



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0506MI-1 for Southfield Public School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The expressed intent of the SPS is to expand existing programs from selected schools to all schools and institute new programs identified as necessary to complete the support system. It proposes to accomplish this by means of what it terms "The Comprehensive College Support System". The CCSS is built on three pillars that rely on 10 strategies to implement. The pillars, address the following topics or focus: curriculum and standards, assessments, and support services. Ten strategies are proposed to support the pillars. The Program will be supported in part by partnerships with the College Board, Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID), and Wayne State University's College of Education. Although the strategies are described in minimum detail and identify some activities, instruments and processes, they are the strongest presentation of an otherwise unconvincing proposal.</p> <p>Although the plan envisions what can be considered an ambitious program in relation to past initiatives, espouses reasonable goals and objectives, and presents a coherent framework in terms of its pillar and strategies, its glaring weakness is that it offers only a minimum of detailed evidence throughout to convince this reviewer that it has thoroughly considered and planned for the how, what, why, when, where, and by whom these strategies will be undertaken, supported, evaluated, and ultimately achieved.</p> <p>The low score reflects the assessment that this plan, although intended to address a real and compelling need, ultimately is not achievable as proposed.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Participating schools, their demographics, and their appropriateness for RtT-D are provided. Of interest is that participation students (100% of the students in the district) are classified as high-need.</p> <p>What is not evident, due to the sparseness of evidence presented, is that the LEA's approach to implementing the proposal will support these entities and its vision for reform. Hence the mid-range score.</p> | | |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The conditions that contribute to the need for a high-quality plan for reform are compelling, (e.g., high unemployment, decrease in student enrollment, and increase in student mobility).</p> <p>Noted, however, is that the Michigan Educational Assessment Tests administered at grades 3-8 in reading and mathematics and grade 8 in science, show scores typically are in the range from 70% to 90% of students scoring proficiently, student achievement as measured by state tests declines at the high school level. The district's graduation rate is approximately 87% as reported by the State of Michigan. At the time of graduation, Southfield's class of 2011 indicated that they planned to enroll in a four year college (65.5%), attend two-year colleges (21%) and attend business/trade schools (2.5%). Eleven percent of the students stated no future plans.</p> <p>To better prepare students for the rigors of college and to encourage them to attend, Southfield schools have provided an array of Advanced Placement (AP) courses for students. Southfield's two comprehensive high schools had a total of 465 AP course enrollments in 2009 and 547 enrollments in 2010. Passing scores of 3 and above were attained on 40.8% of the tests taken. Increasing participation and achievement in AP courses will, it is anticipated, improve these statistics.</p> | | |

Plans for activities, timelines, deliverables, and leadership to accomplish this are provided, but it is difficult to determine their credibility as being "high-quality" due to a scarcity of specific details such as the how, what, why, when, where, and by whom these strategies will be undertaken, supported, evaluated, and ultimately achieved.. A midrange score is therefore appropriate for this criterion.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 3 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

At the high school level, the district's graduation rate is approximately 87%. At the time of graduation, Southfield's class of 2011 data indicated that 65.5% planned to enroll in a four year college (attend two-year colleges (21%) and attend business/trade schools (2.5%). Eleven percent of the students stated no future plans. The goal of Pillar #3 of the plan is to improve these outcomes. The strategies proposed to do so are described, however details as to how those strategies will be implemented are vague. The district's projected goals for a 100% graduation rate by the program's end is unrealistic.

The SPS Board of Education believes that the mission of the District is being accomplished when there is valid evidence that its educational programs are making it possible for students to achieve one or more educational outcomes, commensurate with their ability and potential. Although it does not discuss how it plans to achieve these outcomes, it does provide targeted outcomes through SY 2016-17 that appear reasonable and achievable under a high-quality plan evidence of which, however, is not evident.

The district achievement gap figures show a 20% difference between the socially economically disadvantaged students and special education students. It may be assumed that the cause for the Gap is because SPED students may not have understood or not been adequately supported in how to receive and process the related instruction.

This reviewer agrees with the district that a major step towards addressing this gap is to provide the quality of professional development that will prepare teachers to differentiate their classroom instruction, have deepening understanding of the skills they are teaching, and a better model for sharing the information with students and parents. It is encouraging that the plan calls for this. it is questionable, however, given the scarcity of supporting evidence, whether most will be achieved.

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 | 2 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Although SPS reports a clear track record of success that "can be demonstrated by the following data and information," it provides no detailed, categorized data beyond some total grade performance ratings to support its claim. As an example of 'information', the following illustrates its weakness as evidence: "Achievement data of the examination high school and middle school STEM students indicate that these students have made significant achievement gains over the past two years particularly in the area of English Language Arts. Overall, state assessment scores for the district's grades 3-8 students show significant gains."

Also, there is no significant material that indicates that student performance is available to students, educator), and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. The low score awarded this criterion reflects these comments.

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district does not make the information specified easily available. Rather, each year, the State Center for Educational Performance Information (CEPI), prepares annual comprehensive financial data that is then published by the SDE. The state information contains the district's web address where financial data consisting of accounting charts of accounts the SDE required financial data is posted. The district also include a link on its websites to the website where the State Department of Education posts this financial information, none of which includes the detail called for in this criterion.</p> <p>This is a classic example of information being "available" but for the most part, not being easily accessible to all but the system literate.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district verifies its autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal and includes attachments of supporting evidence. Lacking, however, are examples of the district having demonstrated evidence of applying these components to conditions proposed in the plan. Also unclear is how, when and by whom these conditions will be carried out.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points) | 10 | 0 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no conclusive indication of meaningful involvement of stakeholders in the development of the proposal. Specifically, it is not clear whether the district's strategic plan committee which consists of teachers, local school principals, district administrators, support staff, parents, students and community members, members from Wayne State University College of Education and College Springboard had input prior to the grant's development.</p> <p>There is no letter of support or indication of involvement included from a collective bargaining representative. Nor is there any indication of support from 70% of teachers. Also, no letters of support, other than one from a state representative, are in the application.</p> <p>This criterion is not addressed.</p> | | |
| (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
| <p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Two high-quality plan elements, activities and deliverables, are addressed in terms of the assessment of the LEA's priority needs of students. Activities consisted of the district acquiring four types of data to analyze and determine how to address closing achievement gaps. It looked at data in the sub groups but paid special attention to the achievement of special education students and economically disadvantaged students. Results indicated that students needed additional support in ELA and mathematics. The analysis also indicated that the instructional practices for teachers in grades k-8 needed to be improved and differentiated. Both these results of data analysis are proposed as strategies in the proposal.</p> <p>No other aspect of the plan meets the high-quality designation beyond this level.</p> | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 4 |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan, which outlines 11 components intended to engage and empower all learners, in particular high-need students, touches upon being of high-quality by having a goal to personalize the learning environment and support individual academic and career interests as specified in the criterion. In addition, the plan outlines activities by teachers creating instructional strategies specifically designed to enhance and support personalized instruction for all students. Teachers will use individualized learning plans and progress reports to monitor and gage student progress. Teachers will participate in professional development to personalize instruction so that all students can be on a path towards college and career-ready standards and meet college and career-ready graduation requirements. However, there is not enough detail or evidence (e.g., personalized learning opportunities and targeted teacher professional development) to assure creditability to the plan's chances of success of achieving the elements of this criterion.</p> | | |
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 5 |
| <p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>As a plan for the professional development of teachers, this section contains all the elements of a high-quality plan. Although not completely aligned with the components of the criterion, it is based on the laudable goal (implied, not expressed) to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students.</p> <p>The plan will provide content research supports as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> critical elements for ensuring meaningful professional development for teachers: classroom-based curriculum and instructional methods, teacher research practices and application, new teacher induction and mentoring, and professional learning communities. <p>Beginning in the 2012-2013 school year, all teachers will participate in the following training modules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding by Design Differentiated Instruction National Board Certification Training and Assessment Take One Series <p>Activities and timelines for delivering this content, the deliverables they will produce, and the leadership and resources to activate and support it are presented in a creditable fashion that bodes well for its success.</p> <p>Two initiatives have been implemented to promote collaboration among staff. The first of these, "The A-Team." is group of administrators, department chairs, counselors, program leaders and the school social worker that meets regularly to create, discuss and decide many of the curricular, operations and management processes related to students and staff. The second initiative is the Town Hall Meetings. These meetings allow administrators and counselors to share information on grades, attendance, appropriate behavior and goals, and for staff to collaborate on problems, solutions, and successes.</p> <p>Other elements of the criterion, however, are not addressed. Enough strong features are included here to warrant a score of medium.</p> | | |

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)



| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15 | 0 |
| (D)(1) Reviewer Comments: There is no evidence that SPS has practices, policies or rules that facilitate personalized learning within a purposeful or high-quality plan. | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| (D)(2) Reviewer Comments: SPS states that a modern and up-to-date infrastructure is in place, meeting all current fire, safety and handicap standards. They also state that a modern instructional and administrative technology system is in place, and that every classroom in the district is linked to the world via video and data transmissions. The district provides one computer for every three students. Additionally, all classrooms and labs are well stocked with up-to-date materials and equipment. There is little information, however, to document this, to indicate parent access or support, and to describe the purpose and extent of its use, especially in terms of supporting personalized learning, as specified in the criterion. The lack of specificity and supporting evidence necessitates a low score. | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 0 |
| (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The District's plan to conduct a rigorous and continuous improvement process is basically a <i>plan to plan</i> . That is, their plan is to convene a team to meet on a monthly basis to determine how the program will be implemented. A timeline will be developed and a decision will be made as to where meetings will be held. The district believes that all of its stakeholders must participate in the process.. The plan is to involve stakeholders by presenting the plan at the annual Title I meeting, Boards of Education meetings, local school parent-teacher meetings, and PTO meetings. Parents will also be asked to complete a survey of some sort to provide feedback on the planning and implementation of the RttT-D. No credit is warranted for this <i>plan to plan</i> . | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Ongoing communication and engagement will be maintained through SIP-Team meetings, public announcements in local newspapers, updates at the district's school board meetings. Information about the implementation of the RTT initiative will also be posted on the district's website as well as each of the participating school's websites. SPS TV 16 broadcasts school programs 54 hours of each week and has a continually updated bulletin board featuring news, announcements, student's accomplishments and calendar of events. The superintendent's office provides information on the district. The school district publishes an annual report and each school complies with Public Act 25 in publishing a local school annual report. Although this criterion is met, it is should be noted that availability of information and its actual access are separate concepts. Parents, for example, may not have access or receive the support needed to engage in the communication. | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
| (E)(3) Reviewer Comments: Six performance measures are listed.; 12 to 14 are required. Not addressed at all are their rationales, purpose, and how their progress will assessed over time. | | |

This criterion has received very little attention from the applicant.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district will contract with an external evaluation service firm to conduct both formative and summative evaluations. Engaging external evaluators are considered good practices because they tend to be more objective than in-house personal.

The formative component will document program implementation strategies and activities. It will provide ongoing information to the project which can be used for program adjustments where necessary. The summative component of the evaluation will provide feedback which allows for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving the intended outcomes.

SPS intends formative questions to look at such issues, for example, as “Were new program components implemented on schedule?” and “What were the facilitators and inhibitors of the implementation?”

Examples of Summative questions are “Was there an increase in the academic achievement of students?” and “ Was there an increase in the percent of students who enrolled in two and four-year colleges?” The planners recognize that the complexity of the project requires the use of various qualitative and quantitative research techniques such as interviews, focus groups, document reviews, classroom observations, and feedback from professional development sessions.

The plan meets the specifications of the criterion.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
| (F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The budget identifies and provides the rationale for all funds that will support the project. Generally, the information is appropriate, however there are two concerns that contribute to a lowered score. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No stipends are listed in the appropriate row, rather they are incorporated in the personnel category (i.e., Table 4-1) • No identification of one-time investments vs. those for ongoing costs, as required by the criterion. | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| (F)(2) Reviewer Comments: A strong indication of local support of the proposed program is that the district’s superintendent and all members of the Board of Education are reported to have committed to identifying the resources and soliciting community support to sustain the program beyond the life of the RttT-D grant. The district also intends to redirect the use of funding such as Title II, Part A and to pursue new federal and state grant opportunities and local foundation awards; and continuing to allocate the district’s human and financial resources and in-kind support from the College Board and other potential private partners. The district will incorporate the project’s purposes, activities, and benefits into its ongoing work by developing an advisory group of key stakeholders including students, parents, staff, partners, and other to work with the Division of Instruction to ensure that the program becomes embedded in the culture of the district and is sustained beyond the grant period. These expressions of commitment and concrete plans bode well for sustainability of the program and warrant a high score. | | |

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 0 |
| Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: There are no components in the proposed plan to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students. | | |

Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---|-------------|---------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Not Met |
| Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not coherently and comprehensively address the standards of absolute priority 1. The plan makes a reasonable and generally justifiable case for its activities and strategies, but often fails to provide convincing, or at times any, evidence to support the probability of activities being properly and effectively implemented. | | |

| | | |
|-------|-----|----|
| Total | 210 | 62 |
|-------|-----|----|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0506MI-2 for Southfield Public School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 3 |
| (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant offers a narrative that explores the idea of new program but does not explain it in a coherent manner. The sole statement that suggests reform is in the first sentence and there after discusses new vision. To establish reform the reviewer needs to understand the current track to see the changes that will be made to address the four core educational areas. There are no data presented to demonstrate previous standings and no plan presented to demonstrate reform. The applicant on several cases uses the term reform. Example... Reform the role of counselors... yet there are no specific details to understand the reform vision. The applicant states they will increase percent of student enrollment in AP courses and increase percent of graduates who enroll in post-secondary institutes, but fail to provide details for this initiative. The reviewer is unclear of the vision for reform and scores this section medium low range score. | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 6 |

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is a clear plan for implementation for the new strategies as explained by the applicant.

There is a clear description posted by the applicant discussing the goals, objectives, and implementation strategies that the applicant desires to execute.

The applicant breaks down 3 pillars to further explain the strategies for implementation.

The applicant does not address or identify the participating schools and the rationale for how those schools were selected. The applicant identifies the various grade levels for each strategy or pillar but doesn't explain the selection process for implementation.

The applicant doesn't list the participating schools or the grant activities that these schools that will be utilizing. The applicant does discuss a few schools within the section but without clearly stating the relationship between the school and the grant the reviewer is vague on the relationship between the grant and the schools. The applicant offers a chart illustrating participating schools for the project but fails to explain the details of the participants.

The applicant missed vital information in this section resulting in a mid-range score from the reviewer.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant doesn't offer a plan to scale up or offer meaningful reform to support the district.

In this section the applicant states the board believes in the mission of the district and also believes it is being accomplished if only one educational outcome is met.

The applicant continues to list educational outcomes but doesn't connect these outcomes to the objective of this section.

The applicant doesn't offer a high quality plan for implementation within this section. The applicant failed to describe timelines, objectives or deliverables to demonstrate a high quality plan.

The applicant doesn't explain how these goals are planned to be achieved nor does the applicant explain any logic or theoretical construct that supports the vision or goals of the district. The reviewer responds with a low scored due to the limited information to directly address this section.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 3 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does offers some data related to grade level performance of students but does not aggregate the data to explore achievement gaps.

The applicant states that the students performed below levels but does not offer a plan for improvement of student performance.

The applicant does state that the plan for improvement will constitute some professional development for teachers but there is no plan discussed by the applicant.

The applicant offers data on graduation rates but they are not broken down in subgroups but illustrated by schools. The goals don't appear to be realistic or achievable as they all state 100% for each goal year with the highest current posted rate achieved is 94%.

The applicant does offer data on summative assessment and growth for grades 3-8. Data doesn't offer enough information to address the criteria in this section. The reviewers score is low do to missing information.

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 | 3 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant doesn't offer clear data to demonstrate the achievement gap between subgroups of students. There is not a clear understanding of what students are being serviced or evaluated to identify the gap. The applicant stated there is a 20% difference in "socially economically disadvantaged students, special education students..." which is still unclear.

There is no isolation of subgroups in order for the reviewer to understand the applicant's vision for improvement in student learning.

The applicant states 3 years ago the district opened an examination HS for high achieving student but no data is available which makes this information unsupported.

The applicant indicated that data was available for review in Table 2 but the reviewer is unable to locate the data in this section. The applicant reported that the 3-8 grade students showed gains but didn't discuss the gains within the narrative.

The applicant discusses the inclusion of STEM in the schools but does not describe an implementation plan for execution nor does the applicant offer any supportive information to suggest achievement or reform.

The applicant states the district is now focusing on "good teaching" but fails to offer evidence that would improve student college enrollment, graduation rates or achievement.

The applicant doesn't offer a clear record of success nor does the applicant demonstrate a track record for improving student learning outcomes or the achievement gap.

The reviewers score is low due to missing information relevant for this section.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
|--|---|---|

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states a financial audit will be conducted annually. Applicant also states that an audit will be conducted 120 days after each school year. The reviewer failed to understand the difference with the two audits stated by the applicant in this section.

The applicant stated that all annual financial audit reports and student accounting procedures reports shall be available to the public.

There is no specific notification of personal salaries, expenditures or other fiscal information that will be released.

The applicant does not distinguish a high level of transparency of investments of fiscal information at the school level.

The applicant didn't offer any detailed information of actual personal information at the school level for instructional staff, or teachers.

The applicant failed to meet the full criteria of this section and consequently received a low score by the reviewer.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|---|----|---|

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant offers limited narration to describe sufficient autonomy of project implementation.

The applicant offers information related to the objectives but fail to explain. The information referenced by the applicant is bylaws and definitions, not demonstrating autonomy.

The applicant provides supported reference information but doesn't offer any explanation.

The applicants presented information doesn't offer personalized learning environments evidence; therefore the reviewer must report a midrange score.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There is no discussion by the applicant about how stakeholders will engage in support of this project.

The applicant explains strategic plan in this section that would incorporated teachers, local principals, administrations, staff, parents and community members. The applicant does identify a partnership with two institutions of higher education but

doesn't articulate the level of engagement that will occur.

There is no evidence of direct engagement or support for this proposal presented by the applicant in this section.

The applicant does have letter of supports for this project. With the limited information presented by the applicant the reviewer offers a mid level score.

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

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant stated that the collection of data came from schools self-assessment, achievement data, perceptions data, and demographic data.

The applicant offers information that the average gap for achievement for grades 6 to 8 is greater than 40%.

The applicant continues to explain the gap indicated from the instruction practices of teachers but doesn't offer a clear plan to address the gap.

The applicant doesn't offer a high quality plan for analysis. The applicant does offer information related to a personalized learning environment and fails to meet the criteria for this section resulting in a low score from the reviewer.

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

| | Available | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 5 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not offer a plan to improve student learning. The applicant states that the plan contains specific components but never explains the plan itself. The applicant then discuss a learning environment teachers will create instructional strategies that are engaging for all students but fail to offer any details to the idea.

The applicant state teachers will utilize strategies to gated personalized instruction that will help all students attain college and career readiness.

The applicant doesn't offer a high quality content with the use of digital learner continue to increase student achievement. There is no information presented about timelines, objectives, activities, goals or deliverables related to the project.

The applicant fails to discuss the engagement of parents or educators related to this project.

The applicant fails to offer any evidence or high quality plan to improve learning or demonstrate rigor academically.

There is not enough information presented by the applicant to address to criteria within this section and consequently receiving a low score by the reviewer.

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

20

5

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The District improvement plan and the local school staff development plan is explained by the applicant.

The applicant stated that the critical element for ensuring the meaningful professional development plan.

The applicant does not offer a plan for teaching and learning that would offer students the increased ability to enter college and be career ready. The applicant submits a narrative the focuses on professional development of teachers. The applicant discusses weekly mandatory meetings to create, discuss and decide curricular, operations and management of staff. Yet, the applicant doesn't offer any information or details to the plan.

The applicant doesn't discuss the participants in this project nor any details about their role.

The applicant does not offer a plan to improve student learning. The applicant states that the plan contains specific components but never explains the plan itself. The applicant then discuss a learning environment teachers will create instructional strategies that are sensing for all students but fail to offer any details to the idea.

The applicant doesn't offer a high quality content with the use of digital learner continue to increase student achievement.

The applicant fails to offer any evidence or high quality plan to improve learning or demonstrate rigor academically. There is not enough information presented by the applicant to address to criteria within this section and consequently receiving a low score by the reviewer.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15 | 3 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant doesn't clearly explain the policies, practices and rules of governance to meet the requirements of this section. There is no quality plan illustrated within the narrative by the applicant.

The applicant doesn't explain the governance structure of the LEA that will be used to govern the project. There is no policy discussion, rule or regulations discussed in this section by the applicant.

The applicant states that every classroom in the district is lined to the "word via video and data transmissions." The reviewer is very unclear as to the relevance of that statement for this section.

The applicant states that the district provides 1 computer per 3 students. But that doesn't offer a demonstration of mastery of standars.

The applicant does not explain any opportunity for students to demonstrate mastery.

The applicant fails to completely address all the criteria needed for this section and therefore receives a low score from the reviewer.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was written apart of the previous section. The applicant didn't separate the subsections to be evaluated to ensure they meet all the requirements of the section criteria.

The applicant doesn't discuss anything about the students related to participation, no discussion of parents or educators and their access to the program.

The applicant doesn't offer any infromation about the access of technology for either students or parents aside from the statement as follows: The district give 1 computer per 3 students. No further details about the use or engagement of these computers followed the statement.

There is no quality plan illustrated within the narrative by the applicant.

The applicant doesn't explain the governance structure of the LEA that will be used to govern the project.

The applicant does not explain any opportunity for students to demonstrate mastery.

The applicant fails to completely address all the criteria needed for this section and therefore receives a low score from the reviewer.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes an improvement plan for the 2012-13 school years to reflect the RTT plan.

The applicant states the district improvement team will meet monthly. The meetings will be to evaluate the programs. The applicant doesn't explain what instrument or process for evaluation will be utilized to accomplish this task.

The applicant does not offer a high quality plan for continuous improvement that includes any timelines, objectives, goals or deliverables that would offer details about this plan.

The applicant discusses performance measure for the district but doesn't clearly explain in detail how the fit the overall dynamics of the project. There is no discussion on who will monitor the plan.

The abstract terminology utilized by the applicant doesn't offer a clear plan of detail improvement process.

The reviewer is only able to offer a lower score due to the limited relevant information for this section.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that ongoing communication and engagement will be maintained through the SIP Team. The applicant continues to offer information about the implementation of the RTT initiative and how it will be posted on the district website.

The narrative by the applicant fails to meet or address any of the criteria. There is not a high quality plan represented by the applicant that would discuss responsible persons, timelines, objectives or goals. No demonstration of holistic communication between participants demonstrated by the applicant.

There is no strategy offered by the applicant to illustrate communication or engagement. The reviewer offers a low score as a result.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that ongoing communication and engagement will be maintained through the SIP Team. The applicant continues to offer information about the implementation of the RTT initiative and how it will be posted on the district website.

The applicant doesn't offer any rationale for the identification of participants.

The applicant fails to provide a plan for implementation.

The narrative by the applicant fails to meet or address any of the criteria. There is not a high quality plan represented by the applicant. No demonstration of holistic communication between participants demonstrated by the applicant.

There is no strategy offered by the applicant to illustrate communication or engagement. The reviewer offers a low score as a result.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
|---|---|---|

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that they will hire an external firm to evaluate the project. The applicant evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the current program specification and guidelines.

The applicant states that both summative components of the evaluation will offer feedback to allow for periodic assessment of progress. The applicant also states that formative questions will also be utilized to evaluate the program as well.

The applicant fails to describe a narrative of a high quality plan to examine effectiveness of investments. There is no information presented in the discussion of funds and it's utilization of fund and how that process will be evaluated. The reviewer offers a low scores as the applicant fail to address all components in this section.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 7 |

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant offers a strong budget application. The budget presented included a breakdown and a narrative by the

applicant.

The applicant offers limited narrative to explain the identification of the required funds to support the project. The applicant explains in detail a clear breakdown of each subcategory of the budgets.

The applicant didn't offer any training allocation for funds. Yet within the project the applicant discussed Professional Development projects for teachers.

The applicant personnel line item for a doesn't offer enough detail. The line item doesn't offer details to the total number of hires for the various positions.

The information presented by the applicant is adequate. The challenge for the reviewer is that the overall application didn't offer enough information to justify the budget presented. The program design was lacking in the overall narrative resulting in a mid level score for this section.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not clearly articulate sustainability for this project at the conclusion of the grant term.

The application appears to have not isolated this subcategory so the content is inferred by the reviewer. The sections for F are combined and evaluation and review will be done collectively related to the criteria for this section.

The applicant does not offer a high quality plan within the narrative as there are not clear objectives or timelines noted by the applicant. The applicant states that there are resources from stakeholders to operate beyond the grant but not clear detail exist.

The applicant states the superintendent and all members of the Board are committed to maintain adequate resources but no specifics are given.

The lack of information for this section justifies the reviewer giving a low score.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant didnt offer any information in this section on competitive preference resulting in no score given by the reviewer.

Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|---------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Not Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Throughout this application the reviewer struggled to isolate the components to meet this priority. The applicant didn't offer a clear comprehensive plan to demonstrate how to build core educational assurances in key areas of learning. The applicant failed to offer adequate details related to the specific of the project.

The applicant offered information about a plan that would be implemented if this grant was received with very little detail of execution and implementation.

Very little information related to the participants, stakeholders, educators, and school district was offered throughout the proposal.

The lack of key evidence by the applicant justifies this application to not meet the Absolute Priority 1.

| | | |
|-------|-----|----|
| Total | 210 | 66 |
|-------|-----|----|

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points) | 15 | 0 |
| Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: no supplemental budget submitted | | |



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0506MI-3 for Southfield Public School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant successfully set forth a comprehensive coherent vision.</p> <p>Evidence of this vision in the plan provided begins with expanding the existing Comprehensive College School System program from selected school to all school in the district. The goal of this program is to build a complete, effective, systemic K-12 process to prepare all district students for enrollment and success in institutions of higher education or career readiness.</p> <p>This program is built on 3 pillars and 10 strategies to support the pillars of high quality curriculum, high quality assessments, and high quality support services. These pillars and strategies generally support the work in the core educational assurance areas that include adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy, building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction, recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals; however the area of turning around lowest achieving schools is not clearly mentioned and there are no strategies listed that specifically address students in those buildings.</p> <p>In light of the strengths and limited weaknesses identified, this application received a high score.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant successfully set forth an approach for implementation which will support high quality LEA and school-level implementation.</p> <p>A chart is included that shows the relevant demographic information of schools participating in grant activities and the number of participating students, number from low-include families, number of high need student and participating educators. All students in the district are eligible to participate. The 10 strategies in the Comprehensive College School System program will be the implementation methods for their plan.</p> | | |

In light of the strengths identified, this application received a high score.

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

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not set forth a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated to meaningful reform.

The plan provided includes data on increasing student mobility within the district. This data supports the need for meaningful reform to support district-wide change initiatives. Student achievement data shows that not all students are performing at the rate expected and by offering district-wide reform projects, more students will meet the goal of preparing all students for enrollment and success in institutions of higher education or career readiness. However, the plan is inadequate in clearly identifying the deliverables and the parties responsible for implementing the activities

In light of the limited strengths and weaknesses identified, this application received a medium score.

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

10

8

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The application successfully sets for ambitious yet achievable goals for improved student outcomes as evidenced by the data included that show baseline proficiency status and expected growth as a result of their Rtt-D plan.

The plan discussed reducing the achievement gap and identifies a 20% difference between 2 of their subgroups-- socially economically disadvantaged and special education students on the Fall 2011 state MEAP test. It is unclear whether the district has identified any additional subgroups. Their plan to address this gap is to provide more quality professional development to prepare teachers to differentiate classroom instruction, deepen their understanding of skills they are teaching and a better model for sharing information with students and parents.

Evidence is included for graduation rates with a baseline included and a goal of 100% for each building which is an ambitious yet achievable goals over 4 years.

The college enrollment data included states that at least 2/3 of the students say they plan to enroll in college and/or trade school. However, there is no data that shows that this many students, in fact, do enroll in post secondary education. Therefore the plan to increase the enrollment in AP courses should help support this goal.

In light of the strengths and limited weakness identified, this application received a high score.

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 | 3 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not demonstrated a clear track record of success. The narrative references a Table 2 that shows state assessment scores for the district in grades 3-8; however this reader could not find this table in the plan provided.

The narrative included in the plan details 3 programs currently being implemented. The Springboard program is an articulated model of rigorous instruction in English language arts and mathematics for all students in grades 6-8. However, there is no performance data relating to this program included in the plan.

GEAR-UP is a summer program designed to serve students showing the greatest potential for growth and who were engaged in skill-based lessons, learning activities, test-taking skill challenges and a technology-based instructional tool that provided them personalized and individualized remediation in their areas of need. However, there is no data to determine the success of this program.

The district has engaged in teacher training in differentiated instruction (DI) at each level to accomplish the following: design grade level appropriate professional development series, material and DI tools; identify 3-5 DI tools or strategies to be implemented district-wide; provide professional development on 3-5 specific instructional strategies for DI teachers and create demonstration teachers to provide shoulder-to-shoulder modeling, coaching and support.

Further, there are no learning outcomes that are specifically mentioned for closing achievements gaps and achieving significant reforms in its persistently lowest achievement schools or low performing schools.

Finally, there is no mention in the plan of making student performance data available to parents, students or educator in ways that inform and improve instruction, participation and services. While the plan discusses several strategies/programs currently being implemented, it is confusing as to which students are targeted in these programs and for which teachers.

In light of these weaknesses and very limited strength identified, this application received a low score.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
|--|---|---|

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant has not demonstrated transparency in LEA processes, practices and investments.
 While the board appears to follow, based on a narrative included in the plan, a set of regulations and timelines relating to financial and pupil accounting records, there is no evidence of how or if the applicant makes data available to the public relating to actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only, actual personnel salaries at the shoo level for teachers only and actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level.
 In light of the absence of the required information, this application received a 0/low score.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
|---|----|---|

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant adequately set forth conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments as evidenced by the inclusion of the district's Bylaws and Policies in addendum 1 and 2 included in the appendix.
 In light of the limited documentation identified, this application received a medium score.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
|---|----|---|

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant identified adequate engagement and support for this application.
 The plan provided included a description of their strategic plan committee, made up of district teachers, principals, administrators, support staff, parents, students, and community members, when they met, and that they reviewed academic readiness for graduating students. It is not clear if the proposal was revised based on their engagement. They further determined that based on achievement data, students still need strengthening in ELA, mathematics, and science. It is difficult to tell from that statement how they drew that conclusion because there is limited and confusing achievement data included in the plan.
 The collective bargaining unit has signed the proposal. However, there is only one letter of support which is a concern if the plan is to be successful.
 In light of the limited documentation, this application received a medium score.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
|--|---|---|

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant does not set for a high quality plan for analysis of the current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic contained within the proposal for identifying the needs and gaps the plan will address.
 The plan provided included a very brief listing of the 4 types of data they use to analyze subgroups. The plan suggests that they look at data in all subgroups but that they pay special attention to the only subgroups mentioned-- special education students and economically disadvantaged students. The data included is inadequate and not clearly

presented to show any link between the current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the reform proposal.

In light of these weaknesses identified, this application received a low score.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 4 |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not set forth 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.</p> <p>The plan provided briefly mentions that the district has an approach to learning that engages and empower all learners, particularly high need students in an age appropriate manner by creating a learning environment in each school and identifies 11 components of the plan. However, there is no information about how they are linked to college and career ready standards, whether students are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest with access to diverse cultures and contexts that motivate and deepen individual learning. In earlier sections of the plan there is a brief mention of students in the Advanced Placement program acquiring the skills of critical thinking and that there is a freshman seminar that includes academic support, study skills, time management and social skills to help in the transition from 8th grade to 9th grade.</p> <p>There is no evidence of strategies that ensure each student has access to a personalized sequence of instruction content nor an adequate description of a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments are made available or digital learning content is available except for AP classrooms and then the description of this opportunity is vague.</p> <p>Further, there is very sparse information relating to ongoing and regular feedback for students and how the district can be sure that students know how to use tools and resources to track and manage their learning.</p> <p>In light of these weaknesses identified, this application received a low score.</p> | | |
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 4 |
| <p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has not set forth 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. While the plan included creates a staff development plan which includes the elements of classroom-based professional development, teacher research groups and professional learning communities, there is no evidence how this plan will support students' academic needs, student learning approaches, or measuring student progress.</p> <p>Further there is no mention of a teacher or principal evaluation system that includes the required components. There is a brief mention that walkthroughs to ensure proper delivery of content and implementation of PD are in place and that the district is considering the review of lesson plans by principals and that there will be a link to student achievement. This is inadequate to meet the criteria in this plan.</p> <p>It is unclear in the plan provided how all participating educators have access to and know how to use tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements because there is no method included that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches--rather there will be three job embedded training modules offered that include Understanding by Design, Differentiated Instruction and National Board Certification Training and Assessment Take One Series. There is no data included that would show how these trainings meet student needs or what type of feedback will be provided as a result of this professional development.</p> <p>There is a mentoring program available that includes new teaching staff to be paired with a peer mentor. The mentor-mentee pairs will have their instructional day scheduled to provide for mutual time for classroom observations, one on one time and time to discuss how differentiated instruction can be used to meet high standards and college and career</p> | | |

readiness for all students.

There is no plan that includes training, policies, tools, data and resources that helps schools leaders assess and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness, to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effect and highly effective teachers and principals.

In light of these weaknesses and limited strengths identified, this application received a low score.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15 | 1 |
| (D)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not provide a high quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator and level of the system with the support and resources they need, when and there they are needed. The plan provided did not have any narrative relating to practices, polices, and rules that facilitate personalized learning. This would include the organization of the central office, providing school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over building level decisions, giving students the opportunity progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery and in multiple comparable ways, not time spent on a topic, and providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In light of these weaknesses identified, this application received a low score. | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 0 |
| (D)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not set forth a high quality plan relating to LEA and school infrastructure. The plan provided inadequate information relating to LEA and school infrastructure. Technical support is briefly mentioned from the standpoint of the infrastructure is modern and up-to-date, meeting all current fire, safety and handicap standards, that a modern instructional and administrative technology is in place, that every classroom is linked via video and data transmissions and the district provides one computer for every three students. This information does not meet the intent of criteria. There is no information ensuring that all participating students, parent, educators and other stakeholders regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools and other learning resources to <i>support the implementation of the applicant's proposal</i> . Nor is there any assurance included that student, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies. Additionally, there is no information in the plan relating to an open data format and the use of interoperable data systems. In light of these weaknesses identified, this application received a low score. | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 1 |
| (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not set forth a high quality plan for a continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during | | |

and after the term of the term of the grant.

In the earlier sections of the application provided, there is a description of the vision of the plan with a goal, 4 objectives and a series of strategies to support the Comprehensive College Support System (CCSS). In this section of the proposal, there are 4 different goals identified and it is unclear which of the goals are being identified for the continuous improvement process. Further, the information included about timely and regular feedback is inadequate will monitor and measure the information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top-District.

In light of these weaknesses identified this application received a low score.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
|--|---|---|

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not put forth a quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement.

While there is information relating to the various opportunities the district has to communicate with stakeholders, there are no strategies identified as to how each of these communication opportunities will share data about the RTT-D plan.

In light of this weaknesses identified, this application received a low score.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
|--|---|---|

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan was not of high quality and did not set forth achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures.

While this plan does call for all students to participate, there is no attempt to identify any subgroups in the district. There is a chart included in the application to support the response to the performance measures in the applicant's narrative. However, there is insufficient information included in the narrative. It is lacking a rationale for selecting that measure, there is no explanation of how the measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative information tailored to the proposed plan regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. In addition there is no plan about how the district will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

In light of the weaknesses identified, this application received a low score.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
|---|---|---|

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not put forth a quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the investments.

While there is a brief but inadequate narrative included in the application this narrative does not address any of the goals of the plan, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties relating to such an evaluation. Nor does it address anything about plans related to working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of schedules and structures.

In light of these weaknesses identified, this application received a low score.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
|--|-----------|-------|

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|---|----|---|

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant set forth a plan for the overall budget which is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal.

The budget includes a description of all of the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal. It also includes funds that will come from other sources. However, it does not identify the funds that will be

used for one-time investments with a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

In light of these weaknesses and the limited strengths identified, this application received a medium score.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not set forth a high quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.

The plan provided includes a narrative that describes that the applicant has the resources and support from stakeholders to operate the projects beyond the length of the grant and it briefly describes where part of the money might come from. However, the plan does not incorporate any of the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties that would be involved to support a quality plan.

In light of these weaknesses and limited strength, this application received a low score.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This application does not include the optional competitive preference priority.

Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|---------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Not Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not meet absolute priority 1, personalized learning environments.

While the applicant set forth a comprehensive vision, implementation plan and ambitious yet achievable goals, the plan does not coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

Further, the plan does not describe how they will accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student. There is no information included on how they will increase the effectiveness of educators or expand student access to the most effective educators.

There is some information about achievement gaps across student groups but sub groups are not included or defined. Graduation rates are projected to increase however there is no clear narrative at whether the students increased graduation rates will prepare them to be prepared for college and careers.

In light of the weaknesses and limited strengths identified, this application has not met Absolute Priority 1.

| | | |
|-------|-----|----|
| Total | 210 | 70 |
|-------|-----|----|

