



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0842MI-1 for School District of the City of Detroit

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Detroit Public Schools (DPS) outlines a clear and comprehensive vision for reform that focuses on targeting its lowest performing schools and schools with the widest gaps. They articulate a clear vision of becoming "the most rapidly improving urban district in the nation." Drilling down further, the district aims for all schools to become "centers of excellence" led by highly effective principals who are the instructional leaders of their building. This vision sets a clear framework of purpose for all of the initiatives described in DPS' application.

The vision, and corresponding plan, that DPS articulates builds off of the core four assurance areas and focuses on the right elements within them. For example:

- Not only does DPS' plan include low-performing schools, but its entire plan is aimed at serving specifically their lowest performing schools and setting ambitious goals around transforming the way these schools serve students to impact student outcomes.
- DPS' plan places an emphasis on instructional leadership, both at the classroom and school level. This is a critical component of implementing any plan on personalized learning environments and is the right place to focus. Without strong support and professional development mechanisms for your human capital, no programs personalized learning environment structures will succeed.
- The district places an emphasis on using data to drive instruction through the development and use of individualized learning plans (ILPs) for all students.

DPS' approach to establishing personalized learning environments for students in its low-performing schools is clear and credible. The district articulates a focus on five key pillars in their approach that are not overly complicated, and are the right things to focus on to make significant improvements in student outcomes:

- talent management at all levels
- high quality teaching and learning
- rigorous and transparent continuous improvement processes
- a customer service orientation
- a secure and inclusive culture

Throughout the district's application, the specific programs proposed complement and align well with these five priorities, making for a clear, comprehensive, and well-thought out approach to improving student outcomes in the schools it is serving through this proposal.

Overall, the district outlines a clear and compelling vision for what it is trying to accomplish, frames it according to five key priorities, and proposes projects that are aligned to these priorities, resulting in a high score for this section.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

DPS' approach to implementing indicates that it will help support effective implementation of its proposals for the following reasons:

- It focuses on a subset of its schools, rather than spreading itself too thin. In addition, it chose to focus on the schools with the greatest needs, serving 46 of its most high-need schools, including 33 Priority schools, 3 Focus schools, and 10 high-poverty high schools, allowing for high-impact on results.
- By serving all students within these 46 schools, the district will be able to more effectively implement than if it was trying to separate out only a portion of these students for inclusion in the grant's programs.

Essentially, DPS will create a mini-district within the district of exceptionally low-performing schools within which to target these innovative

approaches. This will allow them to place an intense focus on these schools, and will allow them to serve as incubators for expansion in the future. For these reasons, DPS' strategic approach earns them high points in this section.

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

10

8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

DPS describes a strategy to develop a high-quality plan for scaling, and has put thought into a responsible strategy for its approach to scaling.

- DPS will hire a "change facilitator" who, in addition to managing the change implemented throughout this proposal, will be responsible for developing a plan for scaling the reforms that prove effective. The plan will provide guidance, support, and capacity building strategies for principals who may want to scale these initiatives into their buildings.
- In the final year of the grant, DPS will encourage other schools to adopt some of the strategies from their plan that have proven effective. This approach of scaling only what works and allowing opportunity for other schools to begin implementing during the final year of the grant period is a smart strategy for taking on scaling in a responsible and manageable way to ensure maximum impact and scaling with fidelity of implementation.
- The district also explains that they will conduct presentations, small working groups, and conferences to share implementation strategies with other schools to facilitate scaling, which will help ensure high-quality scaling.

The one area of concern in the district's scaling strategy is around resources. DPS states that they will seek to identify resources to support additional schools who want to implement. However, according to DPS' budget for this proposal, there are significant one-time costs involved in implementing these strategies, and it is unclear how the district will find enough money to scale this significantly.

DPS does effectively describe its theory of change for why these strategies will enable it to meet its outcome goals:

- It's theory of change focuses on the right places in that it places a significant emphasis on its human capital. It's logic is that leaders who value human resources and invest in them will make a difference in whether or not this is successful, and their plan supports this approach by placing a significant focus on developing people and spreading the reach of their best people, instead of on implementing lots of "stuff."
- DPS also articulates that it believes creating awareness of its vision and goals, and creating space for parents and students to be "partners in change" will help lead to results. They will create a sense of urgency and a sense of possibility that, combined with the transparency about their mission, will help drive everyone's actions towards the same end and further their success.

Overall, DPS scores high in this section because the scaling strategy and theory of change for its reforms are strong and give confidence that the programs they propose to implement will have an impact on student outcomes, however it loses a few points for not providing evidence as to how it will identify (or approach the identification of) the significant resources involved in scaling.

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

10

4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Based on the expected outcomes and the plan outlined for achieving them, it is believed that DPS' plan will lead to improved student performance. DPS students in the schools served by this plan are achieving at devastatingly low rates, and the personalized learning experiences outlined will be critical to improving results for them, as outlined by the district's goals. Given that the district's proposal is targeting its lowest performing schools, improving achievement outcomes for these students should serve to increase results district-wide.

The districts goals on absolute achievement are ambitious and achievable, with a few minor exceptions:

- DPS proposes a 5% increase annually for all students (including subgroups) in MAEP proficiency. While in some cases this would be overly ambitious as it is very difficult to move student achievement 5% annually, because DPS students are starting from a dramatically low baseline, these kinds of gains are within the realm of possibility and anything less would not be doing right by these students.
- DPS faces a unique situation where there are virtually no gaps between all students and subgroups, and any gaps that do exist are not uniform across grades and subjects. Given that subgroups make up a majority of the student population, and the "all students" group performs at equally low rates as subgroups, it is reasonable to set goals that have all students and subgroups achieving the same rate of growth each year.
- The only exceptions that are not achievable are places where subgroups are growing to above 100% proficiency over the grant period. For example, the American Indian/Alaska Native subgroup is projected to have 125% of students

proficient or above by the 2016-17 school year. This occurs in multiple places.

The district's goals on gap closure are a bit more confusing and it is hard to determine if they are ambitious and achievable:

- The district proposes to measure gap closure by the percent of students proficient on the MAEP statewide, minus the percent proficient in DPS. Given that DPS does not have significant gaps across subgroups, this seems like an appropriate measure for measuring gap closure. However, closing these gaps by 5 points per year seems overly ambitious because the state will presumably continue to improve and DPS will have to improve much faster to close gaps by 5 percentage points. However, without knowing the average or anticipated rate of growth at the state level, it is difficult to determine if DPS' proposal is in fact overly ambitious.
- In addition, it does not seem ambitious to measure gap closure in 3rd grade reading only, as proposed.

DPS' measures for improving graduation rates seem overly ambitious. While the district is putting in place several initiatives aimed at preparing students to graduate college and career ready, moving from a 59.4% graduation rate to a 96.4% rate seems very ambitious for the time allowed. Given that only 10 of the 46 schools served are high schools, it would seem that more time will be needed to have an impact on graduation rates in this way, as a significant portion of students served by these programs will not graduate for some time.

The district sets goals around college enrollment, however, without having baseline data, it is impossible to determine if these goals are ambitious and reasonable.

Overall, this section scores medium-low for DPS. While the district's vision seems likely to result in significant student achievement gains, the absolute achievement goals are the only ones that clearly meet the metric for ambitious and achievable. There are concerns about the feasibility of gap closure and graduation rate goals, and it is difficult to measure if the proposed metrics for college enrollment are feasible.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

DPS does not sufficiently demonstrate a clear track record of success improving student outcomes across the district over the past four years. There is little evidence to show progress in improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps, improving grad rates, or increasing college enrollment. DPS cites specific pockets of success, but none are consistent over a four year period. For example:

- 11 schools met or exceeded state average achievement over a three year period. In addition, it met AYP in the 2009-10 school year and four schools were removed from the PLA list in 2012.
- DPS highlights success at several specific schools, including Cass Technical High Schools, which was designated a Blue Ribbon School.

While important, none of the successes highlighted point to a clear record of success over the past four years in improving outcomes.

In addition, DPS has not demonstrated sufficient evidence about its ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its PLA schools.

There is some evidence of progress, but nothing that would be considered significant, particularly given that of the 33 priority school identified in this application, the majority have scores across all grades and subject levels that are, for the most part, below 20% proficiency. A few examples of the kind of progress demonstrated by DPS are:

- 4 schools were removed from the PLA list in 2012.
- Of the 30 dropout factories identified in the district, four years later 8 of them have been closed.

The district demonstrates that it has various mechanisms in place to share student performance data with educators, parents, and students but there is not one comprehensive solution. It seems parents and educators have a variety of tools at their disposal and it could potentially be difficult to navigate and determine the best solution for a given need. For example, the district provides:

- An early-warning type dashboards for teachers to access a variety of indicators on progress
- A parent and student learning village to access class assignments, textbooks, learning activities, etc.
- An Annual Education Report (AER) in the form of a web-based report.
- A MI School Data Portal
- Individualized Learning Plans (ILPs) for participating students

Throughout all of these resources, there is only one place where parents and students can access academic data for individual students, which is the ILPs.

Overall, DPS scored low in this category. There is little evidence of a track record of success, and it has not demonstrated an ability to make significant improvements in its PLAs. The district earns some points for having a variety of systems to share and access data, and for demonstrating some evidence of success. However, given the lack of a clear, consistent, LEA-wide track record of success, and a comprehensive, easy-to-use data portal for parents to access student achievement data, it scores relatively low.

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

5

2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

DPS does not demonstrate a high-level of transparency in its processes, practices and investments through public expenditure data.

- Data is displayed on the DPS website around personnel and employee compensation in a "budget and salary compensation transparency report," for example, but it is not clear if this data is actual, displayed for teachers only, or at the school-level.
- The application states that the "State School Aid Act" requires "certain information" to be posted but it is unclear what that information is.

The applicant scores low in this subcriterion, earning some points for its commitment to transparency and for displaying some level of compensation information on its website, but because it is unclear if that information is displayed as requested in the selection criteria for B2, it does not earn full points.

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

10

4

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

DPS does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the conditions described in this sub-criterion are in place. It demonstrates support for personalized learning environments from the Governor through the creation of a statewide system of schools to "radically transform teaching and learning" but it does not provide any additional information about what this is or what autonomy it provides to which schools. In addition, it explains that the Michigan Department of Education supports personalized learning by making 2012 the "Year of the Digital Learner" but this also does not provide sufficient evidence of statutory or regulatory flexibility.

B3 receives a low score for providing no information about the legal, statutory, or regulatory contexts that will enable DPS to accomplish its objectives through this proposal, though it receives some points because it is not clear that significant legal or regulatory autonomy is required to implement it's plan, and for demonstrating general support from state leaders for the type of learning environment DPS proposes.

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

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The efforts DPS took to engage stakeholders in the development of its proposal were meaningful and seemed valuable, given that DPS indicates it made changes to its plan based on the feedback it received. For example:

- It developed a district-wide "Design Team" composed of district- and school-based personnel, including the district's parent engagement coordinator. The Design Team work was meaningful in that it engaged a wide variety of stakeholders, including principals and teachers, and reached consensus on goals and strategies.
- It convened a community-wide forum to provide information on its proposal and seek feedback. Attendees at the forum included union leaders, business representation, parents, and teachers.

However, while the district points to involving teachers in the development of its plan, it does not describe specific evidence of how it engaged the teachers in the 46 participating schools.

Finally, DPS provides letters from a significant variety of stakeholders, including school administration representation, members of congress, the detroit parent network, and the president of the Detroit Teen Leadership Institute. However, the letter from the state department of education indicates that it offered some suggestions for improvement in an attachment that does not appear to be included in the application. This would have been helpful in determining whether or not (and how) the district took feedback into account in revising its proposal.

Overall, this sub-criterion scores fairly high as DPS demonstrates a significant amount of thought and meaning in its stakeholder engagement, but it loses some points for not specifically describing engagement with teachers in participating schools or including the feedback from MDE.

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

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The district does a good job in this section of describing its current needs and gaps, and its logic for choosing to implement the initiatives it did. However, it does not sufficiently make the connection around how its plan will address the specific needs and gaps it identifies. For example:

- DPS explains that 40 of its 130 schools were identified as PLA in 2011, and that more than 50% of its 3-8 students scored below basic on NAEP.
- In addition, its dropout rate is up from the 2010-11 school year district-wide, and 1.2% of its students are college- and career-ready in all subjects.
- DPS also indicates that the gap between district goals and achievement is growing.
- It also explains that it examined successful schools in the district and found that they all have personalized, equitable, and academically rigorous approaches to teaching and learning, and that giving teachers the skills to meet diverse needs is critical to achieving success.

The needs and gaps identified are significant and clear, and the district's rationale for success is well-founded by looking at the successful schools within the district, but it would have been helpful to have seen more of a connection made between the strategies proposed and the needs the district is trying to address. As a result, this section scores in the medium-low range.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Overall, DPS has a strong plan for implementing personalized learning environments into its participating schools, and some of the identified projects are very compelling in terms of potential to impact student achievement. Some areas of the sub-criterion were address more substantially than others, as outlined below. However, the district did not outline a high-quality plan in that it did not provide specific milestones to track its implementation.

C1a: This section is centered around ensuring that students are actively involved in their learning in that they know where they are at any given time, and know what they need to do to achieve their goals. It asks that they are enabled to do this in multiple ways that meet their interests and expose them to diverse experiences and cultures. DPS has a lot of strong evidence to indicate that its plan will meet this criteria, and falls short in one area. Both the strengths and weaknesses are outlined below.

- DPS proposes to involve parents and students in their learning by engaging them in the development of students' Individualized Learning Plans (ILPs), and to track their progress in meeting the goals on these plans. While this is the right idea, the most significant weakness identified in this section is that the ILP that is offered as an example is not particularly student friendly. It includes places to track formative assessment data from a variety of sources, and space to outline student objectives across different subjects. But, it does not provide a clear path for students to achieve their goals and is not based around the content they need to master. Therefore, it is not sufficiently equipped to be a useful tool for students and teachers and it runs a high risk of being created and not used. Students need to see the material they need to master laid out in manageable chunks, with specific strategies and opportunities identified to master them. The student should then be able to indicate on their own plan when they have mastered that material. The ILP provided in the application does not seem to allow for this kind of student engagement.
- The district references using a student interest survey to identify opportunities for them to engage in content and material that aligns with those interests, which is important.
- The H.S. reform strategies allow students at that level to access material that will help prepare them for college- and career-readiness through AP courses, internships, and project-based learning. In addition, the college visits will help expose students to additional opportunities and contexts.

C1b: This section seeks to identify what personalized learning opportunities students will have access to and in general, DPS has a very solid plan for creating personalized learning environments for students across all grade levels. The structures are generally infused into the school-day, making them meaningful and accessible for all students. Some examples of the strengths and weaknesses of DPS' approach are:

- There is some indication that students will have a personalized sequence of instruction through the use of the ILPs, a blended learning model, and at home experiences through the VCES. However, it would have been helpful to further understand how the school day would be structured to ensure effective use of these opportunities. /without specific implementation steps and milestones, It was difficult to envision what a typical school day experience would be like for a student in these schools and how all of these tools and programs would truly facilitate a cohesive personalized

sequence of instruction for students.

- It was clear that students would have a high-quality and diverse set of instructional approaches through the VCES and the interventionists. This is an incredibly smart approach whereby interventionists will deliver all core content for students in grades 3-5 in science and social studies through the VCES system. The teacher of record will help personalize the learning for each student and facilitate individual and group practice on the content. This is brilliant in that a) the district can spread the reach of its best teachers, b) the students get access to more rigorous content (like AP courses, for example) that the district wouldn't have been able to provide otherwise, and c) the teacher of record in the classroom gets the professional development experience of watching a highly effective instructor teach for an extended amount of time. This is an incredibly smart approach and holds a lot of potential to be incredibly impactful for students and teachers alike.
- While the ILP is designed to be a tracking tool, it is not clear how often it will be updated or how it will be used on a weekly, if not daily, basis by students. Nor is it clear how the tools described will help provide personalized learning recommendations for students.

C1c: There is brief mention of training elementary students on device usage for the devices they will use in their reading instruction, and it is assumed that in the development of the ILP, there will be discussion about its use. However, the district fails to outline a clear plan for ensuring students know how to navigate everything at their disposal to successfully manage their own learning.

Overall, DPS proposes some incredibly innovative and promising strategies for improving student achievement that include a diverse and high-quality menu of strategies and resources. The VCES is one of the most critical tools, and the internship opportunities, counseling suites, and college-going culture the district aims to create will help peak student interest and improve investment in their own learning. The instructional models of blended learning, flip classrooms, project-based learning, and co-teaching through the VCES technology provide for a well-rounded, comprehensive individual learning environment for students. However, it does not sufficiently describe how students will be equipped to lead their own learning by using the ILPs and the technology at their disposal. In addition, the district loses some points due to concerns around the effectiveness of the ILP to serve as a tool for students' constant use, and because there remains some uncertainty around how these strategies all fit together to create a comprehensive and purposeful experience for students, but overall it scores relatively high in C1.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

C2a: The district proposes a strong, job-embedded, professional development experience for participating educators, but there are a few shortfalls in the proposal. The strengths and weaknesses are as follows:

- DPS describes a system of professional development where teachers collaborate in PLCs and have opportunities to observe highly effective teachers. It describes a system with ample opportunity for collaboration, discussion, practice, and learning. It also describes a Lesson Study whereby teachers will develop a lesson together, one member of the PLC will teach the lesson while others observe, and then they come back together to discuss it. This seems like a highly promising practice in terms of teacher development. However, it would have been helpful to know how these PD structures would specifically tie to the implementation of the components of the proposal. It seemed somewhat disjointed at times.
- The PLCs DPS describes provide a good opportunity for teachers to look at student data on a frequent basis and identify opportunities to improve instruction to better meet these needs.
- The VCES system, as previously described, creates a great model for teachers to be able to observe highly effective instructors through the video technology.
- The district's evaluation system is centered around instructional improvement, and includes opportunities to provide feedback based on a Danielson-based rubric, and to video-tape lessons for feedback and teacher development.

C2b: Overall, DPS describes some structures that will help equip teachers to know how to use the resources and strategies at their disposal, but the proposal lacks a sufficient plan for helping teachers know how to use and manage the wide variety of resources at their disposal. For example:

- The ILP creates a structure to set goals and areas of focus for students but doesn't appear to create an individualized sequence of learning that might help guide teachers identify optimal learning strategies to best accommodate each student's plan. In addition, DPS does not sufficiently provide evidence of a process or structure to match student needs with resources and approaches.
- However, there is evidence of access to high-quality instructional tools through the Interventionist strategy using the VCES, blended learning, other video lessons, and AP courses.

C2c: As noted above, DPS provides some strong structures for principals and teachers to support the delivery of effective instruction. However, it could be closer tied to personalized learning environments and some of the instructional strategies proposed in the plan (blended

learning, and flip classrooms, for example). Some examples of the strengths and weaknesses of the plan are:

- Principals will have opportunities to observe other principals who have demonstrated success in their schools and who implement some of these strategies in their schools. In addition, principals will be prepared to be instructional leaders in their school, which is critical to improving teacher effectiveness.
- Principals evaluate teachers against a Danielson-based rubric and will be able to identify specific areas of growth for individual teachers, but there is concern that there is not a specific plan for ensuring principals are knowledgeable enough to coach teachers to improve.
- Much of the districts plan hinges on human capital and identifying and leveraging its most effective teachers and principals, which is the right approach. However, without a qualifying evaluation system in place until the 2014-15 school year it is concerning that the district (and principals in particular) may not be able to effectively identify their best people.
- The district makes reference to a system of continuous improvement that is meaningful, but does little to address the systems and processes the schools and district will use to execute this system. It simply states that teachers and principals will "establish priorities, organize their work, plan for improvement, take action, and implement strategies to sustain improvement." But it is unclear when and how this will happen.

C2d: As discussed at length previously, the district has a strong plan to expand the reach of its best teachers through the Interventionists and online lectures for at home use, both available via the VCES technology. The only element of uncertainty here is the districts' ability to identify its best teachers without an evaluation system like to student achievement until mid-way through the grant period.

Overall, DPS scores medium-high in this category. It has some innovative and smart approaches to human capital development as described above, but it would have been helpful to link these structures more specifically to personalized learning environments as it relates to their plan. It also loses some points for not placing more of an emphasis on equipping teachers to best utilize strategies to meet individual student needs.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>DPS describes a central office that has a Chief Reform Officer, and a Change Facilitator who works under that person and will have day-to-day responsibility for the program. The idea of the Chief Reform Officer is strong in that they are a contract employee who will be a part of the team throughout the life of the grant and will be responsible for coaching and developing other district leadership to embed and sustain a focus on reform and innovation at the district level beyond the life of the grant. However, it is concerning that there is not an office focused on teacher and principal development, given that it is such a strong focus of their proposal. There is a strand for professional development under the Deputy Superintendent but it would seem necessary to have an entire division focused on this work to provide the kind of human capital recruitment and development described.</p> <p>In addition, the district describes a few ways in which principals will have autonomy over necessary decisions but does not adequately describe specifics about what that flexibility and autonomy will provide. For example, it states that principals had hiring authority for the first time this school year, and that there are existing "Detroit Rising" schools where principals have autonomy and flexibility in decision making. However, they don't describe exactly what flexibilities will be afforded to principals in Detroit Advantage schools.</p> <p>DPS also explains that it will place a "high priority" on the removal of seat time and creative scheduling, but it does not adequately describe how it will do this. In addition, there is little evidence that DPS will allow specific opportunities for mastery in multiple times and ways. As described previously, the ILPs are not mastery or standards based and therefore, it is difficult to understand how students will have individual plans allowing flexibility in content mastery, in addition to providing transparency about data and establishing goals. There is also little information about how resources and practices will be adapted to meet the needs of all students, particularly ELL and students with disabilities.</p> <p>Overall, the district earns some points in this section for stating that some of these conditions will be in place, but does not score particularly high because there are no clear plans or descriptions for how this will be achieved.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

DPS has a strong plan for ensuring students and families, regardless of income, have access to resources and tools. It offers counseling suites as a place for students and families to access resources, and home access to learning material through the use of Netbooks that will be given to all participating students. In addition, through a partnership with Comcast, all families will be provided with affordable internet options to ensure students can access available materials online at home. In addition, it offers technical support through its VCES system and will employ a system engineer to provide overall support and provide training to educators on its use. However, it would be helpful to have additional technical support options available to students and parents after hours and it is not clear that this will exist.

DPS describes a MI School Data System that will enable parents to export school test data in a usable format, but it is unclear if they will have this kind of access to their individual student's data. There is also little evidence that there are tools in place to make additional recommendations for learning supports to students and parents. Finally, DPS does not provide any information about the interoperability of its district data systems.

Overall, DPS scores in the medium range on D2 because it has clearly put thought into ensuring all students have access to technology outside of school hours, regardless of income. However, it does not provide enough information to address the additional components of this sub-criterion.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>DPS describes a clear continuous process that, if implemented properly, should provide timely and regular feedback on progress. DPS also indicates plans to involve the whole school in participating in this cycle, which is important to creating a team environment, and providing transparency about what's working and where there is room for improvement. In addition, they plan to add findings from the continuous improvement process to the Annual Education Report (AER), which is important to ensure public consumption of the quality of DPS' investments.</p> <p>However, there is not sufficient information to understand how the district will utilize this process. For example, when the analysis will take place, what data they will have on a frequent basis to analyze (as most leading indicators are actually year-end measures), and how the results will be aggregated across all schools to assess implementation across the entire project.</p> <p>The district scores in the medium range on this sub-criterion because it identifies a strong and meaningful process for continuous improvement, but lacks information about how it will be utilized effectively.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>DPS identifies several opportunities for communication with stakeholders, but very few for engagement. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has a website and parent newsletters where it will post and disseminate information about progress. • It has an existing structure called "Parent Advisory Councils on Student Achievement," (PAC-SA) which are promising. Through these councils, parents will stay informed, receive training on how to analyze student data, and be better equipped to advocate for their students and engage in the progress of implementation. It was indicated that 91 schools have these councils in place, but it is unclear if any of the 90 are in participating schools or if additional councils will be formed in participating schools. • DPS describes opportunities for ongoing engagement through school board meetings, and parent-teacher meetings. However, none of the structures mentioned are new or specifically targeted to seek feedback and engage stakeholders in the progress of implementation of this plan. <p>As a result of the shortfalls noted above, DPS scores in the medium range for this section. Some points are earned for the existing structures that will, to some extent, facilitate communication and in some cases, engagement.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>DPS' performance measures are mixed in terms of whether or not they are ambitious and achievable. In addition, a majority of the indicators are not leading, but rather will come at the end of the school year. Some examples of the strengths and weaknesses of these measures are as follows:</p>		

- DPS is proposing to decrease by 10% annually the number of schools in the state's bottom 10%. It is unclear, without additional information about the number of schools in the bottom 10%, whether this is feasible given that this program will impact 46 schools. It is unclear if the math actually adds up to enable them to accomplish this, but in general, it seems like an ambitious and likely achievable goal.
- A 10% increase in college enrollment over 4 years seems ambitious and reasonable.
- An increase in AP offerings and enrollment by 10% also seems ambitious and reasonable, and the additional goal of increasing by 10% the number of students scoring 3 and above on the AP exams is ambitious and reasonable, and provides a nice "output" metric to complement the aforementioned input metric around number of courses and enrollments.
- The goal of having 100% of teachers and principals effective or highly effective by 2016 seems overly ambitious, particularly as it rolls out a new evaluation system based in part on student achievement in that time period.
- Given that less than 2% of students are currently college- and career-ready across all subjects as evidenced by the ACT, setting a goal of increasing this by 10% over 4 years does not seem ambitious enough given where students are starting and the impact the programs planned to be put in place should have.
- While the measures are not leading indicators for the most part, DPS does describe within them some of the interim measures they will use to track progress on some of the indicators. For example, on the measure around ACT performance, DPS states that it will track coursework taken and encourage participation in more rigorous classes to ensure students are better prepared for these tests. Identifying these additional benchmark measures is important to ensuring DPS will know whether or not it is on track to meeting desired outcomes.

DPS provides some level of rationale for why these measures were chosen, but it is not sufficient. For example, they state that "AP courses will enhance students college- and career-readiness." However, it would have been helpful if the district made a direct connection between the plans they are proposing in the application and why the measures chosen will help evaluate their effectiveness. Finally, DPS lists some alternate measures it will track/propose if those indicated aren't yielding high-quality information, but does not sufficiently describe how it will review and assess whether these measures are effective in tracking progress.

Overall, DPS scores medium-high in this section because a majority of their proposed measures are ambitious and achievable, they have provided some rationale for why they were chosen that is logical, and have identified some benchmark measures to track progress until data is available. However, they lose some points because some of the measures are overly ambitious, and for not proposing true leading indicators to track implementation and assess their effectiveness as indicators.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

DPS plans to hire an external evaluator to assess the quality and effectiveness of its investments. The evaluation, as proposed, is looking at the right measures (for example, measuring the "nature and extent of use of the ILPs"), and is strong in that the evaluator will use a pre and post instrument to get a baseline and track progress (around the impact of the internship coordinator, for example). However, there are concerns that an external evaluator will not be able to provide the type of frequent feedback that is needed to make mid-course corrections. External parties and researchers can often be slower than the practical pace of educational change.

In addition, DPS does not provide clear information to explain how it will use evaluation results to more productively use time, staff, money or other resources in real-time.

In E4, DPS scores in the medium range because it outlines a plan to bring in an external evaluator and has the right mindset about what to measure, but there is not sufficient information provided to determine the effectiveness of its use of this information.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

DPS presents a strong budget in its application. It is clear, identifies all resources, and makes (for the most part) smart, one-time investments. In addition, all expenditures appear to be necessary and reasonable. The district also takes the right approach in building the infrastructure to sustain its plan and investing in its human resources to carry the plan forward after the grant, rather than bringing on a lot of staff through the proposal. For example:

- In the ILP budget, DPS outlines reasonable and sufficient funds to purchase the software to house these plans online, as well as contractual funds to hire consultants to assist in developing the ILP and providing teachers with PD on how

to use them. This strikes the right balance of one-time costs that will also embed sustainability long-term.

- The most significant cost in the proposal is the VCES budget. DPS makes a smart investment in this technology for a variety of reasons described previously. For example, it will call for a significant level of one-time costs, but the ongoing benefit as a result is very powerful. There are some ongoing costs involved with the Interventionists who will teach science and social studies using this technology, but given that it will expand the reach of effective teachers and have a profound impact on student achievement in these subjects with currently abysmal performance, there seems to be a good cost-benefit ratio to consider.
- DPS clearly identifies where other funds will come from to support this plan, including Title I (for the family engagement component, for example), and the State Technology Grant (to provide additional resources to support technology purchases).

Overall, DPS provides a clear, comprehensive budget that is reasonable and sufficient, and is thoughtful in its approach to resources allocation and ensuring a high return on the investments made, scoring this section high.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

DPS provides a high-quality plan for plan for sustainability that is well thought out and is centered around building capacity at all levels, and only doing what works. For example:

- As mentioned previously, the Chief Reform Officer is a temporary position that will serve to build capacity and embed change within the district leadership to sustain this vision long-term.
- The grant proposes to hire a small number of personnel, and instead focus on one-time infrastructure, technology, and professional development to embed capacity within its existing human resources.
- Through its continuous improvement process, DPS plans to identify its most effective programs in improving student outcomes and only sustain those projects.

These are smart strategies that focus on sustainability by improving and building capacity in existing human resources, and making smart investments in things that are effective. As a result, DPS scores high in F2.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Not submitted.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Overall, DPS meets the absolute priority of providing a high-quality plan to implement a meaning personalized learning environment that will lead to improved student outcomes. Some highlights of this plan are as follows:

- DPS is implementing Individualized Learning Plans for all participating students, and all participating students are those in greatest need of the supports outlined.
- The district is utilizing technology to expand students' access to high-quality instruction and rigorous coursework, and is changing instruction to better accommodate students needs through blended learning opportunities and flip classrooms, which will dramatically enhance the students' experiences during the school day and lead to improved outcomes. At the

same time, through the use of Netbooks provided by the school and VCES technology to take lessons outside of the classroom, students will also have access to high-quality instruction and resources outside of the school day.

- In its participating high schools, DPS is proposing a middle college high school approach to expand students access to college-ready curriculum and college-level learning opportunities. It is also proposing strategies to embed a college-going culture in schools and open horizons to students regarding their future potential and opportunities to help them see the value and significance of their learning.

The projects proposed in this plan are comprehensive, innovative, and will effectively build on the work DPS is doing to ensure rigorous college- and career-ready content, meaningful use of data to improve instruction, building capacity of its human capital and broadening the reach of its most effective teachers, all while directly and meaningfully supporting students in its lowest-performing schools. Overall, DPS' plan sufficiently meets the absolute priority of a personalized learning environment and holds promise for its most struggling students.

Total	210	122
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0842MI-2 for School District of the City of Detroit

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Detroit Public Schools is to be commended for seeking and developing "The vision for Detroit Advantage is to make the Detroit Public School District the most rapidly improving urban district in the nation – to transform all of its schools into centers of excellence." It was evident through letters and reviewer comments that many stakeholders at numerous levels played a vital role in putting the vision together and throughout the application multiple times the methods for addressing alignment with common core, college readiness, and addressing student achievement gaps, and incorporating technology all to enhance student achievement were shared. Most notable to this articulation of a comprehensive vision was the making of the district's schools in every neighborhood who will ultimately become centers of excellence that exist to ensure that all students perform at high levels.

Strong Evidence of articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision was found in the Detroit Advantage proposal. The District's Academic Plan is the driver for the vision and Individualized Learning Plans (ILP's) and will be at the center of the Academic Plan. Each of the student learning plans will be used to map each student's journey to educational success. These plans, developed for every child in the district's schools, will reflect the common core state standards as well as students' interests and abilities. The data informed culture of the District will have a key stakeholder in this through the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) located in the State Budget Office). Detroit Advantage reform vision during Year 2-4 relies on the other schools choosing to adopt these reforms. It was not evident in the plan specifically why non focus or priority schools would want to adopt these reforms.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A total of 46 schools and the nearly 25,688 students will participate in the Detroit Advantage reform effort. Decisions regarding how they were selected was made by the Design Team who was comprised of the district's Academic Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent of Innovation, Assistant Superintendents, curriculum leaders, school leaders, content specialists, teachers and parent representatives. Decision by the team was to select the highest need schools in the district followed by the rest of the schools during year 3 and 4.

List of schools and the number of students was shared with 10 of the schools servicing Grade 9 and higher with the remainder all serving Grades K up and through Grade 8.

Page 16 highlights the number and percentages of students who would be participating in the project.

Strong Evidence was noted by the Design Team agreeing that district schools with the greatest needs (Focus and Priority Schools) would be served first with additional schools in need of support phased in during Year 3 and 4 of the program period. Evidence by the Design team did articulate a process to select schools to participate, list of schools was provided, and demographics of participants were provided. These recommendations made by the Design Team regarding program goals, the number and types of schools that should be targeted were tentative pending sharing sessions and receipt of additional input from with other district stakeholders.

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

10

9

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strong Evidence was presented by the applicant regarding a high quality plan was evident regarding scaling up and translating into meaningful reform the supports for district-wide change beyond the participating schools. Evidence of this was noted in the Detroit Advantage theory of change that sets the stage for program implementation and evaluation. It guides the work of the stakeholders. Organization of the leadership and infrastructure was shared regarding how the system would be established. A timeline included that during Year 1 the Detroit Advantage would be implemented in the district's lowest performing Focus and Priority Schools identified because they serve students facing significant learning challenges including ELL students, special needs students, and students adversely affected by poverty. A total of 46 schools would be targeted over the four years. Throughout the duration of Detroit Advantage, time and effort will be devoted to documenting how schools and students are doing in meeting standards and goals. Responsibility of the plan will be to principals and district leaders monitoring and checking progress throughout the implementation process. Principals will be charged with making adjustments where data supports such changes and adjustments. The Change Facilitator will work collaboratively with the Program Implementation Team and other district stakeholders, to develop a realistic schedule in order to phase-in Detroit Advantage best practices. This schedule will allow time for presentations, modeling, feedback, monitoring and time for exploring questions and concerns. Less Evidence was presented regarding one of the primary goals of the scale-up effort regarding how to encourage the participation of any newly identified Priority or Focus schools and schools that have not met annual growth targets in the core academic.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Moderate Evidence was provided by the applicant regarding the extent to which the vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals. Evident by the applicant was that the Detroit Advantage student outcomes would exceed the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's) established by the state. Evident was that Graduation and College enrollment rates would exceed the states goals by 10%. Evident also was that the achievement gap would decrease for groups in the identified Focus Schools by 5% per year. No Evidence was provided regarding the rationale for why students in the subgroups would have the same goals as the District. Incomplete Evidence was provided for all of the groups to be served in the plan; specifically that of the special education sub group was not represented regarding Goal Area, Baseline, and project Goals 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	5
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Weak Evidence was provided regarding the applicants extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. Evidence was provided that Detroit Public Schools met state requirements for Adequate Yearly Progress as a District for the 2009-2010 school year and this was achieved for the first time since 2006. Evidence was also presented that graduation rates had increased from 2007 (58.42%) to 2010(62.27%) and also during the same time the dropout rate for the school system decreased from 29.99% to 19.09%. Evidence in a news article was that in 2006 schools that were identified as dropout factories were now on the path to achieve 80% graduation rates. Evident also were dashboards, parent resource centers, and villages, along with annual reports and the school portal all offering access to data. Parent and student learning village does provide access to student information and resources to help parents and students advance their knowledge. No Evidence was provided over a four year timeframe to support a clear record of increasing equity regarding sub groups in learning. No Evidence of a clear track record was presented over a four year period regarding the proficiency levels on the Michigan Merit Exam (math and reading grade levels) and the NAEP scores presented encompassed only two years of time.</p>		

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Moderate Evidence was provided by the applicant to increase transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments. The applicant provided in narrative that their financial accountability follows the State School Aid Act and that they post the data to the district website. The majority of financial data reported was reported by the applicant as being made available to the public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. No Evidence was provided that supported the extent to which the applicant makes available actual personnel salaries at the school level of teachers and instructional staff.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	4
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Moderate Evidence was presented by the LEA as evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments. Evidence was shared by the applicant that they have been implementing elements of personalized learning as a part of the State and school community's demand for safer schools, improved graduation rates and increased achievement scores. Evidence was shared that from the Governor's level he supports innovation, flexibility, and autonomy to transform schools and classrooms through the Education Achievement Authority of Michigan formally created August 11, 2011. An Inter-Local Agreement between the Board of Regents of Eastern Michigan University and the Detroit Public Schools was mentioned in narrative. No Evidence of the specifics of what the agreement entailed was found and how that reflects and supports local autonomy to implement this plan by the applicant was not evident. No Evidence was shared in the applicant that directly conveyed the "LEA level" of legal, statutory, and regulatory autonomy to implement the proposed personalized learning environments.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Moderate Evidence was provided by the applicant regarding meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development and stakeholder support for the proposal. Evident was that attendees of the first meeting ultimately made up the District Design Team Members. This included the Academic Superintendent; the Directors of Innovation, School Improvement, Parent Involvement, Mathematics, Science, Literacy, Technology, Counseling and Evaluation and Testing. Team members gathered feedback and engaged members through monthly meetings, forums, email, targeted mailings of information to get feedback, and presentations. Noted comments in parent feedback forms around inclusions, exclusions, and corrections in the document can be found in the final application. Evidence of this engagement included letters of support of the city leader, congressman, parent organizations, and a student. Further Evidence was provided in stakeholder engagement through signatures of many of the organizations to be involved in the project. Weak Evidence of university partnership in engagement or participation in the application was found even though the application did share agreements with local universities being established. Also not evident in the letter of supports were community based organizations and local business representatives. LEA level teacher engagement and support was not clearly evident in the application. The district's chief negotiator convened special meetings with the teacher's collective bargaining units to discuss RTTT and come to consensus about roles and responsibilities for union members, but the outcomes and results of this discussion were not found. However, numerous meetings with teachers being included appear to have occurred.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Moderate Level of Evidence was presented by the applicant regarding a high-quality plan for an analysis of the current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal. Evidence was shared regarding the District Team convening and reviewing data. Evidence of the District's Improvement Plan (DIP) plan was provided and it seeks to ensure that all students are achieving at high levels. The DIP was developed in collaboration with families, community members, students, and teachers, addresses student learning and identifies needs and gap. Evidence of analysis beyond that of the district improvement plans and team of how this information actually gets enacted on or the timeframe by which it is reported were not found. The Advantage Detroit Plan will build on the successes and lessons learned from the schools that are achieving their learning goals, but there was no evidence of a plan regarding how or who will gather this information and when. A part of the plan appears to be that CEPI - The Center for Educational Performance and Information is doing analysis but it was not clear regarding a timeline to do the analysis. Responsibilities of personnel regarding the high quality plan were also not evident and most notably missing from the discussion was the role of the Chief Reform Officer in these activities was not evident.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Moderate Evidence was presented by the applicant regarding a high-quality plan for an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner to graduate college- and career-ready. Evident in the plan was that Detroit Advantage during the first year would target the lowest performing Focus and Priority Schools because they serve students facing significant learning challenges. These include ELL students, special needs students, and students affected adversely by poverty. High schools as a part of the Advantage will create six small empowered high schools that are a part of the Detroit Rising Initiative and 3 DPS general admission high school will also be targeted. Lessons learned and opportunities during year 3 and 4 will be made to other schools. Personalized learning environments will be the anchor in participating K-12 classrooms that ensures that learners are engaged and where instruction is differentiated to address learning styles, interests and abilities. Technology will be provided to aid in differentiating instruction and providing professional development opportunities. Evidence was also noted that Detroit Advantage has an array of personalized learning opportunities all tied to an individualized learning plan. Numerous student advisories, high end videoconferencing, STEM related activities, use of interventionists, internship coordinators, career planning specialist, Detroit Reading Corp, along with parent and family engagement activities all were noted in the systems of personalized learning supports. Portfolios, flipped and blended learning, AP classes, ACT, and project based learning are all planned out to support student college and career readiness. Weak Evidence in the high quality plan were the actual timelines for moving all the activities out into the systems and also who had responsibilities for these implementations.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	9
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Moderate Evidence was presented by the applicant regarding a high-quality plan to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner to graduate college- and career-ready. Evidence was shared by the applicant that the Detroit Advantage approach will inspire excellence in teaching and leading through four elements 1) communicating the district's expectations for teaching and leading 2) examining teacher and administrative practice 3) providing ongoing growth opportunities and supports 4) defining and refining of teacher and administrator evaluation systems. Evidence of the use of both Lesson Study and the overall work of PLC's will be supported with time – time during the school day to plan, to meet and to talk. PLC's will evaluate the impact of the implementation of strategies and activities on teaching and learning and make changes in practice to better meet the needs of all students. Goals of the PLC's and Lesson Study should result in greater academic gains in math, science, and English and smaller achievement gaps between students from different backgrounds and cultures. Evident also was that professional development opportunities would include a 1) principal pipeline program that includes a principals' training academy and ongoing mentorship of new and veteran principals; 2) introduction to and participation in the development of a principal evaluation system that seeks to retain the best leaders for district schools; 3) a multi-path career ladder for teachers that focuses on skills needed inside and outside of the classroom; 4) in-service sessions that provide skill development in the high need areas identified by teachers; and 5) participation in teacher evaluation activities that are designed to support and retain the best teachers. Evidence of the responsibilities of the high quality plan will reside with the Office of Professional Development. No Evidence was provided regarding a timeline for training over the grant period and there was no evidence of whether contracted or internal professional development would be done and the process to invoke and support those activities. Weak Evidence was also evident for the credibility of success in the high quality plan because of the current Detroit Educational Evaluation Process document is still being worked on and a Human Resource Administrator will be identified to lead the redesign and completion of the document. Given that the Detroit Education Evaluation Process document is being revamped and expanded address the teacher evaluation process and become more comprehensive in its approach to evaluating school leaders, this activity could impact professional development activities. Evidence was also shared that the Leadership standards will be discussed and leadership behaviors will be identified based on current research and currently a number of formative and summative assessments for administrators are being piloted by several school districts which all were not addressed in the timeline and activities of this high-quality plan for improving teaching.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Moderate Evidence was provided by the applicant regarding a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the supports it needs and when it needs it. Evidence of the infrastructure to support the high quality plan was provided by the Detroit Advantage being housed in the Office of the Academic Superintendent. A Chief Reform Officer will report to the Superintendent of Academics who will have overall responsibility for program. The Chief Reform Officer (CRO) will be committed to achieving the vision and goals of Detroit Advantage. Principals in the target schools will have local authority and autonomy to make decisions related to roles and responsibility of staff, the school calendar, school budgets; services to be provided to a diverse student body; and relationships with the school community including parents, local businesses, and university personnel. Much of these decisions and activities will also go through the close collaboration with the School Improvement Team with the exemplar of this being shared the Detroit Rising Self-Governing Schools and principals hiring for the first time their own teachers. Evidence was not presented in this Detroit Advantage high quality approach regarding the actual timelines for these activities. Evidence was not provided in the plan regarding timelines. More specifically timelines or timeframes regarding the outcomes of the current reviewing and researching of mastery in multiple ways like that of through on-line courses, competency exams (mastery tests) and waivers are examples of approaches all make the plan tenuous in being able to be achieved.

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

10

6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Moderate Evidence was provided by the applicant that the LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning. Evidence was noted that parents and students have access to an online portal called the Parent/Student Village that enables parents to continue students' education at home, after school hours, and on weekends. In addition parents and students receive support and access through parent resources centers, counseling suites, and from the parent network. Evident was also that many of these resources are already a part of the district infrastructure, involve the use of technology and allow for peer support, online support and parental support with responsibilities of them being tied to technology staff, teachers and volunteers, that are working in district facilities to provide technical support. Evidence was also shared that the MI School Data site appears to have most of the student and teacher information that could best inform individualized learning plans and personalized instructional practices for the teacher. It includes information on educator effectiveness; student information data, budget data, assessment data (MME, MEAP, ACT, PLAN, EXPLORE, etc.) graduation rates; retention rates and student attendance. Weak Evidence was provided as to whether acquired data is actually interoperable and able to be exported in an open data format. Evidence was also weak regarding how and what information parents are using or being trained to access away from the school currently and in this application. Weak Evidence was provided regarding what role afterschool and extended hours through the Parent Resource Centers would take in supporting these proposed activities.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Moderate Evidence was provided by the applicant of the strategy for implementing a continuous improvement process providing timely and regular feedback on progress toward goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements. Evidence of a Michigan Department of Education cycle of improvement they use was reported as the tool to be used by the Detroit Advantage stakeholders. Evident in the tool is a process that consists of 1) gathering analyzing/studying data; 2) setting goals; 3) developing a plan; 4) implementing the plan components and 5) evaluating by monitoring and adjusting based on feedback, benchmark data; assessment results and experiences of success. Accountable of engaged school staff, parents and community along with district level stakeholders are all engaged in the improvement discussion. Multiple sources of data will be gathered and analyzed as stakeholders seek to improve student achievement and increase the number of students that leave school prepared for college and careers. Principals, school improvement teams, district leadership and other stakeholders will use the process as prescribed. MEAP data, MME data, MI Access data, end of course, process and perception data will all be used to assess student and program needs and customize plans. No Evidence regarding any timelines for implementation, training of personnel, integration of the process into the teams, or integration of the process to the Chief Reform Officer was evident.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Compelling Evidence was provided by the applicant regarding the ongoing communication and engagement of both internal and external stakeholders. Evidence provided regarding communication included the district website, newsletters and mass media, parent

resource centers, new center for special needs, Parent Advisory Councils, local governing councils, parent connect and pulse data tools, multi-agency partnerships, School Board meetings, Parent Teacher Meetings, Curriculum Council meetings, DPS Foundation meetings, DPS Alumni meetings, School Open Houses and Special Issues Meetings at local schools were all noted as venues to communicate with and engage parents and other stakeholders. The applicant shared that having an actively engaged internal and external stakeholder groups is critical to improving and sustaining district and school improvements.

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strong Evidence was provided by the applicant to a high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. Evidence was provided for the key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the overall credibility of the plan given the size and scope of the project across the district. More specifically Detroit Advantage goals to:

- Increase by 5% annually, the number students in the participating schools and participating grades who meet or exceed standards in science, social studies, reading and math
- By 2016, increase the number of high school students who graduate college and career ready from 60% to 95%
- By 2016, recruit, develop, retain and reward highly effective principals and teachers that work in district schools and classrooms

Evidence of achievable performance measures was shared along with the rationale for the measure and how the measure will work. These measures included Michigan Education Achievement Program, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills, Measurement of Academic Progress, computerized benchmark assessments, Michigan Merit Exam, end-of –unit tests, teacher created tests, surveys and questionnaires administered to target students, teachers, principals, parents and other stakeholders will be used to assess student achievement and the effectiveness of program reforms. The work of Charlotte Danielson and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards will guide the development/revision teacher and principal evaluation tools. Weak Evidence regarding who was responsible for the performance measures was not consistently provided the 17 performance measures.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strong Evidence was provided by the applicant to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities. Evident in the Detroit Advantage was an evaluation plan with considerable detail that includes an External Evaluator to conduct the formal Detroit Advantage process and outcome evaluation to determine if the program projects and components are producing the intended effects. Working in collaboration with district internal evaluators from the Department of Evaluation and Testing, the External Evaluator will collect data to describe what was done, how it was done and who was involved in project activities (process indicators). The External Evaluator will assist in the assessment of progress so that Detroit Advantage stakeholders will have a year by year measures and a cumulative description of accomplishments. The External Evaluator will also consult with the Chief Reform Officer and the Implementation Team, in developing media releases and disseminating progress reports at regular intervals for various audiences including the General Superintendent, the Detroit Board of Education, parent and community partners and the U.S. Department of Education.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Strong Evidence was provided by the applicant regarding the budget. Evidence in the budget was the requests support for reasonable and appropriate support that includes the following positions over the next 4 years: 1 Change Facilitator (Executive Director);1 Video Systems Engineer (Executive Director) ;2 Certified Counselors (College Planning Specialists); 9 Teachers for the Video Education Collaboration System (VECS) program in Math, Social Studies, and Science; 2 Parent Engagement Administrators (Program Associate II); 1 Internship Coordinator (Program Associate I); I Retention /Reward Coordinator (Program Associate II); 2 Administrative Assistants (Clerical) for the RTT Implementation team and the ELA/Reading Volunteers Office. Evidence of the funding and budgets by project were clearly broken out by the supporting activities and had sufficient details of rationale. Identification of funds and purposes were also presented in the budget narrative. Evidence was not apparent regarding how the current State Race To The Top funding and related activities align with this budget.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Moderate Evidence of a high quality plan for sustainability was provided by the applicant. Evident in the plan was that the Detroit</p>		

Advantage Design Team considered sustainability as a part of the application resulting in the emphasis being placed on investing in technology, infrastructure, and professional development rather than a large number of personnel. Evidence was also shared that the perception of the continuous improvement process would be seen as a mechanism for sustaining project goals and improvements. In essence, the model would be to gather and study data, set goals, plan, implement, and then evaluate. The applicant shared that through this plan it will aid staff in identifying what reforms should be retained and what reforms should be changed or discarded. Responsibility of this will rely on the Change Facilitator. Evidence was other funding that were listed and briefly discussed to be a part of the sustainability. Not evident in the high quality plan was the timelines, budget three years following, and who would be responsible for the process following the grant.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Evidence of a Competitive Preference Priority section in the application was not found.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Evidence was noted in the application that Detroit Public Schools has the infrastructure, experience and the commitment to achieve the goal of personalizing instruction across the district. The small schools that comprise Detroit Rising, as well as the other target schools, stand to benefit greatly from the structure, the supports, and the additional resources that are a part of the Detroit Advantage approach. The district is committed to preparing students for college and careers as evidenced by the establishment of self-governing schools; individualized learning plans for every student; and grant-supported installation of classroom response equipment; video-conferencing units; use of content area interventionists to model good instructional delivery; increased use of Advisory Periods and Counseling Suites and associated guidance resources. The district's small schools are also examining different approaches to awarding academic credits. The goal is to provide a model that can be replicated that will make it easier for struggling students to catch up, exceptional students to race ahead, and students facing geographic and scheduling barriers to take the courses they need.		

Total	210	121
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0842MI-3 for School District of the City of Detroit

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

The applicant has addressed its vision plan for retooling the system from top to bottom, which is reflected throughout the vision plan. New leadership is focused on school reform and student learning, creating a strong support to students and the program. There is increased emphasis on high standards: with a rigorous curriculum in place, and an accountability system. The vision will provided a new direction and energized the organization, promising of turning around the lowest achieving schools. Neighborhood schools will become Centers of Excellence led by highly effective principals. Schools will reflect evidence of student learning.

The applicant has addressed the following in its vision plan for retooling the system from top to bottom.

- New leadership will be the focus on school reform and student learning.
- Increased emphasis on high standards with a rigorous curriculum in place, and an accountability system.
- The vision will provide new direction and energized the organization, promising of turning around the lowest achieving schools.
- Neighborhood schools will become Centers of Excellence led by highly effective principals.
- Schools will reflect evidence of student learning.

District’s new Academic Plan provides focus in the ILP’s mapping the journey from increasing student achievement and accelerating learning. There is evidence of a plan to support its Centers of Excellence by concentrating of core strategies, personalized instruction, and family and community relationships. The Academic Plan will provide the framework, guide the district reform and school transformation and act as the heart used to map each student’s journey to educational success ensuring that all students graduate prepared for college, careers, further training or employment. Evidence of technology, bolstered by a video collaboration and conferencing system will be introduced to differentiate instruction in the blended learning classrooms.

The applicant provides additional evidence to ensure the Detroit Public Schools (DPS) craft and implement a comprehensive system based on principals of responsibility, standards, and empowerment creating a dramatically improvement on climate and instructional delivery. DPS is committed to hire smart and retain smart by offering various opportunities for collaboration, study and high quality pathways for those who wish to aspire to reach the top of the profession.

The plan addresses with details the overarching goals, activities and timelines to reflect aggressive yet attainable results. Further details on what lead to the change at top-level administration if this was tied to school improvement that would lead to lowering the gap that currently exists. This section is rated on the higher level.

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

10

8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant’s approach to implementation reflects reformation with the introduction of ‘Detroit Advantage’, a rigorous, robust student-centered Race To The Top initiative. Support from the high quality LEA level demonstrates strength with the formation of the Design Team comprised of the district’s Academic Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent of Innovation, Assistant Superintendents, curriculum leaders, school leaders, content specialists, teacher and parent representatives. What is not clear is how will the new leadership assist and/or take over these main areas of responsibility, which are also seen as a sign of empowerment.

A total of 33 Priority Schools will be served, three Focus Schools, ten high poverty reconfigured schools that include six small, self-governing high schools, two general admissions high schools, and one Special Education Schools. Collectively, 46 schools and 25,000 students in kindergarten through grade 12. As evidence in the details of the proposal the Design Team came to an agreement that schools with the greatest needs would be served first. Priority and Focus schools are two new school designations. Priority Schools are schools in the bottom 5% of Michigan’s annual Top-to-Bottom ranking. Focus Schools have the largest gaps in achievement between their highest and lowest performing students.

The plan is seen as aggressive based on the selection of the four distinct areas of schools, which is covering different focus and collectively serving 46 schools with a total 25,000 students in kindergarten through grade 12.

- Three Focus Schools
- Ten high poverty reconfigured schools that will include
- Six small, self-governing high schools
- Two general admissions high schools, and
- One Special Education Schools

It is also seen as attainable because of the leadership that has been established to see that the primary goals can and will be carried out as evidenced with the strong stakeholders of the LEA administration beginning with the superintendent.

- Support from the high quality LEA level demonstrates strength
- Formation of the Design Team comprised of

- The district's Academic Superintendent,
- Deputy Superintendent of Innovation,
- Assistant Superintendents,
- Curriculum leaders,
- School leaders,
- Content specialists,
- Teacher and parent representatives.

It section falls within the high level of ranking.

It section falls within the high level of ranking.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Details of the Rolling Out/Scaling up by the Detroit Advantage reforms demonstrate clarity in the process this plan will follow. DPS works from the premise that there is a sense of urgency for reform, and there is also a belief that reform is possible. Evidence of plan is in place that will help to guide the work ahead. DPS will assign a Chief Reform Officer to report directly to the Superintendent on all matters of the reform, and work closely with all key stakeholders. Principals will be charged with making adjustments where data supports such changes and adjustments. Details of the responsibilities to be carried out in the chain of command were not clearly defined. This would have given a better understanding of the complexity of issues that need to be addressed.

The applicant presents their scaling up plan to be a multi-dimensional process, which can be viewed as strength.

- First their needs to be a “readiness” for reform.
- Evidence that the applicant knows first hand that prior to conducting any scaling up activities, a plan will need to be collaboratively developed and coordinated by a knowledgeable, experienced “Change Facilitator”.
- The scale up plan will be well designed to include guidance, support and capacity building.
- Projections during year 4, any district school desirous of replicating Detroit Advantage reforms will have that opportunity.
- Overall the DPS-wide reform and change documents is needed, and
- The mode of delivery for this to take place.

The plan is evaluated in the higher range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a detailed plan reflecting the LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes. Based on the State targets for LEA’s DPS will implement reforms leading to increased student learning and improved student outcomes in the target grades and target schools. The reading subject area listed as target for improvement in 3rd grade seems to be limited in scope. Further discussion would help to clarify what appears to be limiting.

Strong Evidence is presented on graduation rates, college enrollment, decreasing achievement gaps, performance and summative assessments, and school demographics in a series of chart reports. This evidence will help to show areas of improvements and give guidance as to what may need to be changed. Results should lead into further discussion of how to improve student learning and performance and increase the graduation rates and college enrollment.

While seen as setting up ambitious goals with a statement made of rising above state norms, the applicant fails to outline the possible pros and cons, therefore this section is evaluated in the medium range.

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	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

RDS demonstrates a record of success by highlighting each of the schools, which have set a record for themselves and have been recognized. Reports indicate the following:

- Reports show that seven Detroit elementary and four middle schools have exceeded the state average in reading and math.
- Three Detroit high schools with an average ACT composite of at least 16.5 are presented.
- In 2010 four DPS were removed from the state's persistently low achieving list, which shows the signs of raising student achievement and lowering the gap.

Lack of clarity on the process used to inform parents of the status of their school, and of their daughter/son's reports. Specific activities leading to the improvement of these schools was missing therefore the rating for this section falls within the medium range.

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

5

4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Detroit Public Schools (DPS) demonstrates its LEA level of transparency by having been awarded the Sunny Award. The editors of sunshine review honoring the most transparent government websites nationally presented the award. DPS announces their budget details on the districts website. Aiming to show transparency, the Fiscal Year Approved Budget is available for the public to view, as are the following budget areas: Personnel Expenditures, Current Opening Expenditures, Current Bargaining Agreements, Employer Sponsored Health Care Plans, Audited financial statements, Employee Compensation Information, District Paid Associate Dues, and District Paid Lobbying Costs.

Discussion and evidence supplied is seen at a high ranking level.

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

10

5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Documented as evidence the Governor, the Michigan Department of Education, and the Detroit Public Schools have supported the establishment of personalized learning through collaboration, networking, removing barriers, and established partnerships. In addressing the autonomy level that they have, it remains unclear just how much that autonomy is. This section is rated at the medium level.

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

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that the process of information shared with all stakeholders is genuine, positive, and meaningful. Documentation of special meetings held to inform participants of the content of the DRAFT proposal led to modifications that were made. Evidence of direct involvement at the highest levels of the school organization, parents and students have all contributed generously to this effort through the various meetings that were held. Evidence of letters written on behalf of the Detroit Advantage initiative have been provided. These letters are reflective of the stakeholders support, holding the promise of greatly improving teaching and learning in the Detroit Public Schools (DPS).

Clearer details on the specific modifications that were addressed as a result of input from the various committees would help to give a clearer picture of what went into this process. This section falls within the high range.

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

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's high-quality plan for analysis of the current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the applicant's proposal, includes the identification of the needs and gaps that the plan will address.

DPS states their awareness of student performance levels not being where they should be. Documentation reflects that 40 out of 130 schools were identified as Persistently Low Achieving in 2011. There is evidence of a plan, which addressed the implementation of personalized learning. Groups have met to review the needs of the district. Analysis of the needs and gaps are evidenced in the charts provided within this proposal.

Clarification is found lacking when stating reasons why the 40 out of 130 schools persistently remain in the lower achieving range. Plans for addressing and correcting this persistency were found lacking placing this section in the middle range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. participating students will pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards to achieve their goals.</p> <p>An aggressive plan is discussed and is now in place at various grade levels, addressing specific areas in each of the targeted schools. The applicant has included in their high-quality plan a Design Team to addressing the following specific areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An approach to implement instructional strategies for all participating students is addressed and evidence provided, Parents, educators and students understand what they are learning • Learning and development goals have direct links to college-career-ready standards • Students are involved in deep learning experiences; students have access and exposure to diverse cultures • Students master critical academic content and development of skills and traits • Personalize sequence of instructional content, and students having access to a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments. <p>There is discussion on the ongoing feedback for students, educators and parents. The district holds a clear goal that all grade levels (k-12) every student will graduate and advance to college or career ready focus, thus closing the achievement gap. The information provided along with the evidence places this section within the higher range.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant validates by the usage of a professional development plan, which is to be headed by the Office of Professional Development. The district has a plan to achieve their vision of becoming a rapidly improving urban school district with teachers' and school leaders. Key areas that DPS will focus on are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication at all levels • Expectations set for teachers • Expectations set for School Leaders • Evaluation of professional practice <p>What is not evident is how will those in the office of professional development gain from their training.</p> <p>Plan reflected within the overall design shows that when teachers' and school leaders are well prepared the following areas would fall into place successfully</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready • Plan to include an approach to implement instructional strategies • Participating students pursuing a rigorous course of study • Acceleration of learning through support of his/her needs • The capacity to support progress towards meeting college and career ready standards <p>The range given to this section falls within the higher portion.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is evidence that the central office organizational plans will carry out the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote support services to teachers and students by providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners 		

- Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery
- Target school principals will hold autonomy to make decisions related to roles and responsibilities of staff and the school calendar, school budgets; services to provide to a diverse student body; and relationship with the school community

What is unclear is evidence of the goals, timeline and activities that will provide the guidance of how the district plans to carry out this plan. Additional clarity is needed in selection criteria of schools to be served therefore, the applicant scores in the medium range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant in their high-quality plan will support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provides every student and educator with the support and resources when needed.</p> <p>The applicant addresses in their high-quality plan to focus in the following areas to ensure that all students, parents, educators have access to necessary tools, learning resources both in and out of school. They will see that students, parents and educators have appropriate levels of technical support, and that educators have access to the use of technology systems and use of data in other electronic format to aid in their instruction. Lastly they will work towards having the LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's high-quality plan reflects strategies for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback. The strategy also addresses a strategy for implementing a rigorous and continuous improvement process, as well as a plan to monitor, measure and publicly share information.</p> <p>Evidence of an Improvement Life Cycle promoted by the Michigan Department will be used reflecting continuous improvement. This process offers stakeholders with a foundation to address school and district improvement and promote student achievement. Clarity is found to be lacking in the details of the steps that need to be taken within the Improvement Life Cycle, which is to be put into effect. Therefore, the applicant scores medium-high on this criteria because of having a high-quality approach to continuously improvement to its plan, the public sharing of information, adopting the Improvement Life Cycle promoted by the Michigan Department.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's high-quality plan may require adjustments and revisions during the implementation period. It also holds a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan with ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders, adding strength to the overall plan.</p> <p>Technology usage is mentioned as yet another vehicle in communication. It is not clear as to the importance that technology will play in the overall communication plan. It is also unclear as to how changes and modifications will be handled. This is seen in the medium range.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's high-quality plan has a clear and high-quality approach, which actively engages internal and external stakeholders, which is critical to improving and sustaining district and school improvements. The applicant also recognizes the ongoing</p>		

importance of communication and engagement and also seeks to build on and sustain existing resources.

The applicant has also identified 17 performance measures to be carried out. The measures breakdown reflect (3) Pre K-3; (5) 4-8; (7) 9-12; and (2) All.

- (a) Its rationale for selecting that measure are based on the applicant's applicable population.
- (b) Each of the measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information tailored to its proposed plan. Adjustments and modifications will occur when needed.
- (c) The measure over time will serve as a gauge to inform both student, parent and educator the progress that is being made, and where added work needs to take place.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Evidence of a comprehensive Detroit Advantage evaluation will be implemented from the onset of the reform initiative. Types of data to be collected and evaluated will include demographic data; perception data; student learning data; and school process data. The plan calls for an external evaluator to be hired that will assist in the evaluation of the program. He/she will work closely with the director of the project and have ongoing evaluations conducted which will serve as a vehicle to

- Observe what changes need to be made
- Evaluate district funded activities that employ technology
- Evaluate more productive use of time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology

Stakeholders will have a year-by-year measurement and a cumulative description of accomplishments achieved as well as setbacks. Data will also be collected to assess the effects of the project's reforms, academic activities and interventions, as well as the impact of technology and professional development on teaching and learning (outcome indicators).

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: A detailed budget including a narrative identifies all funds that will support the project. The budget also reflects funds from other sources to give added support to the project. Funds to be used for one-time investments, ongoing operational costs, and those incurred during and after the grant period are clearly identified in the budget narrative, as well as in the budget plan.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Evidence of sustainability throughout the applicants proposed plan is evident both in the descriptions as well as in the budget. The budget plan clearly demonstrates support from outside agencies and is reflected in the budget summary. What remains unclear is what type of budget might exist after the life of the grant that would demonstrate ongoing services.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: There is clear evidence throughout the proposed plan of the integration of services to be provided to students and parents. Integration of private and public funds to help support the project, helping to lay the foundation of stability. Evidence that the following topics were clearly described within the content of the project plan: Description of the coherent and sustainable partnerships formed with public and private		

organizations; Description of how partnerships would track the selected indicators that measure each result; the use of data to improve results; Development of a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students, and a description of how the partnership integrate education and other services. Although the above is clearly addressed in the project plan, there was no Competitive Preference Priority statement addressed separately by the applicant, rather reflected throughout the proposal.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant comprehensively addressed how it plans to build on the core educational assurances to create learning environments that are designed to improve learning and teaching through personalized strategies addressing the student’s needs therefore advancing student achievement and closing the gaps.

The focus on college- and career ready standards will be reflected from Pre K – 12th grade and will overall address each of the following areas.

- Boost accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning
- Meet the academic needs of each student
- Increase the effectiveness of educators
- Expand student access to the most effective educators
- Decrease achievement gaps across student groups
- Increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and career

Students will be exposed to highly effective teachers who themselves will be participating in professional development sessions to help them re-tool as they learn new strategies and technology applications.

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