> <p>The evaluation plan lacks sufficient detail regarding how the professional development activities will not measured to ensure the knowledge is transferred to the classroom.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes in its narrative the cost related to the project to include cost for personnel, assessments, contracts, professional development, etc. The costs associated with the project appear to be reasonable. However, the reviewer was not able to discern the dollar amounts the school districts and other external supporters would contribute to the project because the budget does not provide this information. While the applicant states in its narrative that it is hopeful that Title III funds could assist, there is no guarantee these funds will be available.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high quality plan for sustainability beyond the grant and the proposal lacks a detailed plan for continued funding. The applicant makes general statements as to the continued funding of assessments and professional development and other costs related to the project, but no specific dollar commitment was referenced in the narrative. It would have been helpful if the applicant would have provided specific dollar commitments for the sustainability of the project. By doing so, the reviewer would have been able to determine if the project could be sustained after the grant period.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a description of the formation of a Human Services Coordinating Body (HSCB) in 1990, consisting of public health agencies whereby an interagency service assurance agreement was approved by eight member agencies. Additional evidence of partnerships includes the establishment of a Task Force in 1995 to make recommendations regarding a document entitled "Our Commitment to Reform for Children and Families." In 1995, the Macomb County Human Services Coordinating Body (HSCB) was approved as the "Community Collaborative." The HSCB has submitted a partnership letter and has appointed the System of Care Subcommittee to oversee the work of this competitive preference.</p> <p>The applicant has identified five school-age population results for students that include educational results and other educational outcomes.</p> <p>The applicant will take the lead in gathering and tracking to measure the first five age population results. The applicant has provided sufficient detail of the measure in Section E of the narrative. Data for the last five population results will be tracked through the Early Warning Dashboard.</p> <p>The applicant describes how the data will be used to create Individualized Learning Plans for all students. Plans will be developed using a Multi-Tiered System of Support that will place students in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III based on indicators.</p> <p>While the applicant provides information related to the strategic plan and how it will be followed in order to see improvements, the applicant does not sufficiently address a plan to scale the model.</p> <p>The applicant outlines its integrated systems approach to integrating education and other services within the participating schools. In addition, the applicant sufficiently describes how it will assess the needs of participating students, identify and inventory the needs and assets of the schools, create a decision-making process, engage parents and families, and routinely assess its progress in implementing the proposed project.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
---------------------	-------------	-----

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Throughout the narrative, the applicant has addressed how it will 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.

Total	210	161
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0512MI-3 for Macomb Intermediate School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Macomb ISD Consortium

Articulates vision through Individual Learning Plans, assessments, multi-tiered system of support, personalized learning environments and intensive teacher and administrator professional development.

Macomb ISD Consortium provides details for the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) process to support and accelerate achievement, deepen learning, and increase equity. For example ILPs will accelerate achievement through a comprehensive pre-assessment and individualized plan that will follow the student through the middle grades and be supported through an individualized teacher-student coaching model. ILPs will deepen learning by providing a structure for a personalized learning environment. The applicant demonstrates that ILPs provide equity through a customized approach to learning that involves students accessing higher tiers of support based on individualized need; this type of approach creates a culture in which teachers address content and skill deficient with all students regardless of individual progress.

Macomb ISD Consortium supports clear vision based on research aimed to accelerate mortification and social/emotional interventions through grades 5-9. Macomb ISD Consortium demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the how ILPs will provide relevance for students and organize teachers and school leaders around the current strengths of students.

Educational Assurance #1 - Adapting Standards:

Macomb ISD Consortium justifies an aggressive adoption of college and career readiness standards through both Michigan Educational Assessment Program as well as the ACT College Readiness System. An aggressive adoption of this reform vision provides teachers and school leaders the framework to revise curriculum and make adjusts to resources and materials.

Macomb ISD Consortium demonstrates a vision for student systemic improvement through a Multi-Tiered System of Support.

The plan describes each tier of support as well as monitoring and adjustments based on data. The Multi-Tiered System of Support addresses the academic, social/emotional, and behavioral interventions as well as the inclusion of a parent component. The scope of the Multi-Tiered System of Support is broad in approach, but lacks specifics for site level implementation. For example, with the implementation of a Multi-Tiered System of Support school leaders and school teams need support and guidance in revamping school schedules, repurposing intervention specilists, and developing a school culture tuned to this reform. This section of the plan lacks those details to address these elements.

Educational Assurance #2 - Data Systems:

Macomb ISD Consortium presents a compelling data system design through: all 21 districts utilizing the same system, the design plan of an "early warning dashboard", and analytics directly tuned to a students ILP. This is a coherent vision to monitor progress based on assessments and student predictors.

Educational Assurance #3 - Developing teachers and principals:

Macomb ISD Consortium provides evidence of comprehensive evaluation systems for teachers and principals. This evaluation systems includes components that address teacher success using student growth measures as well as a connection to Multi-Tiered System of Support. This system considers how teachers respond challenging student behaviors. The consortium also articulates professional development structures such as the Comprehensive Literacy Plan for Middle and High School to provide leadership and focus for retaining effective teachers and principals.

Educational Assurance #4 - Turning around lowest achieving schools:

Macomb ISD Consortium presents a compelling structure and track record for systemic improvement processes. Systemic improvement structures include and support a "rapid turn-around" model as well as an off-site intensive school leadership team training that includes assisting school leadership teams in systems thinking, implementation of a school improvement plan, progress monitoring of goals, and overall assessment of improvement strategies.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Macomb ISD Consortium provides a reasonable and supported reform proposal that includes a focus on the middle grades (grades 5-9). Justification by Macomb ISD Consortium includes the understanding that "middle grades are the best chance to identify students at-risk of academic failure and get them back on track in time to succeed in high school." This justification is supported through application of research; namely Banlfan, Robert, Putting Middle Grade Students on the Graduation Path, 2009. This research is sound logic and supports the plan to keep students on the path to graduation combined with efforts to close achievement gaps.

A. The Macomb ISD Consortium selected all middle schools within the consortium. The process for selection meets requirements of Absolute Priority 4 with 46% of students within the 31 Middle Schools and in 20 LEAs are from low-income families thereby meeting eligibility requirement 1(c). The applicant demonstrates that all of these participating schools have agreed to all eligibility requirement specified under section 1 (d, I a, b and c.) The applicant also supports eligibility those evidence of adopting college and career ready requirements, thereby meeting eligibility requirements 1 (d, ii, a and b).

B. All schools listed will participate in grant activities. A list is proved in the application.

C. Macomb ISD Consortium lists an estimate of 37,000 students. The consortium is clear as to the percentage of high-need students within the consortium. The applicant details a process to begin a comprehensive assessment to identify student need.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Macomb ISD Consortium logic model is a high quality plan. It includes a focus on Middle Schools with a strategy to prepare students for high school. The applicant details an assessment plan to "scale up" reform in a systemic manner consistent with college and career readiness through college and career readiness assessments that are align, namely: ACT series of assessments, MEAP, Career Cruising, and NWEA (Northwest Evaluation Association). The applicant included a logic model that involves assessing academic as well as social/emotional and healthy/physical needs. Direct treatment runs through grades 6-8 and with a post assessment in grade 9. The it evident the the reform with ILDs and a Multi Tiered System of support focused at the middle grades provide a logic model that can be scaled up into high school.

The applicant is unclear how the reform effort for middle school will be scaled for lower grades. Macomb ISD Consortium logic model does not provide support for change to the for reform that will reach to early grades (grades K-4).

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant lists comprehensive data sets for all sub groups in each subject area. The applicant uses the Michigan Educational Assessment Program as the overall indicator of improvement with reducing the percentage of non-proficient students by 5% in year 1, 7.5% by year 2, then 10% reduction by year 3, 12.5% in 4 and finally a reduction in the percentage of non-proficient students by a cumulative percentage of 15% by year 5.

The applicant uses the a flat metric to determine success; namely reducing the percentage of non-proficient students. The applicant demonstrates no intention for utilizing dynamic growth measures such as Value Added data that encourage differentiated growth for students already reaching proficiency or to measure the extent to which sub-groups are progressing or regressing toward or away from the proficiency target. Utilizing a growth metric in this manner would be beneficial because it would illuminate progress in relation to sub-groups and encourage student growth beyond the target of proficiency. The proposed methodology for determining growth based solely on changes in achievement levels (namely reducing the percentage of non-proficient students by stated targets of percentage per year) is an insufficient methodology.

A. Given the methodology for measuring growth and success, the applicant provides clear and achievable targets for performance assessments. Specifically 5% in year 1, 7.5% in year 2, 10%, in year 3, 12.5% in year 4, and finally, 15% in year 5. Targets are both achievable and ambitious in that they begin with a large effect size during the implementation year and move through a moderate level of increase over five years with a final effect of 15% cumulative.

B. The applicant has clear and achievable targets for reducing the achievement gap in sub-groups. This is the same goal for general proficiency of all students; specifically 5% in year 1, 7.5% in year 2, 10%, in year 3, 12.5% in year 4, and finally, 15% in year 5. The logic is to reduce the gap by a percentage applied across each sub-group. In some instances the applicant is not ambitious enough with the reduction for sub-groups. For example the applicant states that in the subject of reading the gap between Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific students (compared with White students) will be reduced by negative 5% from -12.1% to -7.1% over a five year period: this actually demonstrates an increase in the gap. There are other similar examples in this section that fail to examine the individual growth of sub-groups. The applicant applies the same reduction rate for all groups in a global manner regardless of baseline percentage.

C. The applicant provides ambitious and achievable annual goals to improve graduation rate. Most target move the baseline over the four year period to an acceptable level between 90% - 100%. There are some targets however that lack an ambitious goal: for example Clintondale School has a baseline of 44.26% for White students and with a goal of moving to 66% over the five year period. A graduation rate of 66% by a sub-group is not ambitious. Similar examples in the data exist.

D. The applicant does not provide data for college enrollment goals. This is based upon Michigan not collecting this data.

Optional - E. The applicant indicates that some post-secondary work has begun in the consortium and that 20 districts are working towards post-secondary programing; however the applicant is lacking the the specifics about the number of schools that currently have established post-secondary options.

The applicant does not specifically share data about state LEA targets in the data set. No determination to meet or exceed state targets can be determined without the inclusion of this data.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Macomb ISD Consortium provides details to support previous records of success highlighting collaboration with the 21 school districts through closing the achievement gap, improved student progress toward proficiency, increased graduation rates, and improved teacher and school leader effectiveness. The applicant is vague as to the details of these past successes.

4a - The applicant lacks charts, data, or quantifiable gains to support improvement in the previous four years in closing the achievement or raising student achievement. Macomb ISD Consortium provides research about the practice of implementation of a Multi-Tiered Support System, but lacks local results over the previous four years to demonstrate implementation of the Multi-Tiered Support System within the Macomb ISD Consortium.

4b - Macomb ISD Consortium provides a convincing practice by placing low achieving students in highly effective teachers' classrooms based on yearly evaluation process. The Macomb ISD Consortium suggests using the an ILP with these students in a tiered systemic approach. The applicant also states that Macomb ISD Consortium will "concentrate great instruction and supports for educators, students, and family in tier 3 of is MTSS", but this statement is not supported as to the nature or extent of that specific instruction or support. The applicant states that "evidence shows that making these student the priority will lead to a very significant increase", but fails to say what evidence and also fails to describe share methodology inwhich that student priority will lead to an increase.

4c - Macomb ISD Consortium suggests the implementation of a comprehensive data system; from the vendor Power School. The Consortium suggests the development of an organization instrument to provide data from the Student Information System

to communicate data in a user friendly manner. This applicant does not share any history use of a data system nor whether such a system has been available to parents. The applicant does describe the data system and that it has the components necessary to meet the criteria under B2(c) by making it available to students, educators, and parents.

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

5

4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a compelling narrative that addresses all areas of B2 a-d and is consistent with the state laws within Michigan as explained by the applicant.

The applicant states under Michigan law that substantial transparency reporting is required for school districts.

a) Actual personnel salaries and benefit costs for employees are required to be placed on district websites; therefore with district compliance this fulfills the requirements for school level instructional and support staff.

b) Actual personnel salaries and benefit costs for employees are required to be placed on district websites; therefore with district compliance this fulfills the requirements for instructional staff.

c) Actual personnel salaries and benefit costs for employees are required to be placed on district websites; therefore with district compliance this fulfills the requirements for teachers only.

d) Actual budgets, most recent audits, retirement costs, and administrative costs are required to be placed on district websites; therefore with district compliance this fulfills the requirements for actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level.

The LEAs defined in the consortium demonstrate the requirement to make expenditures public by publishing the required data on its website with a link to the required data; however they do not specifically state that these requirements are being adhered to; although this is relatively implied.

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

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Macomb ISD Consortium describes previous collaborations at regional and state levels to demonstrate evidence successful conditions for implementation. The applicant also provides sound structures in leadership through past practices and success such as collaborative work with technology systems, curriculum writing, professional development, training, mental and physical health, safety and crisis management, and legislative input to address conditions for success.

The applicant states that LEAs with the consortium have the authority and autonomy under the law. This autonomy has not been revoked through the state. LEAs with the consortium also have authorities within the new teacher evaluation system to utilize teacher placement; it is no longer based on seniority. The applicant demonstrates this authority by stating that the Macomb ISD Consortium and it's partner LEAs are general power districts as determined by the Michigan Constitution with elected boards who make policy decision related to curriculum, calendar, and scheduling.

Macomb ISD Consortium has demonstrated significant autonomy through the narrative in this section; for example they explain that they have implemented projects and activities to improve school and that the consortium has a leadership team that has demonstrated implementation.

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

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not demonstrate a systemic process of review and revision through engagement by parents, teachers, families, and principals resulting in dialogued and changes with the development of the proposal, nor does the applicant demonstrate how the proposal was revised based on engagement and feedback.

The applicant does demonstrate support through represented collective bargaining units that serve with the consortium. This evidence is demonstrated through letters of support from the American Federation of Teachers as well as Michigan Education Association. The combined unions represent !00% of teachers within the consortium as well as all schools.

Macomb ISD Consortium provides compelling evidence of support from key stake holders through a significant array of strongly supported letters from parents, the business community, advocacy groups, civic and community-based organizations, as well as member of the state board of education.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Aspects of the high-quality plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILP Individualized Learning Plans for all students, but specifically those in grade 6-12. • Placing copies of each student plan into the data system to provide access • Training for all groups to process to access document. <p>The applicant has logical behind the reform proposal and identifies the possibility of gaps in the plan. The applicant identifies a plan for analysis of those needs and gaps associate with the assessment of students for the ILPs. The applicant states that assessments will be used to determine student achievement and to determine gaps.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Macomb ISD Consortium lists a vision and plan for a Personalized Learning Environment.</p> <p>This plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personalized Learning Environments that are student based rather than course based • Personalized Learning Supports through access to content and learning that is student paced <p>(a)</p> <p>(i) The applicant shows support by demonstrating that students will understand success in accomplishing their goals through a system of personally monitoring and guiding students through plans with teachers and support staff.</p> <p>(ii) The applicant does identify learning and development goals linked to college and career readiness standards through early development at grade 6 of an Educational Development Plan to provide student vision</p> <p>(iii) The applicant does demonstrate the manner in which student will be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest.</p> <p>(iv) The applicant does demonstrate the manner in which students will have access and exposure to diverse of back grounds within the school district, but is lacking in evidence to link the manner in which students will have access to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives in a manner that will motivate or deepen individual student learning.</p> <p>iv) The plan includes a great deal of classroom and school level logistical risks to coordinate the details of instruction for a personalized learning environment. These risks could be overcome through an ongoing and focused formative assessment system, yet the applicant is unrealistic with this specific aspect of complexity for the implementation of the Personalized Learning Environment. The applicant mentions later in this section the use of Blackboard as a Learning Management System, but does not make a compelling connection to link these ideas. The applicant does indicate how an overall assessment will guide students in the development of an Individualized Learning Plan with will guide the current knowledge and skills for college and career readiness.</p> <p>(v) The applicant does demonstrate the manner in which students will master critical academic content and develop goal-setting as evidenced through "skill building, leadership and character development. The applicant describes these and other "soft-skills" related to college and career readiness will be addressed through a "training and support" system utilizing personal relationship and peer and adult mentoring.</p> <p>(b)</p> <p>(i) The applicant demonstrates a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development through the IDLs. These plans are monitored with data and support from teachers through a system of Multiple Tiered Support and aligned college- and career-readiness standards.</p>		

(ii) The applicant demonstrates a variety of high-quality instructional approaches: Personalized Learning Environments (learner centered rather than content centered), skill building, leadership, and character development (including skills necessary for careers), interactive books, technology available at the point of instruction for research, differentiated instruction in multiple subjects to accentuate motivation, a student learning information management system (Blackboard), communication tools utilized through iPad, and training and support for students. The applicant gives the example of a high quality instructional strategy using Read 180 intervention software

The applicant demonstrates a variety of environments including: Multiple Tier Support System and well as a Personalized Learning Environment.

(iii) The applicant suggests high-quality content and digital learning through a 1:1 technology platform. The applicant defines a few content examples; interactive books and Read180, but high-quality content in learning is vague and without specifics. For example the applicant does not include a model for local teacher recorded content or self-made digital course. Nor does the applicant provide a learning classroom framework such as "the flipped classroom model" to maximize engaging instruction during the school day with the support of digital content for reinforcement and practice.

The applicant does suggest the use of Post Secondary options for students and includes interaction with teachers and staff community college faculty and staff at annual events like middle school breakfasts and counselor enclaves.

(iv)

(A) The applicant describes that the data warehouse system will "provide easily accessible data regarding progress to students, teachers, administrators, parents, partners, and steering committee members; however the applicant does not define specific data in this section that would informed individual students about specific mastery of college and career readiness standards.

The applicant does discuss mentoring as a progress monitoring support through Career Cruising and describes it at "a venue for ongoing student feedback through mentoring. Career Cruising is defined as "a platform to connect students and adult career seekers with informed dreams to career advisors, mentors, and career development opportunities with local employers, and to enable local employers to connect with their future talent pool."

(B) The applicant defines monitoring of ILPs by staff as well as post secondary options in partnership with local colleges. These reform efforts are feasible in scope and are reasonably integrated into the logic model of reform.

(v) The applicant articulates mechanisms of support and training for high-need students such as Differentiated Instruction and teacher/student greater communication through Blackboard. The applicant also includes training and support for both educators and students for a variety of support systems such as peer mentoring, adult to student mentoring, and parental involvement. The applicant states students will be given time during the regular school day to complete specific and directed support via technology, but is unclear about the specific describing exactly the "high quality" supports for "high need" students.

The applicant does articulate using formative assessment of the child, individualized texts and curriculum, co-teaching, and family support, these strategies are list and are aspects of the personalized learning environment.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	5
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Teaching and Leading:

The narratives for the section of the application contain overviews of the current professional development structures, define a vision for effective teachers, speak about a commitment to technology for teachers, overview landmark meta-analysis research on instructional strategies by Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, provide an overview of new Common Core standards by subject area review the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) reform offered as a pathway to college and career readiness, and explain the partnership program: Ford Next Generation Learning. The applicant is inconsistent with grant application criteria in section C2 and demonstrates little evidence for reform in the major areas of C2: collaborative teacher team structures, details on how specifically data systems will inform teachers and teacher teams, teacher evaluation systems aligned to inform school leaders and school leadership teams towards improvement, a plan to address how teacher to increase the number of students receiving instruction from high-quality teaches and principals.

A. Educators Engaged in Training and Professional Team or Communities to Support:

The applicant offers no evidence of a high quality plan to support the development of school based teacher teams working in collaboration for student support. The applicant lists effective research on instructional strategies, namely: Classroom Instruction that Works by Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, but lacks a structure to implement these strategies with fidelity. Simply providing professional development for all middle school teachers and administrators in participating schools does not constitute a high quality plan.

(i) The applicant suggests the development of and Educational Development Plan (EDP) for Career and Technical Education the EDP will be incorporating into the student's ILP. This plan will help to ensure students graduating on time.

(ii) The applicant does include professional development and vision to support the ongoing development of adapting content for instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common or individual tasks, in response to their needs, interests and learning approaches; however the applicant does not offer a a high quality plan to ensure the development of these systems.

(iii) The applicant does suggests the development of and Educational Development Plan (EDP) for Career and Technical Education and the use of a ILP for students, but does not address frequent monitoring of this plan based on progress nor the need to adjust instruction to match that progress.

(iv) The applicant summarizes the Common Core standards by subject area, but does not have a high quality plan to address school level implementation, monitoring, or fidelity with these standards. The applicant does not tie these standards to a teacher or principal evaluation system. The applicant defines effective teachers and articulates the qualities of an effective teacher and commits to offering professional development about this vision, but lacks a high quality plan to implement an evaluation system consistent with this vision. The Macomb ISD Consortium lists 7,762 of the 7,762 teachers are rated as highly qualified per the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; menacing that the educator's license/certification matches the area in which they are teaching. The applicant does not offer a high quality plan to go beyond this requirement for teachers as part of the teacher evaluation system.

B. Educator Access, Use, Tools, Data, and Resources to Accelerate Progress:

(i) The applicant addresses training and support for a data system that provides continues feedback. This is a convincing high quality plan in that it is implemented system wide, sensitive to changes in instruction, and identifies individual learning needs.

(ii) The applicant addresses high quality learning resources and curriculum work in general in specific content areas through the implantation of college and career readiness. For example the applicant lists the 2011 Framework for K-12 Science Education developed by the National Resource Council. The applicant defines the need to reform science instruction through using these standards with the intention of students to mirror the practices used by scientists and engineers.

(iii) The applicant demonstrates insufficient evidence to support a high quality plan for process and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches to continuously improve feedback about effective resources to meet student needs.

C. Leaders and Leadership Teams:

(i) The applicant does not articulate any details about a teacher evaluation system, nor does it articulate the manner in which the results of those evaluations will inform school leaders and school leadership teams. Without this system school based teams can not take necessary steps to collectively improve teacher effectiveness, school culture or climate, or provide for collective and targeted continuous improvement at the teacher level.

(ii) The applicant lists two training / professional development practices: Classroom Instruction that Works will be offered for professional development by all middle school teachers and the Ford Next Generation Learning Framework. The applicant does not provide a framework for ongoing implementation of these processes. The aspect of implementation with this professional develop and as

a result these become isolate initiatives with no assurance through a high quality plan. For example these initiative are not a part of a teacher evaluation system that includes classroom walk through or systemic checks for fidelity.

D. Effective Teacher and Principals in Hard to Staff Schools and Subjects

The applicant lists the vision for effective teachers. The applicant does not define highly effective principals. The applicant does not include a high-quality plan for increasing the number of stud nets who receive instruction from high quality teachers and principals. The applicant does suggest in general that many of it's teachers are already defined through ESEA as noted above, but is unclear in defining "highly effective" or how specifically to move those teachers to "highly effective". The applicant does not therefore specifically address how to increase the number of "highly effective" teachers in hard-to-staff schools or subjects.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

LEA Practices, Policies, and Rules

(a) Organizing the consortium governance structure to provide support and services to all participating schools:

The applicant provides convincing support for meeting the requirements of D1a through:

- Provide for a Project Manager to oversee day to day activities with this grant with high quality job requirements.
- The project team will meet monthly to monitor progress.
- Representatives from the Macomb Intermediate School District Consortium will from an Intermediary Executive Committee to oversee accountability for implementation.
- Creating high quality expectations for the leadership team within MISD to implement all components of this plan.
- Project manager along with IEC provides support and accountability for implementation with MISD leadership team.
- Training and communication to teachers, parents and students about the reform effort

(b) Providing school leadership teams with flexible autonomy over factor (school schedules, calendars, personnel decisions, staff models, roles for educators, and budgets

The applicant describes a process for the development of grade level teams to include 1-2 teachers from each participating school. The goal of this group will be to meet monthly to discuss projects and provide feedback to administrators, teachers, schools, and key stakeholders. If the feedback contains an obstacle the group will develop a course of corrective action. The applicant lacks a high quality plan to provide authority and autonomy for the requirements of D1b; namely calendars, school schedules, personnel decisions, staffing models, etc. Provide a feedback structure and dialogue (while perhaps a worthy and necessary system) does not provide the necessary authority for schools, school leaders, and school leadership teams to make the necessary adjustments in D1b.

(c) Giving students to progress through mastery not amount of time on topic and;

(d) Giving students opportunity to demonstrate mastery at multiple times and multiple ways

The applicant suggests that the use of the personalized learning plan for each student will provide the flexibility to a students learning style. Within the procures of this personalized learning environment MISD will allow a student additional time to master content and also allow students to accelerate with the same procedure. The logic model for this will be that teachers will have professional development in managing students within various stages of learning and a 1:1 device could be used to help achieve this aim. The evidence is unconvincing as the applicant does not define in detail the the manner in which or the extent to which student acceleration could occur. Nor does the applicant address systemic concerns could arise from this model of learning.

Additionally, the applicant suggests that research is clear that humans learn in different modalities and over different periods of time, but does not state what specific research.

(

e) Providing learning resources and instructional practices adaptable and accessible to students with disabilities and English learners

The applicant presents extensive evidence to meet the needs for learning resources and instructional practices for students with disabilities and for English learners as evidenced by:

- Special Education: Tier 2 and Tier 3 Strategies: Accelerated Adolescent Reading Initiative, MATHIA Software from Carnegie Learning, TI Math Forward
- English Learners: Bilingual / EL Education Program, Sheltered Content Classes, Failure Free Reading Instructional Software Program, EL Instructional Personalized Learning.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

LEA and School Infrastructure

(a) Ensure students, parents educators, and other stakeholders have access to content, tools, and other learning resources

Macomb ISD Consortium ensures compliance with D2a through the use of a high quality plan utilizing Blackboard for access content, learning tools, and learning resources. Blackboard software is a convincing and already in use. Teachers at in the consortium are currently placing videos on Blackboard sites to provide additional help when students are away from school.

(b) Ensure students, parents educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support through a range of strategies

Macomb ISD Consortium demonstrates evidence to provide technical support to educators through professional development activities on an ongoing basis. Additionally, Macomb ISD Consortium states that "technical support" is built into data systems and will be provided through a user interface and if a user has difficulty navigating the system or accessing information they can request technical support from Macomb ISD Consortium. This model appears to work in theory, but Macomb ISD Consortium does not discuss a structure and plan to provide communication or direct support for parents. Such supports could take on the look of a parent information night for technology support or a school based liaison to provide a higher quality of technical support. The applicant does not support parent implementation of technical support through criteria defined in D2b namely a range of strategies.

(c) Using information technology systems that allow students, parents educators, and other stakeholders an open data format and to use the data in other electronic systems

The applicant provides evidence that addresses the use of open data format through the use of Power School export data and reports. The applicant states that uploading data that was download from Power School presents a violation of FERPA, but suggests the data can be share with outside tutors or online programs to assist students academically.

(d) Ensure that LEAs and schools use inter-operable data systems (including systems for human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data

The applicant does not address the use of inter-operable data systems through the application. There is no entry for D2d.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strategy for Implementing a Rigorous Continuous Improvement Process

Provides timely and regular feedback on progress towards project goals and opportunities and ongoing corrections during and after the grant term. Address monitor and measure, and publicly sharing information on such investments as professional development, technology and staff.

The Macomb ISD currently utilizes a continuous improvement process. The current continuous improvement process is in place to monitor and assess the consortiums current 5 year plan. The School Improvement Team meets monthly and is reviewed annually for implementation and progress. The applicant states that the same process will be used to monitor and adjust the goals and objectives of this proposal. The applicant does not state the manner in which this process will publicly share information on the proposed investments in technology, professional development, and staff for the RTTT-D grant if awarded.

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

5

4

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Ongoing Communication and Engagement

Strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external for stakeholders

The applicant demonstrates strategies for internal engagement and communication through: ongoing communication with all members districts through regular meetings, evaluation reports, and online formats. The ILP Coordinators will meet once per month.

The applicant demonstrates moderate strategies for external stakeholders with engagement and communication through the use of feedback from the online Blackboard system. The applicant is lacking with additional strategies that would define meaningful engagement for external stakeholder in particular for parents and community members. Consideration such as district level community engagement teams such as the teams developed internally could provide the applicant meaningful engagement with those key stakeholders.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Performance Measures

Ambitious yet achievable performance measures both overall and by sub-group with annual targets

(a) The applicant must describe it's rational for selecting measures

Macomb ISD Consortium member districts are just beginning to administer performance assessments on a consistent schedule. Due to this inconsistency the applicant will utilize the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (NEAP). The district is working to implement the NEA (Northwest Evaluation Assessment) as a progress monitoring tool three times per year. This rational is sound and convincing.

(b) The applicant must describe how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information leading to it's proposed plan and theory of action regarding the the implementation of areas of success or concern

The applicant describes that the current measures are not rigorous, timely or formative. The applicant currently is using measures of MEAP. The applicant suggests that new laws in Michigan will implement a new testing and evaluation system during the year 2012. In the meantime the applicant suggests using the MEAP and the NWEA.

(c) The applicant must describe how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress

The applicant does describe the implementation of an improved measure with a battery of assessments from Smarter Balanced. The applicant describes that this assessments will be computer adapted measures taken by all students in 2014. The applicant sets current targets for the grant using MEAP and states that they will change assessment targets in the middle of the grant cycle to reflect the new assessments from Smarter Balance.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Evaluating Effectiveness of Investments

Macomb ISD Consortium has a convincing plan to evaluate investments through both a self-evaluation as well as an independent outside evaluator to provide a comprehensive project evaluation services. The outside evaluator will utilize a rigorous process and have a background in educational evaluation.

- Internally: Macomb ISD Consortium provides a convincing process to evaluate that includes ongoing communication and regular meetings monthly meetings with stakeholders and partners. These meetings will have over site through Macomb ISD Consortium leadership team as well as the RTTT-D Project Manager. Do to these ongoing factors the internal evaluation process is effective.
- Externally: The applicant will employ an outside independent evaluator that will utilize a systemic process and have a background in educational evaluation. The external evaluation procedure will include examining for the investments and include specific evaluation questions on logic models, well established tools (surveys and questionnaires), project specific assessment data (surveys and questionnaires), and interviews. Due to these comprehensive outside measures this process for evaluating the effectiveness of investments is feasible and affective.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Budget for the Project: Budget Narratives and Tables (a) The applicant does identify all funds that support the project (RTTT-D, external foundation, LEA, State and Fed Funds) (b) The applicant provide evidence that is reasonable and sufficient to support development and implementation: for example salaries and staff levels are reasonable additionally 1:1 devices are not purchased for all students but rather in a manner to share devices and encourage student to bring devices that already have them. (c) The plan is a clear and demonstrates a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities (i) The applicant includes a description of funds (RTTT-D, external foundation, LEA, State and Fed Funds) (ii) The applicant identifies funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be ongoing operational costs that are incurred during and after the grant period. There is a focus on strategies that ensure that ensure long-term sustainability. For example the applicant is moderate and reasonable with staffing level and salary targets for new positions. The applicant also includes a gradual transition between RTTT-D funds and LEA funds to create capacity and gradual dependence on local funding streams.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Sustainability of Project Goals: The applicant has a high-quality plan for sustainability of the projects goals for the time after the grant. The applicant demonstrates sustainability through developing professional development of new processes and systems at the early part of the grant cycle, while utilizing a train the trainer model for professional develop. This process builds capacity through training and investment with local staff. The plan does include support from the state and local levels. The applicant does not include budget assumptions, sources, or use of funds that justify continuation of the project for the three years after the term of the grant.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Competitive Preference Priority

The applicant describes additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs would be supported through a partnership with Macomb County Human Services Coordinating Body HSCB.

(1) The applicant provide a description of the partnership

(2) The applicant does Identify population-level desired results for students

(3) The applicant describe how the partnership would: (a) Track the selected indicators, (b) Use the data to target its resources in order to improve results, (c) Develop a strategy to scale the model, (d) Improve results over time; through Macomb ISD Consortium gathering and tracking data to measure the first 5 results listed below.

1. Readiness to learn at entry into school.
2. Successful transition from elementary to the initial grade of middle/junior high school.
3. Successful transition from middle/junior high school to the initial grade of high school.
4. Completion of high school (graduation, GED).
5. Enrollment in post-high school education/training programs.

(4) The applicant does] provide a compelling description towards about how the partnership would integrate education and other services through: HSCB partners] assisting Macomb ISD's Consortium by supplementing needs and assets through the ENGAGE 6-9 and ENGAGE assessments and monthly meetings of the IEC. Community partners and families will meet with the school teams to ensure continuity of service, fidelity to interventions and progress monitoring over time.

5) The applicant describes how the partnership would build the capacity through:

1. Achieving milestones related to the support being provided.
2. Becoming more self-directed in the management of day-to-day living including coursework in school.
3. Using agency-provided resources effectively and efficiently in managing their lives.
4. Planning meaningfully for the future.
5. Reducing dependence, over time, on agency-provided resources.

(6) The applicant identifies its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures though:

1. Readiness to learn at entry into school.
2. Successful transition from elementary to the initial grade of middle/junior high school.
3. Successful transition from middle/junior high school to the initial grade of high school.
4. Completion of high school (graduation, GED).
5. Enrollment in post-high school education/training programs.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Personalized Learning Environments.

The applicant coherently and comprehensively addresses absolute priority: through a MTSS and personalized learning environments.

The applicant sets forth a compelling set of strategies with a logical plan for integration and implementation.

Goals are ambitious, yet achievable.

Reform is focused on college and career readiness standards with the capacity to build and develop sustainability.

Learning is designed to be individualized through a ILP (Individualized Learning Plans) for each student. Students can work ahead and a plan that is ambitious for 1:1 technology is employed.

The applicant looks to decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total	210	146
-------	-----	-----