



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0021MN-1 for Main Street School of Performing Arts

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>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium proposes a vision of charter school reform that creates a successful model for charter school consortia across the state. However, it is not clear if the articulated vision includes a comprehensive reform model that encompasses the four core areas. Instead, the consortium proposes a “Learning without Limits” environment, or a collaborative environment between the member schools allowing them to connect students through technology, thus expanding academic and social opportunities. This vision is vaguely articulated in the consortium’s proposed plan. For example, MSSPAC identified new programs, technology connections, effective small group models, and narrowed achievement gaps as priorities that relate to the four educational core areas. However, it is unclear how these new programs relate to the four educational core areas. Also, the consortium did not clearly articulate how it would accelerate student achievement or increase equity through the personalized learning environment. Likewise, no specific description is provided to determine what the personalized experiences would look like for students and teachers. Therefore, the district did not clearly set forth a comprehensive reform vision that articulates a relationship with all four core areas, nor did it explicitly describe how it would accelerate student achievement in a personalized learning environment.</p> <p>Overall, this places MSSPAC in the upper low range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium's approach to implementation includes liked-minded charter schools as evidenced by the involvement of multiple schools in the consortium. However, it is unclear of what liked-minded charter schools may look like since no detailed description is included in the application. Likewise, the process for selection of schools is described with limited details that reference only an invitation process for charter schools interested in eliminating the achievement gap. However, there is a list of 13 participating schools in the grant activities including 294 educators. Furthermore, the number of high needs populations represent 68% and the number of low-income populations represent 50% of all participating students, thus an indication that MSSPAC’s approach to implementing the reform proposal will have high quality school support for implementation.</p> <p>Overall, this places MSSPAC in the upper middle range. 7</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium's reform proposes limited strategies as an approach to increase graduation rates and college/career readiness among its 13 served charter schools. For example, the consortium proposed to start by identifying the best ways students learn together. However, it is unclear how the consortium will identify the</p>		

best ways for student learning nor does it specify what specific process will be used to accomplish this task other than by establishing goals and developing deliverables to be shared and used within the consortium during the grant period.

Likewise, the proposal only appears to support consortium wide change since it does not address how the reform will be scaled up to support change beyond the participating schools. This is suggested since the proposal focuses on all students in the consortium. Furthermore, it is not clear what specific activities MSSPAC has established as part of its high quality plan to improve student outcomes. In fact, some of the activities on the timeline are dated summer of 2013 and fall of 2013.

Overall, this places MSSPAC in the low middle range.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium reports a target of student learning by incremental growth that varies tremendously from charter school to charter school. In fact, in some cases, schools did not include targets. There is varied evidence that goals are ambitious or achievable for all students and subgroups as noted by the included charts and statewide assessments since all schools reported the data in different formats. Likewise, there is no observable focus on a consistent growth area annually throughout the consortium schools by the end of the grant period. Furthermore, there is no identified expectation to decrease gaps neither in student achievement levels annually nor by the end of the grant period for some charter schools. Given the size of the population the consortium anticipates serving; it is highly unlikely that there are limited gaps in some schools since the consortium noted that they typically serve students who are academically underserved.

In addition, goals for increasing the graduation rate, college enrollment rates, rate of postsecondary degree attainment by the end of the grant period are varied in ranges from charter school to charter school, however the consortium's focus is on advancing the education of students regardless of the expected increase.

Overall, this places MSSPAC in the lower middle 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	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium reports no clear record of success over the past four few years based on charter schools information provided in the proposal. Moreover, many schools in the consortium did not respond to this section. Based on the available responses, 69% of the participating schools self-reported a record of success for at least two or more years, 23% reported making progress towards closing achievement gaps, and only 8% reported graduation and college enrollment rates. For example, one member school reported an increase in math scores by 19.9 % from 2012-2013, a graduation rate increase to 80% from 2012 to 2013, and an increase in the number of students enrolling in college. Another example of success reported was recognition of a school by the Minnesota Department of Education as a Reward School, identifying it as ranking among the top 15 percent of all Title I schools in the state. Thirdly, a district includes a 75% increase in school wide course completion rates over the past four years as success.

Although, 54% of the charter school members of the MSSPAC addressed how data will be made available to stakeholders in ways to inform and improve instruction, it does not clearly state in every case, how data will be made available to teachers and students. For those responding, data would be available for parents through the jump rope and infinity campus system school databases, annual reports, conferences, weekly newsletters and attendance at public board meetings.

Similarly, the consortium did not provide clear evidence of ambitious and significant of reforms used in the schools nor did it provide information on reforms to improve persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools. Therefore, since the consortium did not demonstrate a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement across all of its member schools, MSSPAC scores in the bottom of the middle range.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium provides some evidence that it currently practices transparency in processes, practices and investments. For example, in accordance with the state’s School Transparency Act, personnel salaries and other expenditures by school are made available to the public through school board minutes on school websites. However, a review of minutes attached did not reveal information regarding salaries. Likewise, it is not clear if the personnel salaries are available for school-level instructional and support staff, instructional staff only, and teachers only, or if information is available for non-personnel expenditures.</p> <p>Additionally, the consortium states that information on school-level instructional and support staff expenditures are provided on the MDE electronic reporting system on a need to know basis.</p> <p>Therefore, since it is unclear if expenditures are broken up into regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration and if the consortium practices clear transparency in reporting to the public, this places MSSPAC's score in the upper middle range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium reports limited conditions that have resulted in autonomy under state guidelines to implement its approved grant proposal. For example, MSSPAC states that in order to participate in the consortium membership, a school must be recognized as an LEA in the state. However, there is no evidence to suggest a policy or document from the State allowing autonomy to the consortium in executing the personalized learning environment plan proposed.</p> <p>Overall, this places MSSPAC in the lower low range.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	7
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium reports limited stakeholder involvement in the proposed plan. For example, only 15% of the consortium members documented at least 70% of teachers from participating schools support the proposal.</p> <p>Additionally, letters of support were included from many external stakeholders such as governmental officials, business owners, postsecondary organizations, and parents. Obviously, it is clear from the letters that MSSPAC has support from some stakeholders, but it is unclear if all of the consortium members included letters of support. Therefore, based on limited evidence, it is unclear specifically how students, families, teachers and parents were involved in the proposal development or if the consortium had meaningful stakeholder participation throughout the development of the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, this places MSSPAC in the mid middle range.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium proposes a plan designed to deliver collaborative student learning projects through its <i>Learning without Limits</i> initiatives that will link directly to college and career readiness skills in students. However, the consortium does not provide a clear description of this program. Furthermore, it appears that additional plans exist within the consortium since, according to the proposal, each member school will have an individual plan. These plans are inconsistently reported throughout this section. Therefore, there appears to be a lack of consortium continuity.</p> <p>MSSPAC proposes varied data systems that will be used throughout the consortium to address individual student needs.</p>		

However, it is unclear how the data will be analyzed or how it will be used to revise instruction so that individual student needs can be addressed.

Likewise, professional development approaches are listed for a limited number of member schools as adding to a high quality instructional environment. This model when used appropriately will provide staff with instructional strategies that target specific interventions designed to build content area skills.

The consortium proposes the use of mobile devices such as iPads, smartboards, projectors, and laptops in some member schools as part of the approach to further student's education. The use of technology in the classroom will enhance the student's ability to become college and career ready since the digital content will be aligned with the college and career standards. Likewise, the technology will provide portals for parents to obtain information on their child's academic progress if implemented appropriately and throughout the consortium.

MSSPAC notes the availability of student data both in local and statewide databases for some member schools. When used correctly, the databases should drive instruction on the school, classroom and student levels.

Although, the consortium addressed some areas in this section of the proposal for a limited number of member schools, little evidence of training and support for students could be identified in all member schools, nor how students will master critical content, or the type of accommodations and high quality strategies for high-need students. Similarly, it is not clear if opportunities will exist for exposure to diverse groups or will a variety of high-quality instruction occur in all member schools. Furthermore, the consortium's commitment to personalized learning for all students is unclear, particularly for all member schools.

Finally, a high quality plan including goals, rationales, timelines, responsible parties, and deliverables is clearly proposed for some member schools but not all schools. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools in the consortium.

Overall, the consortium scores in the lower middle range for this area.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium identifies a plan for improving teaching and learning through its *Learning without Limits*' initiatives with a focus on the effective use of technology professional development for all 13 schools in the consortium. For example, the consortium reports that school-based educators will receive adequate and ongoing professional development by connecting through Moodle and Collaborating to develop Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) and align the Minnesota State standards for college and career readiness. However, it appears that other plans exist within the consortium since each member school will have an ILP. These plans are inconsistently reported throughout this section. Thus, there appears to be a lack of consortium continuity.

Additionally, students will have opportunities for use of varied technology learning resources in member schools. For example, students will experience digital learning resources such as mobile devices. The use of technology in the classroom will enhance the student's ability to become college and career ready. According to the proposal, the digital learning content is aligned with the college and career standards.

Although MSSPAC provides some evidence in limited member schools, there is no evidence of educator training to provide frequent feedback to students in all schools.

Some member schools in the consortium will use the teacher and administrator, Q-Comp evaluation system of effectiveness currently in use by the state. The Q-Comp plan uses promotes growth through professional development. By using this model, some member schools will have additional data to assist in improving the depth of its proposed plan. However, the consortium provides little evidence on the components of the Q-Comp evaluation system.

Although professional development will be provided to teachers in some member schools, it is unclear how the training or any training will result in matching student needs with available resources in all member schools. In addition, there is no specific evidence to determine if all schools addressed how the consortium will support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready, nor will frequently measure student progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps, or include a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

Furthermore, a high quality plan including goals, rationales, timelines, responsible parties, and deliverables is clearly proposed for some member schools but not all schools. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools in the consortium.

Finally, based on the limited evidence provided, MSSPAC scores in the lower middle range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	5

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium's proposal and policy are aligned to support implementation of this project. The consortium will hire an administrative manager, finance manager, and technology expert/trainer to provide the necessary structure to adequately support its schools. For instance, the administrative manager will represent all schools and serve as overall responsible party for ensuring implementation of the activities involved in this reform effort. The finance manager will undertake all budgeting, invoicing, payment and reporting processes and the technology expert will be responsible for integration of technology throughout the member schools.

Additionally, consortium schools have varied autonomy to plan for improved student achievement based on the implementation of various reforms at each member school. In other words, the type of reform in each school dictates the level of autonomy in that school. However, most schools appear to have the flexibility to develop calendars, hire personnel, and organize instruction. Likewise, students at some schools but not all schools benefit from similar flexibility such as alternative class options to support learning.

In some cases, member schools either did not answer this section or stated that the information was in another section of the proposal that has not been located. Therefore, it is unclear if all students in all schools have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery or have opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways. Additionally, it is not clear how the consortium will ensure that its practices, policies and rules facilitate learning for all students, including students with disabilities and English learners, since only 38% of the member schools actually responded to this section of the proposal.

Furthermore, a high quality plan including goals, rationales, timelines, responsible parties, and deliverables is clearly proposed for some member schools but not all schools. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools in the consortium.

Overall, this places MSSPAC in the low middle range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium infrastructure demonstrates its record of support for an instructional learning environment throughout the consortium member schools with 75% of the schools describing the proposed high quality plan. However, it is not clear if all students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders for all schools, regardless of income, have access to content, tools, and learning resources outside of the classroom.

Likewise, MSSPAC does not provide evidence of a wide range of technical support to ensure that all stakeholders have appropriate deliverables and support with technology instruction. Again this support varies by member school and is provided in the proposal in limited details for some schools.

Furthermore, MSSPAC member schools all have various software packages that house each data warehouse system and integrate multiple data sources so it is unclear if parents and students are able to use technology to export information in an open data format, or if data systems are interoperable for all member schools in the consortium. Also, it is not clear if plans include additional components to be integrated for all consortium use in the future.

Finally, a high quality plan including goals, rationales, timelines, responsible parties, and deliverables is clearly proposed for

some member schools but not all schools. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools in the consortium.

Overall, this places MSSPAC in the mid middle range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	6
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium approach varies per member school on utilizing multiple data driven instructional models to ensure continuous improvement. A process will be developed as a result of consortium consensus to ensure that all schools operate under a systematic approach that involves data driven instruction and a continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during the grant period and after the grant ends.</p> <p>It is unclear how all of the member schools in the consortium will monitor and measure the quality of its investments under the grant since members schools are proposed various methods for monitoring an evaluation. In some cases, member schools will have to develop an instrument for evaluation.</p> <p>Although the consortium indicates that member schools will report to the public through websites, public meetings, and reports, it is not clear in this section, specifically how all schools will publicly share information on the quality of investments under the grant since only 38% of the schools responded. It was stated in the proposal that other school responses are within the application.</p> <p>Furthermore, a high quality plan including goals, rationales, timelines, responsible parties, and deliverables is clearly proposed for some member schools but not all schools. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools in the consortium.</p> <p>Overall, this places MSSPAC in the low middle range.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium offers a fragmented approach to providing meaningful communication with its stakeholders. It provides evidence in this section of strategies that will be used for communication among member schools through the communications committee's leadership. Although the consortium indicates that some member schools will offer ongoing communication through emails, moodle sites, face-to-face meetings, and public meetings, it is not clear in this section, specifically how all schools will offer ongoing communication with stakeholders since only 38% of the schools responded. It is noted that other school responses are within the application.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant provides no evidence of how it will engage internal and external stakeholders in all member schools across the consortium.</p> <p>Furthermore, a high quality plan including goals, rationales, timelines, responsible parties, and deliverables is clearly proposed for some member schools but not all schools. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools in the consortium.</p> <p>Overall, this places MSSPAC in the lower middle range.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium attempts to show a commitment to implementing a personalized learning environment with varied performance measures by subgroup that reflect each member school's commitment. Likewise, it presents performance measures for some schools that appear to be achievable, as stated.</p> <p>For example, one member school's performance measure states that 98% of non-disabled students will achieve a passing</p>		

score on the graduation writing test prior to graduation by the end of the grant period. This should be achievable since the baseline for this school is 86%.

However, there is little evidence to address the rationale for selecting the measure, how the measure addresses information pertaining to the plan, how it will review and improve the measure, and how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern.

Likewise, most schools include at least 12-14 performance measures but it is unclear if all schools have the suggested number of performance measures. Therefore, based on a lack of ambitious and achievable goals for all schools and all subgroups in the consortium, MSSPAC scores in the upper low range.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium does not include evidence of a plan to evaluate the grant funded program in all member schools. In fact, the consortium indicates that they will devise criteria based on member consensus, to evaluate the effectiveness of their program, thus confirming that no specific plan for evaluating the proposed program is included. Likewise, some member schools are in the strategic planning stage which also confirms the lack of such a plan. Hence, since the consortium is still in the strategic planning stages for evaluating the effectiveness of its investments such as professional development and technology, the criteria that will be used for evaluation has not been defined for all member schools at this time.

Furthermore, a high quality plan including goals, rationales, timelines, responsible parties, and deliverables is clearly proposed for some member schools but not all schools. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools in the consortium.

Overall, MSPAC scores in the upper lower low range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium provides a varied budget that identifies funds available and one that is sufficient to implement the grant.

MSSPAC articulates for some schools in a narrative format, all funds available such as Title I and local funds to support the grant project. However, there is no indication of the availability of local school funds for project implementation for all member schools nor was a total revenue amount provided for all member schools. Equipment and other resources are listed in some narratives; however, the plan does not include a clear description of how these resources will align with the consortium's vision or the vision of each member school. Finally, it is also unclear for some member schools which purchases are for one-time investments and which strategies will ensure long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments since this information was limited to only some of the member schools in the consortium.

Furthermore, a high quality plan including goals, rationales, timelines, responsible parties, and deliverables is clearly proposed for some member schools but not all schools. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools in the consortium.

Overall, this places MSSPAC in the mid middle range.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium does show a commitment for sustainability beyond the grant period for some of its member schools. For example, in one school, the district currently provides financial support for the project through staffing and will continue beyond the grant period. However, it is unclear in all cases how the plan will be sustained beyond the end of the grant period.

Additionally, it is also unclear how the consortium plans to evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments, evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget, and include an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant ends for all member schools in the consortium.

Likewise, MSSPAC does not specifically mention any other entities such as the school board, collaborative partners, advisory boards, and local businesses as potential providers of financial resources in the future. In other words, no potential supporters were identified to provide support currently or beyond the grant period in all cases. Therefore, sustainability based on support from outside supporters beyond the grant period is unclear.

Furthermore, a high quality plan including goals, rationales, timelines, responsible parties, and deliverables is clearly proposed for some member schools but not all schools. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools in the consortium.

Overall, this places MSSPAC in the mid middle range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium proposes to integrate partnerships established by member schools with agencies such as social service providers, businesses, mental health providers, and postsecondary institutions; however, little evidence is included of specific and sustainable partnerships with both private and public organizations by member schools.

The consortium has identified a limited number of population level desired results and performance measures for its member schools with only 38% of the schools reporting. For instance, one member school identified a social/emotional population level desired result and performance measure as increase participation in clubs, intersessions, and summer programming for girls. Another member school identified increased college readiness as an education outcome with an increase in the number of students being college ready as the performance measure.

Although the consortium proposes to address some of the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of students in some member schools, there is no evidence of how these needs will be addressed in all member schools. Nor is there evidence to support that high priority will be given to high-need students in all participating member schools.

Likewise, the consortium does not clearly state how partnerships will address particular student needs and services.

MSSPAC proposes no evidence relating to building capacity for staff. Similarly, no evidence is included to ensure that parents, students, and families have input into the decision making process.

Overall, this places MSSPAC in the lower low range.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Main Street School of Performing Arts Consortium proposes a vision of charter school reform that creates a successful model for charter school consortia across the state. However, it is not clear if the articulated vision includes a comprehensive reform model that encompasses the four core areas. Instead, the consortium proposes a "Learning without

Limits” environment for its students. This vision is vaguely articulated in the consortium’s proposed plan. For example, MSSPAC identified new programs, technology connections, effective small group models, and narrowed achievement gaps as priorities that relate to the four educational core areas. Finally, the consortium did not clearly articulate how it would accelerate student achievement or increase equity through the personalized learning environment. Likewise, no specific description is provided to determine what the personalized experiences would look like for students and teachers.

In addition, goals for increasing the graduation rate, college enrollment rates, rate of postsecondary degree attainment by the end of the grant period are varied in ranges from charter school to charter school, however the consortium’s focus is on advancing the education of students regardless of the expected increase.

Likewise, professional development approaches are listed for a limited number of member schools as adding to a high quality instructional environment. This model when used appropriately will provide limited staff with instructional strategies that target specific interventions designed to create a personalized learning environment in some member schools.

In addition, family engagement approaches are listed for some member schools but the correlation to a high quality instructional environment is unclear.

Similarly, the consortium proposes the use of mobile devices in some member schools as part of the high quality content proposed for students. However, it is unclear of how these resources will create a personalized learning environment for students.

The consortium does not propose for all member schools a clear teacher and administrator evaluator system of effectiveness to be used in this plan.

Finally, there were several sections of the proposal that were unanswered. For example, the consortium did not articulate a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests, describe what the classroom experience would be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning, articulate clearly consortium wide reform or goals for improved student outcomes, or provide evidence of effective evaluation systems for all schools in the consortium.

In many instances, references were made that responses were available in other areas of the application. Likewise, several questions were consolidated into one response thus making it cumbersome to review the proper response. Based on the limited information provided in this proposal and in the absence of evidence of a high quality plan for all member schools, MSSPAC scores in the upper low range.

Total	210	76
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0021MN-2 for Main Street School of Performing Arts

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Section (A)(1) Gave information concerning the MSSPA consortium and listed the four overarching goals of the vision, however, the four core areas do not appear to be part of that vision.

Weaknesses:

- The four goals listed lacked a clear and credible approach. The reviewer has no information regarding what the vision is for accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, equity, etc.
- There was no description of what the classroom experience will be like and no description of students and teachers participating in personalized learning environment.

The section scores in the low category due to so much missing information of a comprehensive and coherent vision for reform. A more robust and detailed narrative was needed to build a compelling argument for the applicant's vision for reform.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Section (A)(2) offers a list of "like minded" charter schools and a brief description of each school.

Strengths:

- The applicant provides a list of schools that will participate in the grant activities.
- The applicant provides the total number of participating students.
- The applicant provides evidence that the proposal meets the criteria of (A)(2)(c) of low-income families, participating students identified as high-need, and participating educators.

Weaknesses:

- The applicant does not provide a description of the process used to select participating schools other than they were "like minded".

This section scored in the high range. The applicant provides required information on schools, though process of selection of schools remain unclear.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

In section (A)(3) the applicant articulates a key goal of increasing college and career readiness and connecting their students by creating a "Learning Without Limits".

The applicant did not offer a convincing argument that the plan for reform would be high quality according to RTT standards.

Weaknesses:

- Additional details on the "monthly collaboration meetings "...over the Internet" to share best practices would be organized, who will participate, etc.
- The applicant states that they MSSPA Consortium will begin by identifying the best ways for students to learn. This would have been much more convincing with specific goals stated.
- The second activity included a staff summer training for 2013--a date that has already passed--and a student training in fall of 2013--a date that has already passed.
- There was no logic model or theory of change.
- Professional development was listed as a goal but no details on what the topics, goals, outcomes of the PD would be.
- There lacked a cohesive vision for outcome goals. The applicant essentially provides that the project will start by "identifying the best ways they think the students will learn...goals and deliverables..." This aspect of the plan lacks compelling argument for award to to a requirement of ambitions and achievable goals and a plan to reach those goals.

The section scores in the low range due to the lack of specific description how reform will be scaled up and create consortium change. A lack of details on how the plan will improve student learning outcomes makes the section unpersuasive in its vision for LEA-wide reform and change. In order to qualify as a high-quality plan according to RTT standards, the applicant needs to provide more evidence of key goals, a timeline, deliverables, and parties responsible for activities.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In section (A)(4) The MSSPA Consortia provides school plans to increase "equality".

Weaknesses:

- Not all schools in the consortium provided information. Various schools offer their key goals (however, not all consortia have clearly articulated ambitious yet achievable annual goals)
- Many goals were not specific enough to make a compelling argument for change. For example, "100% of our students will be college-ready upon graduation," lacks specificity and would be more convincing with growth targets, subject areas, current data and future percentage increments, etc.
- Some goals did not seem to be convincingly ambitious. For example, "To show graphically the differences in MCA-II Math proficiency in Minnesota between black students at MSSPA and white students statewide," does not seem very ambitious. "Narrowing of achievement gap for students of color," does not describe in near enough detail to make a compelling argument.
- Some school information gave a timeline of 2009-2013, giving clear information that this deliverable was not in context with the current application.
- The goals are fragmented and not all LEAs presented information, therefore it is difficult to determine if goals equal or exceed State ESEA targets.
- Goals (a-e) were not available for each participating LEA.

This section scores in the low range due to an overall lack of ambitious yet achievable annual goals. There lacked a compelling argument for likelihood of improved student and learning performance for all subgroups, for each participating LEA in the consortium due to not all schools providing information for this section.

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:

In section (B)(1) the reviewer was often sent to another section (F) to read the narrative. The applicant would have made a more effective argument for the section by including all applicable narrative in the section.

Strengths: Several of the schools provide evidence of efforts to improve student learning outcomes, such as increased assessment scores, and improved teacher-to-student ratios.

Weaknesses:

- Lack of descriptions of increasing equity in learning and teaching.
- Addressing "increased math interventions" yet not naming a specific intervention as a consortium goal.
- Addressing "closing the gap" for a student group, but not giving percentage-based incremental goals year to year.
- "Growth" listed as a strength, but no numerical evidence given or vague language given, such as a "blip" of a decline.
- A "most effective" internal measure of success being course completion without any data to support grade level bands, or valid and reliable means of measuring success.
- Lack of charts or graphs of student data.
- Lack of data showing the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement from all consortia schools.
- It is unclear how each of the 13 schools provides student performance data and make it available to students, educators, and parents.
- One of the schools' data project was highlighted as "the most costly of the five projects we are proposing under RTT", however it was unclear if the applicant meant that this was the lowest performing/achieving school?
- The applicant lists activities for MNOHS "...will inventory all existing internal and external student data resources to determine what else we want to know and where to find it." This type of activity does not build confidence that the LEA has capacities for data-confidence in accuracy and capacities for dissemination to students, educators, and parents.
- In several segments of this section, the applicant alluded to "...revise and change standards, classes offered, and graduation requirements to help with graduation rates, achievement gaps..." etc., which lacks enough clarity to determine exactly what the ambitious and achievable goals are.

This section scores in the low range due to the lack of compelling details to make the argument that consortia schools are advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. A template that would have been the same for all consortia schools would have provided a stronger argument for demonstrated school reforms. Some schools presented a timeline and deliverables for the future without detailing past performance for the last four years. Many aspects of this section were too vague to make determinations **in what ways** reform will happen and how it will be measured.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In section (B)(2), the applicant references the Minnesota Department of Education Electronic Data Reporting System by those with "proper permission".

Strengths: The Minnesota Department of Education provides tools on its website to give parents and community members information on the financial standing of each public school and district in the state.

Weaknesses:

- The LEA's do not detail a high level of transparency by making public the requirements of this section.
- The words "by those with proper permission" indicates a lack of transparency in expenditures for all key stakeholders.
- The applicant would have made a more convincing argument for LEA transparency by providing the information required for this section rather than directing the reviewer to each of the 13 consortium schools' websites.

This section scores in the low range due to the lack of evidence of a high level of transparency in financial reporting of the consortium LEAs and a lack of description of the extent to which each LEA makes the information requested available. No details on personnel salaries or other expenditures was included for review.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Section (B)(3) was straightforward in describing how they are members of the consortium.

Strengths: MSSPA Consortium schools have all gone through the accreditation process and reauthorization as outlined in the Minnesota Statute 124D.10-Charter Schools.

Weaknesses:

- In "Activities to be undertaken", the applicant states that Charter schools need to have an authorizer and reauthorization every 1-5 years for a charter school to continue to operate and educate students.
- The applicant does not make a compelling argument that the state, legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements are in place to provide the applicant with the autonomy to implement personalized learning environments.
- The applicant does not offer sample or other documents of reauthorization to strengthen the argument for confidence in reauthorization or a consistent time frame across the schools in the consortium that all participating schools would remain authorized simultaneously, for example, "... in FY 2014-16 all participating schools will be simultaneously authorized with two schools competing for reauthorization in 2016-17" or other indicator of simultaneous ability to participate in the consortium.

This section scores in the medium range due to the fact that the applicant does not make clear if the 13 LEA schools in the consortia are able to carry out the timeline of the grant due to contract renewals. It is not clear if each consortium member school will be renewed each year of the grant.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	7
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The extent of meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal is crucial for success of the project.

Strengths: Various schools in the consortium offered narrative that indicated 70% of support from staff members towards

the plan.

Weaknesses:

- It was unclear how the teachers might have been involved in the proposal development.
- It was unclear how families, students, and principals in participating schools were engaged in proposal development.
- The full membership of the consortium was not represented in key stakeholders' letters.

This section scores in the middle range due to a lack of compelling evidence that students, families, and principals were engaged in meaningful development, feedback,

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	5
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>This section of the application indicated a priority of delivering collaborative student learning projects in a "Learning Without Limits" initiative. This would be an effort to increase students' exposure to technology and be a coordinated effort between all schools. There were problems throughout this section due to a lack of evidence that the plan was high-quality according to RTT standards.</p> <p>Strengths: Several of the LEA's provide current practices and key goals, however, it remains unclear how current practices were intended to align with aspects of this section of the application.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there was to be a united collaboration coordinated between all schools, it was unclear why the consortium didn't have the same key goals. • Selection criteria for subpoints a, b(i-iii), and c were addressed ineffectively. Some sort of template that was consistent throughout the LEA's or a consistent consortium template would have provided more clear and targeted evidence. • Timelines were often listed as "ongoing" without particular details of benchmarks. • Approaches to learning did not appear to be coordinated, rather they were distinct from one another, and willingness and infrastructure for collaboration seemed weak. • Each LEA seemed to have a different plan for addressing college- and career-readiness, and some LEA's were vague in how they would proceed towards preparing students for college-and career-readiness. • Many of the LEA's efforts were duplicated, rather than cooperatively utilized, for example, if an RTI specialist is hired for one LEA, why couldn't they be utilized by the others? If this is the plan, it was unclear. Another example is a school stating it is utilizing funds for the "latest technology" but also textbooks. If a school is hoping to utilize the "latest technology" it would seem necessary to include eBooks or Flex books on the technology instead of non-tech deliverables like textbooks. • Information such as "purchase laptops for assessments" makes it unclear how laptops might be utilized for other aspects of instruction. • Assurances of minimum feedback such as "frequently updates individual student data" was not listed by each LEA. • It remains unclear how each consortium school will define "personalized learning environments" in a consistent and collaborative way. • There lacks convincing evidence of how personalized learning recommendations based on students' current knowledge and skills, college-and career- ready standards/graduation requirements will be used for decision making consortium-wide. • It remains unclear how accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students will be consistently implemented across member schools. <p>This section scores in the low range due to a lack of clarity of cohesive information consistent across consortium schools. It was difficult to determine how each school of the consortium can collaborate in a measurable way, particularly due to the fact that not all schools provided information for the section. The section was lacking evidence to show that the plan was high-quality according to RTT standards which requires key-goals, a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties across all consortium schools.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Teaching and leading is a vital aspect of the application, particularly in the area of providing personalized learning environments for all students.

Strengths: The applicant indicates that the Learning Without Limits initiative will provide substantial room for growth for many of the teachers.

Weaknesses:

- It was unclear how the consortium will provide consistent and cohesive collaboration when the participating LEAs could not provide a consistent and cohesive template for key goals and deliverables. Inconsistencies in goals and deliverables cast doubt on the ability of the LEAs to move forward in a consistent format for their plan.
- The applicant did not address selection criteria for (a) (i-iii) in a way that provided clarity of purpose and alignment. It remains unclear if Moodle and Collaborate systems can provide an interoperable platform based on the different technology platforms utilized by the LEAs.
- The narrative directed the reviewer towards evidence in section F to make claims for processes, and tools to match student needs, but it was unclear how evidence in section F fulfilled the requirements of section C.
- The applicant indicates that a simultaneous gear-up of connectivity and development of ILPs and alignment to Minnesota State Standards for college and career collaboration is not feasible, that connectivity must come first. However, expansion and scale-up on a timeline (which was not given) is required for implementation and specific approaches and resources available were unclear. This lack of clarity does not allow for sufficient evidence that the plan will prepare students for college-and career-ready standards.
- There is a lack of convincing evidence of mechanisms for school leaders and leadership teams to assess, and take steps to improve individual and collective educator effectiveness consortium-wide.
- Because there is a lack of clear training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress, it is difficult to determine if goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps is possible for each school in the consortium.
- It is unclear how an activities timeline that states, "by grant submission deadline" is achievable in the context of grant award.
- The applicant does not make clear which school's (or combination of) professional development model will be utilized for the consortium. If every school uses a different model, it is not clear how efficacy will be measured.
- The application does not make a compelling argument that teacher evaluation and effectiveness will be consistent across the consortium.
- Several consortium schools are listed as "Q-Comp" schools, however, individual schools may utilize Danielson's Framework for Teaching, and others do not. It is unclear how the consortium will actualize highly effective teachers in a consistent manner, across the consortium.
- It is unclear what the consortium's high-quality plan is for staffing hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, in each of their schools.

This section scores in the low range due to a lack of clear, direct address of each of the section subpoints with compelling evidence from each school. It is difficult to determine if the consortium has the ability to build an infrastructure to match project goals in a consistent approach, across all schools, and an overall lack of a high quality plan with key goals, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible, as defined in the RTT notice.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a consortium governance structure to provide support and services to all participating schools;

Strengths: The organizational chart offers a view of consortium governments.

Weaknesses:

- It remains unclear how the plan will provide school leadership teams with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school level budgets.
- This section lacks convincing evidence of consortium policies that will allow each student the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, and the amount of time spent on a topic, across all consortium schools. There seems to be a lack of consistency in how the LEA's give students the opportunity to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery across all LEAs.
- There remains unconvincing evidence of how LEA schools will not be fractured in their attempts to provide learning resources and instructional practices to all students, including culturally and linguistically diverse students and subgroups across the consortium. This is due to the fact that not all LEA's provide evidence for their LEA practices, policies, and rules.
- There lacks a clarity of consistency across the consortium in how each school supports students with disabilities.
- Some schools utilize paraprofessionals and some do not. It is unclear how a project/program manager will make decisions as to which schools need instructional support for project initiatives and which do not, or if that has been a consideration in the application process.
- One of the LEA's indicates that they will require one of their teachers to be the program manager, while other LEAs are paying for that position. This type of variance of implementation lacks consistency across the consortium.

The section scores in the low range do to the inconsistencies between the narrative and the organizational chart. Also unclear is the mechanism for making a determination of how to ensure fidelity of implementation of the high quality plan, when the consortium lacks capacities for consistent school governance models and methods. If each school is unable to pull together a consistent template of how each school will carry out the extent of a high quality plan, it is difficult to assume that once the project would be awarded, that gap in practices, policies, and rules would be immediately overcome. This section lacked compelling evidence of a high-quality plan according to RTT standards due to the missing evidence from all consortium schools of key outcomes, actions, deliverables, and parties responsible.

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

10

2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, the MSSPA Consortium offers "agreed upon" leadership, but are subject to change.

Weaknesses:

- In the development of the plan, it is unclear as to how the consortium will support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure. For example, "Hiring committee and personnel committee" for oversight lacks specificity of number and qualifications of those in charge of external oversight.
- It is unclear what the number and qualifications of various committee members who will have oversight of the project management.
- The plan indicates that individual consortium schools (not all of the schools) have plans in place to support personalized learning (D)(2)(a-d), however, it remains unclear if each consortium school has a plan or if the plan in place is in any way similar to the other member schools' plans.
- It is unclear how each consortium school that is listed will meet each of the infrastructure supports criteria.
- Several of the consortium schools are "Bring Your Own Device" (BYOD) technology formats and it is unclear how assurance that all students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support, particularly if each student has a different technological platform they are utilizing.
- It remains unclear how each consortium member will allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format, and how that data might cross all technology platforms that may exist in the BYOD schools who are part of the consortium
- It is unclear that parents and key stakeholders will have access to resources both in and out of school.
- The applicant maintains that the server for their shared technology infrastructure will be housed in one school, however, it remains unclear how the schools will utilize interoperable data systems, particularly in the context of different platforms of 1:1 technology in the schools.
- It is suggested by the applicant that consortium schools are currently implementing a variety of infrastructures and processes that could be valuable, however, the budget indicates that vendors and 1:1 technology has already been decided by some schools

This section scores in the low range due to a lack of cohesion in project implementation infrastructure. Also unclear is how the consortium might overcome the diversity of technology platform use across the consortium. This aspect of the consortium infrastructure remains problematic without a clear plan for overcoming the multi-platform, BYOD, technology infrastructure as well as some of the schools planning on technology that may not be compatible with what already exists in other partner schools. Overall the section lacks a high-quality plan according to RTT standards. Some schools had goals, some did not. Some schools had key personnel to carry out activities, but overall there was not a sense of how key outcomes, activities, or deliverables would be carried out on a timeline by participating schools in a unified manner.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, MSSPA Consortium indicates that their plans for continuous improvement may be found "throughout this application, particularly in the budget narratives in section (F).

Strengths: Each school of the consortium represented in this section offers various approaches for plans for continuous improvement. For example, at Twin Cities Academy, the principal, "...is primarily responsible for measuring and monitoring grant progress to goals, following the activities and outputs planned for each program goal."

Weaknesses:

- It is unclear from this narrative section, what specific plan for implementing a rigorous conscious improvement process will be **at the consortium level** other than "consortium committee overseeing the program and fiscal managers for the first 3.5 years."
- In one consortium plan, "The consortium, as well, will be jointly developing evaluation instruments..." leaving a lack of clarity as to how consortium level goals and opportunities will differ from school level goals and opportunities.
- The applicant is unconvincing in the argument that an outside project evaluator can be responsible, "...for each goal, benchmarks, timelines, and deadlines [that] will be developed as well as evaluation instruments." if the evaluator is not specifically on a timeline. The evidence that an evaluator will be contracted "early in the grant period," is not specific enough for a high-quality plan.
- It is unclear what the **consortium level** plan for implementation of rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback, other than "...we anticipate that the evaluator will use stakeholder focus groups, surveys, and direct observation of grant activities to measure progress towards each of the goals."
- The use of an evaluator to fulfill the distinct and differentiated improvement process makes it unclear as to how continuous improvement will occur, and how adjustments and revisions will be carried out throughout consortium schools.
- While some of the consortium schools indicated how they might publicly share information on the quality of RTT investments funded by Race to the Top, it remains unclear how the consortium schools will publicly share information in a consistent and accessible format. Further, access to information by low income families remains unclear.

This section scores in the low range due to the lack of clarity in how the consortium may overcome the individual and site-driven infrastructure for implementation of continuous improvements during and after the term of the grant. Details remain vague how the consortium as a whole might be able to collaborate in a high quality plan that manages to provide a single set of best practices of timely and regular feedback on progress. Overall, the applicant does not make a compelling argument that the consortium is able to provide a high-quality plan according to RTT standards. As stated in the application, "For each goal, benchmarks, timelines and deadlines **will be developed**." This lacks compelling evidence of a high-quality plan but rather one that has yet to be developed.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, the MSSPA consortium provides plans for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

Strengths:

The MSSPA consortium plans to have a communications committee, and this group of people will create updates for the consortium as a whole and to each LEA.

- The consortium will create a website for the connectivity of each of the schools.

Weaknesses:

- The applicant did not make it clear as to the qualifications or conditions for membership on the communication committee or indicate the full function of the committee. The details surrounding communication committee responsibilities remain vague.
- The applicant indicated, "...the ways in which our individual LEAs plan to communicate the measures we are taking to narrow the achievement gap may be found in other narratives throughout the application." This section lacked compelling evidence that the consortium will have a clear and high quality approach to ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.
- Each LEA had a somewhat different approach in its use of a program/project manager at the consortium level. It remains unclear how the consortium level leadership will facilitate ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders in a sequential and high quality method.

This section scores in the low level due to a lack of clarity of the makeup, goals, and objectives of the communications committee. It remains unclear how this group will function to support ongoing communication and engagement, a timeline, benchmarks, and deliverables at the **consortium** level. The applicant does not provide a compelling argument that a high-quality plan up to RTT standards is in place.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, the applicant indicates that the MSSPA consortium, "...respects that each LEA understands their student populations best and should set their own goals surrounding proficiency and college/career readiness."

Strengths:

- One of the LEAs indicates, "...aggressive performance measures" with benchmarks of "64.1% proficiency against state standards, (although it is unclear if this is overall, or in a particular content area) and an 87.76% graduation rate by the end of the grant period..."

Weaknesses:

- The other LEA's featured in this section of the narrative do not make clear what their performance measures will be in direct alignment with applicable populations across the consortium.
- Some LEAs list goals such as: "Performance on student summative assessment," and "Measurement of student growth, and tutoring program results," which make it difficult to determine the number and percentage of participating students by subgroup, and other pertinent requirements of this section of the application.
- The reviewer is directed to sort through the budget narrative in order to discover the performance measures, which makes it unclear how the measures align with the required applicant-proposed performance measures listed in (E)(3).
- There lacks a compelling argument for ambitious, yet achievable performance levels for each consortium LEA.

This section scores in the low range due to the lack of compelling evidence that the applicant will address specific performance measures as required by the application and an unconvincing argument that the consortium is ready to address at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan and one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan. Their lacks convincing evidence that the consortium is prepared to meet each performance measure and applicable population of any aspect of 12 of the 14 required performance levels.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, MSSPA consortium indicates its

Strengths:

The key goal is to enhance students' academic opportunities and increase high school graduation rates and college/career readiness by coordinating student learning projects and collaborative staff development throughout the consortium.

Strengths: The activities include surveying students and teachers to gather baseline data on experience with collaborative learning over the internet compare to comprehensive assessment results. The program will be altered based on results. They will administer a yearly technology survey to assess effectiveness and trends and compare to comprehensive assessment data.

Weaknesses:

- It is difficult to determine the rigor with which the consortium will evaluate district funded activities, such as professional development, with a plan that is vague.
- The applicant does not make a compelling argument with evidence that includes a timeline with benchmarks. There is a heading called, "timeline" and it states, "3.5 years, with research for program development starting in January 2014, and having a smooth running initiative by June 30, 2017" but this phrase does not make it clear what the dates/benchmarks are for rigorous evaluation of each activity of the plan. For example, using "Moodle" is one of the activities of this proposal. It remains unclear how the applicant will rigorously evaluate the efficacy of Moodle software utilization. The application indicates hiring people, buying technology, counselors, etc. It is unclear how each of those activities will be rigorously evaluated because there does not seem to be a high-quality plan to do so.
- The applicant indicates that a "deliverable" includes "...a vital, self-sustaining network of shared learning between our LEAs called "Learning without Limits Initiative" that will increase college and career readiness, however, it remains unclear how the consortium will determine efficacy of the "Learning without Limits Initiative" without measurable outcomes besides surveys.
- Three LEA's offer evidence as to how they will individually monitor project efficacy through varying evaluation measures, however, it remains unclear how the other ten plan to evaluate their consortium-funded activities and how the consortium might evaluate efficacy.

This section scores in the low range due to a lack of compelling evidence that the **consortium level** implementation will be evaluated with a high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans, particularly efficacy of 1:1 technology initiatives with a BYOD approach in some, and a single-platform approach (iPads) in other LEAs. Once again, there are inconsistencies across the consortium on timelines, key goals, activities, deliverables, and responsibilities making it unclear that the consortium has a high-quality plan according to RTT standards.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section was somewhat problematic as each LEA provided a budget that was somewhat different than the others in format and function and it was not always clear which of the expenses could benefit the entire consortium through shared use or strategic planning for virtual meetings, training, or student benefit.

Strengths: The development of "a consortium-wide on-line system for homework help" offers an example of a consortium level cost/benefit.

Weaknesses: The applicant does not meet criteria for (b) in that

- It remains unclear how individual LEA's professional development and personnel might be made available to all members of the consortium, either virtually or in person if within a reasonable proximity.
- Listed on the budget of one LEA is RTI software, if the data system is interoperable, the budget narrative does not make it clear if this could be shared across the consortium.
- A technology coordinator is being hired by an LEA to develop training modules, but it remains unclear if the training modules for teachers can be made available at the consortium level.
- An LEA plans to research BYOD school environments, yet other schools in the consortium have the environments in place. There are no dollar amounts listed in this LEA's plans for BYOD research, thus it is an example of how each LEA is operating separately and autonomously, however, there is no explanation of how the consortium will ensure non-duplication of expenditures and services, and which are at the LEA and which are at the consortium level.

This section of the application scores in the medium range due to the lack of compelling evidence that the consortium budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal. What remains unclear is an articulation of consortium goals being fulfilled by the budget in distinction from the LEA-level needs. Individual LEA budgets lacked clear identification of funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs. The applicant does not make a compelling argument for use of external foundation support or other resources the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from those sources.

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

10

2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, one of the LEA's offer narrative of how they will sustain the project's goals after the term of the grant.

Strengths:

- One of the LEA's, TCA shows sustainability through ongoing PLC's, increased professional and organizational capacities, improved ILP's, and technology purchases that will last 8-10 years.

Weaknesses:

- Only one of the LEA's offers evidence of a sustainability.
- It is unclear how the consortium will continue the project's goals after the term of the grant.
- There lacks persuading evidence that the plan has support from state and local government leaders, financial support, and a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use the data to inform future investments.
- There appears to be no clear plan of how the applicant will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget.
- The applicant does not make a compelling argument for an estimated budget for three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and use of funds.

The section scores in the low range due to a lack of clarity of how the consortium will sustain the project's goals after the term of the grant. The section does not offer compelling evidence of timelines, rationale, and deliverables necessary for a high-quality plan according to RTT standards.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The MSSPA consortium offers various aspects of results, resource alignment, and integrated services:

Strengths: The applicant indicates each LEA desires for students to increase proficiency on standardized tests, increase attendance in school, be connected with family and community supports, and graduate from high school college-and-career ready.

Weaknesses:

- Because the applicant did not directly align evidence with the structure of the application in this section, it was not always clear which sections of the narrative were addressing which aspects of the competitive preference priority section.
- The narrative indicates that through the grant, teachers will be freed up to work more closely with students and families. However, it remains unclear what the teachers duties towards this goal would be.
- Ambitious, yet achievable performance measures, "will be identified by the consortium administrators with input from stakeholders and will include measures such as statewide standardized tests..." indicates a lack of clear and well defined ambitious, yet achievable performance measures.
- Some LEA's offered population-level desired results, yet it remains unclear how particular results were determined and not all LEAs are represented in the supporting tables.
- This section lacks compelling evidence that there is a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students to at least other higher need students and communities in the consortium over time.
- It remains unclear how the consortium would provide integration of services between and among LEAs.

- There lack of compelling evidence that a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results consistently and across all LEAs in the consortium.
- This section seems vague in articulating how parents and families of participating students will over input in decision-making and solutions to improve results over time.
- This section lacks evidence of how the consortium will routinely assess progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems.
- It remains unclear as to why certain performance growth indicators were selected, and once selected, why certain increments or percentages of growth indicators were selected.

This section scores in the low range due to the lack of compelling evidence of how the data provided aligned with the preference priorities. What remains unclear is how the progress will be tracked, whether at the consortium or LEA level, and the gaps in evidence that was provided by all 13 members of the consortium. It was difficult to determine with certainty that all 13 LEAs were participating in each aspect of the application due to there rarely being evidence from each of the 13 LEA's in any section of the application.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The strength of the application is the desire of the charter schools to come together and provide a collaborative approach to joining forces through technology. In different sections, strengths of one LEA or another would come through, only to be diminished or missing altogether in another section. There lacked a clear and consistent format or template that allowed the strengths of the LEA's to provide a united approach to the application criteria.

The applicant does not offer compelling evidence to make the argument that the 13 LEA's can coherently and comprehensively address how they will build on the core assurance areas to create learning environments. It remains unclear how all 13 LEAs can become a consortium that functions in a collaborative way to significantly improve teaching and learning. Various aspects of the application remain unclear, particularly how the LEA's can combine to utilize an interoperable technology model when they have various platforms, BYOD, and 1:1 technology differences. Furthermore, the application does not make clear how LEA's might maximize funds to make the best use of resources, expertise, technology, human capital, and other assets to provide deeper student learning. It remains unclear how student achievement and student learning will be bolstered by meaningful reform, when each of the LEA's has so many different aspects and in some cases, a duplication of assets. The application lacked a compelling argument that the consortium has the capacities to develop a targeted approach to personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators and that are aligned with college-and career-ready standards and graduation requirements as a cohesive group.

Total	210	55
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0021MN-3 for Main Street School of Performing Arts

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 application is from a consortium of charter schools in MN, with the Main Street School of Performing Arts acting as lead LEA. The narrative in this section describes in general the intentions of the consortium, in terms of its proposed outcomes. However, the narrative makes no reference to the four core educational assurances, nor does it reference personalized learning environments. Although the application references accelerated student achievement and reducing the achievement gap, it does not elaborate on how this will be done.</p> <p>This section scores in the low range due to unresponsiveness to the main focus of the question addressed.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium invited interested individual charter schools to participate, although the process of determining who to invite was not fully described. Each member school of the consortium is therefore a participating school. A table is provided that indicates, from each school, the total number of participating students, numbers of high-need students, low-income families, and participating educators. No overall total for the consortium is given, but it appears that the overall total would meet the competition's eligibility requirements.</p> <p>This section scores in the middle range, because it lacks an overall total and a description of selecting participant LEAs.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In this section, the consortium does provide a brief outline for a plan referred to as "Learning without Limits." Its goal is to increase high school graduation rates and college/career readiness through use of technology across the consortium. All of the schools currently use some level of technological instruction, and some of the schools are total on-line schools. No reference is made to the four core assurances, nor to the development of personalized learning environments in the schools.</p> <p>The plan outline does not meet the definition of a high quality plan, nor does it effectively address scale-up or improved student learning outcomes. The plan, as listed in A3, has one key goal, and single sentences regarding activities, rationale, timeline, and responsible parties. Several of the participating LEAs have brief outlines of plans in section A4, yet there is still little relationship between those outlines and the four core assurances or to personalized learning environments.</p> <p>This section scores in the low range, due to limited information on reform and change.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative portion in this section offers individual goals for improved student learning by each of the participating LEAs in the consortium. In some cases, the narratives are presented in an abbreviated form of the elements of a high-quality plan. Other participants refer the reader to the budget and Competitive Priority sections of the application.</p> <p>Tables are also provided to indicate annual goals for improved student outcomes, mostly on a school-by-school basis. In the tables on performance on summative assessments, Blue Sky has set very low performance goals, moving from 8.3% proficient in math in 2012-13 to only 18% proficient in 2017-18. College Prep Elementary has similarly low performance goals for its students. Other schools appear to be moving toward more ambitious goals (e.g., Laura Jeffrey, Cyber Village, Life Prep, Twin Cities).</p> <p>In the tables on reducing the achievement gap, the information is mostly presented school-by-school. Tables do not refer to state targets. The first large table, beginning with Laura Jeffrey Academy, presents the percent decrease in gap per year for each subgroup, mostly in comparison to the performance of White students. This methodology does not allow for the reviewer to determine if the gaps are being decreased by an increase in subgroup performance, or by decrease in White student performance. The Twin Cities tables are the most clear and easy to follow.</p> <p>The tables on graduation rates indicate a wide variety of expectations, ranging from a post-grant expectation of 45% graduated from MNOHS to 100% from New Century Academy and Twin Cities. No explanations are provided as to why some groups are expected to achieve and not others.</p>		

The tables on college enrollment are mostly presented by individual school. Again, there is a wide variation in expectations for percentages of college enrollment, ranging from 40% to 92%, with no reference to state targets or goals.

This section scores in the middle range, because there are such variations in the expectations offered in the tables. It does not appear that participation in the consortium is expected to provide a coherent, unified mindset about ambitious student outcomes.

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
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Summaries of demonstrated success and sharing of performance data are provided by each participant in the consortium in this response. In some cases, these are written as narratives; in others, they are written as abbreviated forms of high-quality plans, which talk about what the LEA will do -- not what it has done.</p> <p>MSSPA has provided a concise summary of its improvement in student achievement, its instructional changes, and its vehicles for sharing student data. For example, the LEA cites specific performance data increases in mathematics, graduation rates, and college enrollment. Since these are single school LEAs, it is inferred that its lowest-achieving school is itself. MSSPA offers specific information about the restructuring of its math and literacy offerings and its restructuring of special education services. Other schools, such as Cyber Village and Laura Jeffrey, make appropriate reference to their status as Reward or Celebratory schools in the MN school ratings system. Laura Jeffrey Academy also provides examples of the ways in which it shares data, including student-led parent conferences and student analysis of data from NWEA assessments. Other LEAs provided little information about sharing of data beyond test score reports.</p> <p>This section scores in the low range, as there is little consistency in the individual responses as to the three main questions asked -- how they improved student outcomes, how they provided significant reforms, and how they make student performance data available in ways that inform and improve practice.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the lead LEA has provided substantial information on its processes for communicating salaries and expenditures, the other LEAs have merely provided their websites. Reviewers are not allowed to look for information outside of the application itself. However, MSSPA appears to have open access to salary schedules for employees, not for actual personnel salaries. The information was not made available related to K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration.</p> <p>This section scores in the low range due to incompleteness of answers.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The response in this section is written as a plan, instead of a narrative indicating evidence of successful conditions and autonomy to implement personalized learning environments. As all participants in the consortium are public charter schools, there is an implied recognition of some autonomy, but no examples are given of such work. No examples were given of successful conditions to implement personalized learning environments.</p> <p>This section scores in the low range, because the response provided no evidence of flexibility or autonomy.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative response indicates that each school received 70% or higher approval/support for the consortium proposal, with two sets of signature sheets provided as evidence. The LEAs have no teacher bargaining units. Life Prep, because of its ongoing Wilder Research case study, was able to offer focus groups for stakeholders prior to the proposal's</p>		

submission. There was no information provided as to how any suggestions or comments from stakeholders were incorporated into the design or revision of the proposal. LEAs with external authorizers, such as Voyageurs Expeditionary School, have made note of the support of their authorizer, Audubon Center of the North Woods.

Several letters of support are attached to the application, including letters from universities, charter authorizers, parents, and community organizations.

This section scores in the middle range, as it does show the required levels of support, and does include letters of support. It is difficult to determine if/how any comments or suggestions from those queried were used in the development or revision of the proposal, because no examples of such use were given.

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>This is a difficult section to score, trying to envision a composite picture of the individual LEA plans. The section calls for a high-quality plan identifying an approach to learning, leading to personalized learning environments and access for all students to college and career-ready standards. While some of the participating LEAs have written their responses in an abbreviated form of a plan, others have not. The individual LEAs do not use a consistent format, so different components are missing in different narratives in this section. The results do not add up to a high-quality plan for the consortium.</p> <p>There is a stronger emphasis on the use of technology as an end in itself, not as merely one vehicle to bring about personalized learning environments. While some of the individual responses make reference to career preparation and orientation, others do not. Not all of the responses address the needs of high-need learners and regular, ongoing feedback. Very little is said about high-quality instructional approaches or content.</p> <p>The Laura Jeffrey Academy provides substantial information about modes of instruction, needs of student learners, use of external resources, and differentiated instruction. It does provide more substantive detail about its key goals and activities. For example, the LJA describes its use of Understanding by Design units of study across the curriculum, and its inclusion of college and career-ready standards. New Century Academy and Twin Cities also provide some descriptive information about their learning goals and methods, such as project-based learning, junior and senior projects, extended classes, modification of instruction and curriculum, diagnostic reading testing, etc.</p> <p>This section scores in the low range, as there is such a wide variety of responses to the question, and only a brief narrative trying to tie them together, without a unifying plan. Little attention was paid to components (a) or (c) of this section.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative outlining the joint efforts of the participant LEAs was helpful in this section, as it did describe the intended goals of teacher learning through the consortium. Although the primary goal was increased use of technology, the narrative did explain that an eventual goal was preparation of teachers to deliver college and career-ready standards. It was a concern to this reviewer that a primary outcome of the grant was described as a secondary goal in the application, which lessens the likelihood of achieving it success. Each individual LEA also provided its goals, either in the form of an abbreviated plan or a narrative.</p> <p>There is inconsistency among the individual responses concerning the required elements of this section, with a few LEAs using some aspects of a high-quality plan, and others not at all. Some responses address aspects of personalized learning environments, approaches to learning, monitoring growth toward standards, use of teacher and administrator evaluation systems, use of leadership teams, and increasing the numbers of students to high quality teachers, but the responses are spotty. Very few examples are given of this work being done currently, or what it will look like in the future.</p> <p>It is difficult to determine how and when the participating LEAs will bring their learning together from their individual efforts. The individual narratives do not constitute a high-quality plan for the consortium.</p> <p>This section scores in the low range, due to the lack of comprehensiveness in the responses. Because of the multiple individual responses, it cannot be said that any of the (a) through (d) components of this section was addressed coherently and adequately.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	3
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall narrative indicates that the consortium will hire a project manager to oversee all consortium planning, and to supervise the activities of each of the individual LEA RTTT program managers. The consortium will also hire a fiscal manager and technology expert/trainer. The consortium has developed a consortium organizational chart to demonstrate that organizational structure. From the chart and the narrative, it appears that the management structure will adequately meet the needs of the consortium work, because little will be done as a consortium.</p> <p>The individual responses do not always address the required elements of this section, such as describing the flexibility and autonomy of school leadership teams, multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate progress, and providing fully accessible resources and practices to all students. For example, Cyber Village Academy does discuss site flexibility and multiple methods of student progress and demonstration of learning, but it does not address fully accessible resources and practices. Life Prep briefly addresses all the required components, as does Twin Cities, but without specific examples.</p> <p>This section scores in the low range due to the general nature of the responses, and lack of a coherent high-quality plan for the consortium. While some key activities were listed, the narrative consistently lacked the other elements of a high-quality plan, such as deliverables, responsible parties, and timeline.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The response in this section is required to be in the form of a high-quality plan, but it is not. A high-quality plan should include goals, strategies, resources, persons responsible, and timelines. Responses from the individual LEAs take the form of an abbreviated plan or are in the form of a narrative. Because some of the schools are online schools and others are face-to-face schools, there is a wide variety in the responses provided in this section, which are not integrated into a consortium level-response.</p> <p>For the most part, the individual responses do provide adequate information on access to tools and learning resources, levels of technical support, and open data formats for the sharing of data. For example, Cyber Academy describes an on-campus computer study center, providing refurbished computers to families with low incomes, and the use of BYOD approvals. Laura Jeffrey Academy provides an excellent model for a response to this section, incorporating rationale, timeline, responsible parties, and deliverables tied to three specific goals for this area. With the online schools, it is difficult to determine what constitutes in-school and out of school access. It does not appear that the individual LEAs or the consortium itself currently is using interoperable data systems.</p> <p>This section scores in the low range, due to the variations in responses and the lack of an interoperable data system.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is required to have a high-quality plan for implementing a continuous improvement process, but none is provided. The overall narrative response in this section indicates that the consortium will have an oversight committee. It will also hire an external evaluator to guide the process for continuous improvement, including the use of stakeholder surveys and focus groups. It appears that the external evaluator will have more responsibility in determining continuous progress than the consortium oversight committee.</p> <p>Individual responses from the LEAs in this section make reference as to how each LEA (of those who responded) will cooperate with consortium requests for information and how each will initiate communication activities during the grant period. For example, Twin Cities Academy discusses its access to a shared Moodle site, and its use of newsletters, website, and school board meetings as means of communication within its LEA. While some LEAs, such as New Century,</p>		

envision a rigorous data collection process, others are more modest in merely describing who will collect the necessary data for the consortium. The responses by the LEAs are inconsistent in their use of the elements of a high-quality plan, with some not using the vehicle at all.

This section scores in the low range, because no overall plan for continuous improvement is provided and individual responses are not detailed.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The response to this section requires a high quality plan, which is not provided. The consortium indicates that it will have a communications committee and a website for the project. Individual narratives indicate what each LEA intends to provide internally in communication (e.g. meetings, notices, websites). The offerings appear to be more related to communication to all stakeholders than to engagement -- telling people what is going on instead of bringing in their viewpoints and energies.

This section scores in the low range, because no plan is provided.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Each participating LEA has determined its own performance measures and tables. While some of the individual LEAs do discuss the (a) through (c) components of this section (e.g., LIFE PREP and MSSPA), others provide minimal information, and others provide no information in those areas.

For the tables on student performance, College Prep Elementary has set very low targets in reading and mathematics, moving in 3rd grade reading from a baseline of 11% proficient in 2012-13 to only 21% proficient in the post-grant year of 2017-18. Other schools have more robust goals (70% to 80% proficiency) for student performance. Goals for FAFSA completion and graduation rates appear to be appropriate, in that they move from current rates toward 80% and above.

Not all LEAs have 12-14 performance measures. Little information is provided as to how the data will be used and how the measure may be revised over time.

This section is scored in the low range due to inconsistencies in expectations and performance measures.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A very abbreviated plan is presented at the consortium level for this question, but does not rise to the level of a high-quality plan according to RTTT requirements. One goal is provided, with four activities and a general timeline. A few of the individual LEAs have brief narratives to indicate their roles in evaluating the effectiveness of investments, but not all. For example, the Twin Cities Academy states that it will evaluate the effective of use of technology by analyzing areas of immediate impact, such as student use of iPad tutorials.

This section scores in the low range, due to the general nature of its responses.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed budget is divided into four slightly different amounts over the four years of the grant. Approximately \$652,000 in other funds (not specified) have been identified from other sources to support the project. Project level budget summaries are provided for amounts ranging from \$3500 to over \$700,000. A major component of most of the budgets is personnel, usually for the entire four-year period. An example of a one-time investment is \$190,000 for LIFE Prep to purchase leveled curriculum in three subject areas, but one-time investments are only sporadically identified. Budget narratives and rationales are provided for each of the project level budget summaries, which do describe reasonably the need for and use of the funds, but there is no coherence among the individual budget summaries, nor any attempt to pool

resources across LEAs or use deliverables across the schools. The budget appears to be reasonable and sufficient for the elements included, as individual budgets, but sustainability is not addressed to any degree.

This section scores in the middle range.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was difficult to find in the application, because only some of the individual LEAs responded to F2. No high-quality plan was presented. There appears to be little intent to continue the consortium after the grant, and the narrative provided only a few individual comments about how certain budget items will be handled post-grant with other funds.

This section scores in the low range, because it was unresponsive to the question.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The overall narrative for this section indicates that the partnerships currently in place are at the individual LEA level, and will be used to augment the work of the individual LEAs. The response would have been much clearer if each of the individual LEAs had identified its key partnerships and how they would be used to reach its desired results. As it is, the reviewer cannot determine if any partners work with more than one LEA, or even who the partners are. It does not appear that any partnerships rise to the consortium level. Some individual LEAs have completed tables listing their desired results, although not all of the LEAs have done so. Those who have done so indicate a mix of educational and social/emotional desired results. While some of the LEA responses identify a level of performance or improvement expected in the results, others do not. Beyond these tables and brief descriptions, very little information is provided to address the questions for segments (3), (4), or (5) of this section. The response does not indicate if all 13 LEAs are participating in the Competitive Preference Priority, or only those who submitted individual responses in this section.

This section scores in the low range.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Although this proposal has a number of thoughtful activities coming from individual LEAs, it is not responsive to the four core educational assurance areas, and only partially responsive as to how the individual LEAs in the consortium will create personalized learning environments. The four core educational assurance areas are never addressed directly within the proposal, and personalized learning environments are addressed in a piecemeal fashion by some of the LEAs. There is very little reference to teacher and administrator evaluation systems, access to effective educators, changes in curriculum or instruction, or to consortium-level congruence. While there is much that each of the LEAs could offer to each other in the course of this grant, it does not appear to be a priority to do so.

Total	210	57
--------------	------------	-----------

