



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0133MI-1 for University Preparatory Science and Math

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant articulates an ambitious vision statement relating to 90% of its students attending college without need for remediation. However, the applicant does not describe a comprehensive reform vision that is grounded in the four educational assurance areas. The description regarding the classroom experience for students and teachers is lacking. The applicant does not sufficiently describe its vision for deepening student learning and increasing equity. The application does not mention how the vision incorporates student academic interest. The applicant describes goals such as: 90 of students who enter the ninth grade will graduate; 90% of the graduates will be accepted by postsecondary institutions; and students will achieve an ACT score of 23. These goals lack specificity. The goal referring to ninth graders is not complete. It does not specify whether the student will graduate on time or within a certain number of years. The goal relating to college acceptances is also incomplete. The goal does not incorporate whether the student is to be accepted during their senior year or within one year of graduating.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not provide a comprehensive description of its approach to implementation. The applicant plans to serve students in a consortium that consists of seven schools and two districts. The applicant plans to serve 204 educators and 2,881 students. 72% of the students are low income, but the applicant does not provide sufficient information on the amount of high need students to be served. The applicant does not provide a clear and coherent list of schools that will be participating. The applicant does not provide a description of the rationale it used to select the participating schools. The applicant does not provide sufficient demographic data on the participating students. The number of participating students who are low income and high.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant describes its plan for LEA-wide reform and change only to a limited extent. The applicant does not present a thorough plan for how the project will be translated into meaningful reform. The applicant does not provide a timeline. The applicant does not list key project tasks nor does it list persons responsible for implementation. The applicant does not address how its reform initiatives will extend beyond the participating schools. The applicant does not sufficiently describe its theory of change nor does it provide a logic model demonstrating its plan to improve student learning outcomes.</p>		
<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant lists some state level accomplishments including: participating in the development of the Next Generation Science Standards; ACT administration requirement; and membership in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. As written, the applicant's vision lacks sufficient details to support improved student learning and performance and increased equity. Although the applicant makes limited reference to adopting the Common Core State Standards, the applicant does not provide a clear and convincing description with sufficient details regarding its plan to decrease achievement gaps, increase graduation rates and increase college enrollment.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not demonstrate a clear record of success during the past four years in advancing student learning and in increasing equity. The applicant has only had three years of experience. Notwithstanding this fact, the applicant does not sufficiently demonstrate with data its past experience in improving student outcomes including: improving student achievement, and increasing graduation rates. The applicant also does not have a history of implementing ambitious and significant reforms in low achieving schools. However, the applicant does to a limited extent describe its plan to share best practices and presumably data through the internet, conference, events and workshops. The applicant provides some data on scores from the Measures of Academic Progress.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant plans to have a link on its webpage that will include the annual operating budget. The applicant plans to comply with the state requirements regarding transparency. The applicant lists the type of data it is required to disclose in compliance with state law. School level expenditures, including salaries for instructional and non-instructional staff, are required to be disclosed.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not fully address how it uses its autonomy to achieve a personalized learning environment. Presumably, the applicant has the authority to act with autonomy because of the school's status as a charter school. There are some statutory requirements that state law mandates including an: independent audit, assessment of students; and the use of highly qualified teachers. The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence of its autonomy. The applicant does not address any needed waivers of relevant state requirements.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant describes its plan to promote stakeholder involvement to a limited extent. The applicant has attached 14 letters of support. The applicant plans to have District Improvement Team Meetings to engage students. The applicant does not address how parents, teachers and students were included in project planning or in the provision of feedback the led to the revision of the project plan. The applicant presents teacher signatures on a document that lacks clarity. Further details regarding the teacher signatures are needed.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant describes its plan to improve learning and teaching only to a limited extent. The applicant plans to integrate the 16 Habits of Mind into its curriculum to ensure that students master skills such as: goal setting, problem solving and teamwork. The applicant plan to offer dual college enrollment through Wayne State University and Henry Ford Community College. The applicant cites to literature to support the importance of differentiation as an instructional practice. The applicant plans to implement online learning but the applicant does not describe whether students will have access to credit bearing courses taught in an online format. The applicant does not describe the necessary details regarding access to and implementation of online course deliversity. The applicant provides access to study abroad programs. Students must complete 200 hours of community service. The applicant also provides access to field studies, college visits, and internships. The applicant presents literature to support the use of RtI and theme based instruction. The applicant does not describe a high quality plan for improving teaching and learning through personalizing the learning environment. There</p>		

are no deliverables, outcomes, timelines or responsible parties for key tasks. The applicant plans to provide training to students at the start of every school year on how to access Power School, the student data management system. The applicant states that additional training to parents and students is available on an as needed basis. Student data contained in the Educational Development Plans will be updated at least on an annual basis.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has not presented a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching through personalizing the learning environment. The applicant plans to provide access for teachers to earn a Master's Degree from Grand Valley University. The applicant also plans to create a Pipeline of teachers to assist in attracting new elementary education teachers to its schools. The applicant does not present a high quality plan for increasing the amount of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers. The applicant does not provide key project tasks, persons responsible for implementation or a timeline. The applicant describes its talent pool as having a shortage of Chinese language instructors. Teachers will participate in professional learning communities. The applicant lists some of the training topics which include: Special Education Law and Differentiation. The applicant has designated Wednesday afternoons for staff development. The applicant plans to utilize 11 instructional coaches. The applicant plans to develop new evaluation systems. However, it does not provide sufficient details regarding the model to be used. The applicant also does not fully describe the teacher evaluation system as it relates to identifying effective and highly effective instruction. The applicant lists some of the data that teachers have access to, but does not disclose how teachers will use this data to inform instruction.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not present a high quality plan to support project implementation through policies and infrastructure. The applicant does not list key project tasks with persons responsible for implementation. The applicant also does not provide a timeline. The applicant has organized its infrastructure in teams including: Operations, Academic, External Relations. The applicant describes its procedures regarding earning credit based upon mastery rather than seat hours. The applicant allows acceleration in math courses where appropriate. The applicant allows students to demonstrate mastery through individual and group projects and standardized assessments. The applicant does not describe the role of formative assessments or teacher created assessments in demonstrating student mastery of standards. The applicant does not describe any instructional practices that support English Language Learners or students with disabilities. The applicant describes the autonomy of principals with regard to budgeting and personnel decisions.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes its plan to support project implementation through policies and infrastructure only to a limited extent. The applicant does not list key project tasks and persons responsible for implementing them. The applicant also does not provide a timeline. The applicant plans to hold meetings that involve a variety of stakeholders. The applicant plans to implement a Parent University as a mechanism for engaging and training parents. The school is in the process of implementing a platform that will allow access to student records. The applicant does not sufficiently describe the components of this platform nor does it detail a plan for launching such a platform. The applicant does not describe a system that will integrate all data systems.

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**

--	--	--

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not present a high quality plan that supports continuous improvement. The applicant does not list key project tasks and the persons responsible for implementing them. The applicant also does not provide a timeline. The applicant presents its Continuous Improvement Process in the form of table with Average Daily Student Attendance as its output. Its desired result is earning a 90% daily student attendance rate. The applicant plans to measure this output through the generation of attendance reports on a daily, weekly and monthly basis. As part of its continuous improvement process, the applicant does not address how it plans to monitor indicators that are aligned with project outcomes as well as program goals.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has not described a highly quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with external stakeholders. Although the applicant provides a chart with goals, activities and deliverables, the information provided lacks specificity and does not demonstrate a comprehensive approach to engaging internal and external stakeholders. For example, the applicant's goals for each item are limited to: matching progress to goals, sharing updates asking questions and adjusting as necessary. The applicant's activities for each item are: match progress to goals. The applicant's rationale for each item is: share information and adjust work as needed. The applicant's deliverables for each item are: updates in specific format for sharing. As written, the plan for ongoing communication and engagement is not aligned with project outcomes and program goals. The applicant plans to utilize a Director of External Communication charged with the responsibility of managing communication and engagement. This person will develop a public relations and communications campaign. The components of the communication plan include: monthly meetings; Google site; and a Facebook page.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not present sufficient evidence to demonstrate its plan for continuous improvement. The applicant provides no narrative to support and defend the reasonableness of any of its performance measures. The applicant does not specify a rationale for selection of any of its performance measures. The applicant does not state how each measure will provide rigorous and timely information regarding project implementation. The applicant does not describe how it will refine the measure where appropriate. The applicant purports to use an ACT PLAN assessment to measure an academic component of the project but it only measures college readiness. On the high school level, the applicant does not provide appropriate indicators. The project already has sufficient measures of career and college readiness, but no adequate measure of academic progress. The applicant selected approximately 12-14 performance measures that are ambitious when compared to the baseline data. However, the applicant does not demonstrate sufficient evidence of achievable targets.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not address this criteria. The applicant does not include a high quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the project. The applicant does not list key project activities and deliverables with the persons responsible for implementation. The applicant also does not provide a timeline.</p>		

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not provide a detailed budget narrative in order to explain and justify all line item expenditures. The applicant also does not distinguish between one time investments and ongoing costs. The applicant does not provide</p>		

sufficient evidence that the budget is reasonable and adequate to support the attainment of project outcomes and program goals. The applicant provides a budget with some line item expenditures.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not present a high quality sustainability plan. The applicant does not list key project tasks and deliverables nor does it provide the persons responsible for implementation. The applicant also does not provide a timeline. The applicant describes sustainability of project partners in terms of their contributions to the project. The applicant lists 12 project partners and describes what each partner will contribution at the conclusion of the federal funding. The applicant does not identify other potential sources of funding nor does it provide an estimated budget for when the period of federal funding ends.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence of a coherent and sustainable partnership that will support all of the social, emotional and behavioral needs of its students. The applicant does not sufficiently describe how it plans to track its indicators, use data to target resources and improve results over time. The applicant provides some evidence of services to be provided through a partnership with Matrix Human Services. The applicant describes that this partnership will provide an integrated community referral system and a care management coordination program for basic needs. The applicant describes its other partnerships including: Grand Valley State University, Thompson Education Foundation, Michigan Science Center, Project Lead the Way, University of Michigan and Mosaic Youth Theater of Detroit. The applicant does not describe its approach to scaling the model beyond participating students. The applicant lists desired results including: decreasing the number of students reading below grade level, increasing the amount of students experiencing at least 1.5 years of growth, increasing the number of students who are college and career ready, decreasing the amount of disciplinary incidents and improving the levels of parent and community engagement. The applicant plans to integrate services through the provision of: Head Start Programs financial literacy programs and family literacy activities. The applicant plans to build capacity of school staff through providing training modules on: Understanding Poverty, Breaking the Cycle of Poverty, Goal Mapping with Families, Encouraging Volunteerism and Administering the Transition to Success Model.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core assurance areas by improving teaching and learning through innovative, personalized strategies. The applicant does not address the effectiveness of principals, and the project is not designed to meet the academic needs of students.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>72</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0133MI-2 for University Preparatory Science and Math

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's vision is not clearly articulated and is not comprehensive. The overarching goal for all students is stated as expecting students to receive college admission and complete college; however, a vision for reform to advance what is currently in place is not clearly defined. The applicant states and explains its core values but does not articulate how it would use funds from the RTT grant to deepen personalized learning for students.</p> <p>The applicant provides a clear explanation of the structure of its academies and the ultimate goals for students who attend such as the percentage of students who will graduate; percentage to be accepted to post-secondary institutions; and the average score that students should achieve on the ACT exam prior to graduation. They explain how their current focus and implementation of a STEM-based (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) education would assist in helping student to achieve these goals. The goals are appropriate.</p> <p>The applicant briefly discusses how it will revise its University Prep Schools Pre-College Internship program to increase college readiness and ensure students earn a degree or complete a post-secondary education; however, there is a lack of information to understand how it will approach setting up and monitoring this program based on student data.</p> <p>This section lacks clarity on how the four core educational assurance areas would be addressed. This information is difficult to locate. The applicant attempts to explain its credible approach to accelerating achievement, deepening learning, and increasing equity; however, the strategies appear to focus more on building teacher capacity and providing family support, instead of specifically identifying and describing common and individual tasks to foster personalized learning.</p> <p>Finally, the applicant clearly describes what the classrooms currently look like and feel like, along with an explanation of the appearance of the schools; however, it does not describe what the classroom experience would be like for students and teachers in a personalized learning environment.</p> <p>Due to the lack of clarity and comprehensive information in this section, the applicant received a score in the low point range.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant identified which schools were selected to participate and the total number of participants, but did not explain the process for selecting the schools. There is no explanation about what the student achievement need is to clarify why the schools were selected. A description of the process would have enhanced this section. The scatter plot that was included to show the performance of students on free and reduced price meals vs the percentile rank was hard to read and understand. There were other data charts (Figure 1, 2, 3, 4, &amp; 5) included to show student performance on assessments, but the formatting of this information made it hard to follow the explanation; parts of the charts flowed onto another page and it was difficult to determine which figures were being referenced based on the numbering system. As a result of the above, the applicant received a score in the middle point range.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant failed to include a high-quality plan that described how it would implement meaningful district-wide reform. This section could not be located. Part of section (E)(3) was included here, but there was no explanation as to why that section of the application was in (A)(3). Information about LEA-wide reform &amp; change could not be found in other parts of the grant either. As a result, the lowest points were given for this section.</p>		

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant included a chart that showed baseline student performance and expected performance through the post grant period on the state assessment (summative assessment); however, there was no description or explanation of LEA-wide goals for improved performance. This section lacked clarity and a definition of its expectation for setting ambitious yet achievable annual goals. Only including data for this section without an explanation made it difficult to determine if the applicant's vision would likely result in improved student learning. Assumptions had to be made of what the applicant was trying to articulate in this section. As a result, the applicant received a score in the low point range.		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> This section could not be located in the grant. Thus, the lowest score was assigned to this section.		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant stated Michigan Department of Education's regulations for complying with budget transparency standards. This information was taken from a subsection of the State's statutory requirement. The requirement says that information about salaries, annual operating costs, and other expenditures must be posted on the district's website with links to all of the information. Since the district met the minimum requirements for this section, it received a high score.		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant clearly describes its level of autonomy because it operates a charter school; however, it fails to provide additional clarity and a detailed explanation on how it uses its autonomy to implement personalized learning environments. Information of what charters can do based on approval of an autonomous school board is included, but this section lacks information about how its autonomy to state regulations allows it to implement specific practices that promote personalized student learning. As a result, this section received points in the middle score range.		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant provided weak evidence and information of stakeholder engagement and support. The brief information forces one to assume that the District Improvement Team (DIT) played a major role in developing the proposal; there is a lack of clarity on the feedback loop to gather on-going stakeholder input throughout the development of the proposal. A reference to meeting regularly is included, but not defined. It is not clear how feedback from stakeholders was continually gathered and used (process) to shape the final version of the proposal. Letters of support are included in the appendix section. As a result of the above, points were awarded in the middle range for this section.		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant articulates its Four Pillars of College Readiness, but the Pillars are not explained; and the applicant does not thoroughly explain how it will support students in understanding the relationship between learning and success. It clearly		

articulates the process and support that students receive to prepare them to be college and career ready which include: Developing an educational development plan with an advisor and reviewing the plan with their advisor at least once per year; participating in afterschool ACT prep courses and taking a pre-ACT exam as a way to practice for the formal assessment; and participating in college tours.

The applicant clearly describes academic courses and internship experiences that students participate in during their high school years to deepen their learning; however, there was no discussion of opportunities for the elementary and middle school students that are targeted in this application as well.

The applicant describes experiences to expose students to diverse cultures such as being required to study abroad during their grade 6-12 school years, doing community service, and conducting field studies and college visits; however, again, it does not include an explanation of diverse experience for elementary students. The applicant provides very brief information on how students master critical content and develop skills for goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, etc.; specific examples of how this is developed and enhanced K-12 were missing to fully understand the emphasis on these skills.

The applicant does not fully address how each student has access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development; rather, it provides information that does not articulate the incorporation of differentiation for students' interest and abilities. A variety of approaches are described to engage students in learning, but they are not high-quality approaches that promote personalized learning. A description of how students receive feedback is included and the information does support the applicant's efforts to support students with developing plans so they are college and career ready. Opportunities that allow for a variety of technology integration are clearly explained and an appropriate three tiered system for ensuring specific students receive accommodations is explained.

A system called PowerSchool is clearly described as the tool students use to monitor their performance; students and parents are trained at the beginning of the year and instructors are available to provide support during the school year.

Overall, this section included information that addressed some of the required criteria: however, it did not provide a well developed high-quality plan. As a result, this section received points in the middle point range.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant described a clear approach to teaching and leading that supports student learning. The approaches are comprehensive and include immediate training and professional development once teachers are hired, and then ongoing training based on teachers needs throughout the school year. Surveys are used and are an appropriate strategy for gathering teacher input on their professional development needs. Professional development is offered and provided either at the local school or at the district level through the schools charter organization. A variety of formats (face to face, webinars, small group, staff, etc.) are used to meet a variety of learning styles which align to best practices for implementing professional development. The topics and strategies describe would lead to increasing teacher and principal effectiveness. The applicant provides clear information on tools that are available to teachers and administrators for supporting student learning and planning instruction that is matched to students' needs. Through its description, it is clear that the applicant has appropriate practices and tools in place for looking at data that can be used to structure effective learning environments.

The applicant provided a clear summary of its practices used to evaluate teacher and leader effectiveness to ensure that students are receiving high quality instruction. The plan for increasing the number of teachers that are taught by high quality teachers did not seem to be a reasonable way to use grant funds. The district plans to use funds for seven teachers to earn their masters in Instruction and Curriculum, but there is no plan or expectation articulated for ensuring that the teachers remain after they receive their degree. Also, the number of teachers that will participate is low compared to how many teachers actually work with students on a daily basis.

As a result of the above, this section received points in the high point range.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not clearly articulate or explain how its practices, policies, and rules allow for personalized learning. The explanation of the school schedule as described is the same across schools to better monitor attendance, but there is no explanation of how schedules are created for personalized learning. The "how" for this section is not articulated; the applicant does not appear to address the criteria for this section. As a result, points were given in the low-middle point range.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant clearly described a variety of ways that it currently provides access to information to its stakeholders. Websites, learning nights, community events, newsletters, emails, phone and text messages are some of the techniques used which are all appropriate. The applicant also explains how it provides technical support to parents. However, it does not describe a comprehensive description of its infrastructure to support personalized learning. There is no information provided for how it ensures stakeholders have access to content and resources; nor how stakeholders are provided with different levels of support based on a variety of needs. The applicant also does not have a technology system that allows parents to export information in an open data format nor an interoperable data system. It states that it could use funds from the RTT grant to implement this system, but does not provide a plan for how it would do so if awarded grant funds. As a result, this section received points in the low-middle range.

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant failed to describe and explain its continuous improvement process. A high-quality plan was not included, only mention and a chart for its goal and improvement process for daily average attendance. Thus, points in the low score range were given to this section.

<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant articulates what it does to communicate information with internal and external stakeholders, but the plan does not meet the criteria for a high-quality plan. Roles and responsibilities for communicating are not included. A chart is included that is supposed to articulate a plan for ongoing communication; however, it lacks detail. Thus, a score in the low point range was given to this section.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant identifies performance measures for the required grade bands and students; however, there is no explanation as to why the measures were chosen. The lack of alignment in the formatting of the chart with the data made it difficult to read the information and in two cases the same data was included twice. It is unclear how the measures will provide rigorous and timely information; they appear to be achievable, but without a narrative that provides more context about the measures, it is challenging to determine if they are ambitious. There is also no information included about how the measures will be reviewed and improved over time. As a result, this section received a score in the low point range.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
--	----------	----------

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant did not include information for this section. The information could not be located. Thus, points in the low score range were given to this section.

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

--	--	--

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provided a very brief narrative about its budget; therefore, it was challenging to understand its plan for using the resources. A budget table of revenue was included, but information about how funds would be used to support the project from the various sources was missing. The applicant plans to rely on funding from donations to cover the cost of a few initiatives which is good; however, it does not provide information on a back-up plan should these funds no longer be available; this seems risky. Funds for intervention classes at the elementary level are identified, but this information was not described in earlier sections of the plan. A rationale for investments and priorities was also not included. Thus, a score in the low point range was given to this section.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant includes a thoughtful description for its sustainability plan. It itemizes each item of its budget and then provides an explanation of its plan for sustaining that item. What is missing from this section is how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this information to inform future investments. An evaluation plan is not included. Thus, a score in the middle-low range were given to this section.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides a clear description of a sustainable plan that is in partnership with Matrix Human Services. Its partnership with the organization will support families with accessing public and private resources to offset school resources through an integrated community referral and care management system that focuses on the basic needs of families. The inclusion of a chart that states the activities and describes what will occur in relation to each activity helps the reader to understand the outcomes of the partnership. The inclusion of resources needed and persons responsible for each activity would have enhanced the applicant's description.</p> <p>The applicant also plans to develop a partnership with Grant Valley State University (GVSU) its charter; however, this partnership called "The Pipeline" focuses on teacher recruitment and retention of high quality teachers, rather than student and family supports. The GVSU partnership does not address personalized learning nor describe how the focus on teacher recruitment would have an impact on student performance.</p> <p>The applicant provides brief, but clear descriptions of its existing partnerships with other organizations. The additional partnerships focus on supporting families from poverty to become self-sufficient; interact with engineers and scientists in the classroom; STEM education programs; working with college faculty to provide students with career exposure; and arts integration. The existing partnerships appear to focus on improving students' ability to be college and career ready.</p> <p>The applicant includes a list of desired educational results (Grades K-3; 3-5; 6-8, &amp; 9-12) and two K-12 Family and community desired outcomes; however, it does not explain how the partnership will support the attainment of the desired results. There is no information provided on specific indicators that will be used to track progress; a system described for tracking progress; an explanation of how data will be used to target resources; nor a description of what strategy will be used to scale the model beyond the participating students.</p> <p>The applicant provides a clear description of how the partnership would integrate education and other services K-12. The descriptions provide clarity on the services that will build student and family capacity around education and social services support.</p> <p>The applicant briefly describes how the partnership would build the staff capacity in participating schools through professional development sessions in the summer and ongoing training modules; hire two full-time community specialists that would work with school staff and program directors to improve family education and community supports; and utilize a case manager to work with counselors to better connect with families. However, the brief description does not provide any</p>		

clarity on how it would assess the needs and assets of participating students.

The applicant clearly articulates data points that are used to identify student needs, but does not explain how the partnership would incorporate ongoing engagement and support to staff in identifying and inventory student needs and assets. It is difficult to understand the applicant's decision making process and infrastructure for selecting students due to the limited amount of information provided. There is a lack of specificity for how the applicant will engage participants in decision-making to improve results over time; it lists resources that can be used, but not how the resources would be used to engage parents.

The applicant provides clear information on the evaluation process that will be used to assess the implementation of the plan and its effects. However, the applicant does not include annual ambitious yet achievable performance goals. Instead, it states that they will be identified after family needs are assessed.

As a result of the lack of clarity and information, the applicant received points in the low-middle point range.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The lack of information, specificity and explanations throughout the application made it difficult to understand the district's plan for creating personalized learning environments that advanced student learning. The applicant was not comprehensive in way that thoroughly articulated how it would build on the core educational areas. Including information and details in the areas where the applicant received a low score or zero would have enhanced the application. The brevity and lack of information made it challenging to understand the district's vision and plan for creating personalized learning environments. As a result, the applicant does not meet Absolute Priority 1.</p>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>80</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



## Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0133MI-3 for University Preparatory Science and Math

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>University Preparatory Science and Math (UPSM) has made great strides in its efforts to improve education in Detroit. The applicant's vision of graduating no fewer than 90% of its high school students and to send no fewer than 90% on to college with an average ACT score of 23 with no need for remediation is commendable.</p> <p>The applicant has established its proposed efforts upon the four core educational assurance areas. UPSM adopted Common Core State Learning Standards in 2010, establishing career and college readiness as a priority for all students. Michigan, serving a a lead state partner in the development of Next Generation Science Standards, is paving the way for additional reforms to support student learning and problem solving skills in the sciences, intending to support college and workplace readiness as well as global economic competitiveness. Michigan has met seven of ten State Actions identified</p>		

by the Data Quality Campaign, providing a strong and sound process for student-level data collection and use. The district uses PowerSchool and SchoolNet to make student data accessible. The applicant is very committed to professional learning of staff as evidenced by support for participation in state and national conferences as well as local conferences and professional development experiences driven by needs of both individual educators and applicant need. UPSM provides relevant, job-embedded professional development through opportunities such as coaching (peer and/or expert), facilitated study groups, and action research. A committee of staff members from across grade levels surveys staff to identify areas of need and ensures that professional development is linked to the school improvement plan, UPSM HS Instructional Framework; district initiatives; the Content Expectations (Common Core State Standards, HSCE); Michigan Curriculum Framework; and ACT Standards. Once per week, 2.5 hours of integrated, structured opportunities for professional development are embedded into the regular school schedule with a rotating schedule that accommodates Professional Learning Community meetings, Grade Level meetings, External Coaches training, and Organizational Continuous Improvement and Building Capacity sessions. Through grant funding, it is proposed that one teacher at each of the seven school earns a M.Ed. in Instruction and Curriculum-Emphasis in Educational Differentiation through Grand Valley State University (GVSU). Over the three full years of the grant, 21 instructors at UPSM and University Preparatory Academy (UPA) schools would earn their M.Ed. in Instruction and Curriculum-Emphasis in Educational Differentiation. This process will provide the impacted schools with the professional capacity to implement quality differentiated instruction. This approach will likely also support the retention of impacted teachers as will the salary benefits associated with additional degree attainment, longevity bonuses, and salary increases for National Board Certification.

To turn around the lowest achieving schools, UPSM proposes to apply a rigorous performance evaluation system along with more support, training, and mentoring; a strong curriculum and instructional program; increased time for learning by both students and teachers; and a provision for flexibility around budgeting, staffing, and scheduling at the school level. The applicant further proposes a full integration of public and private resources in partnerships designed to augment the school's resources by providing additional support that address the social, emotional and behavioral needs of participating students and their families.

In order to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity, UPSM proposes to invest in teacher development, strengthen and align academic resources, and provide integrated services for students and families. The applicant proposes to create a teacher "pipeline" to increase urban teacher recruitment and improve urban teacher retention. GVSU education students would earn their degrees and certification through a plan that incorporates a significant amount of internship time at UPSM. UPSM will hire 11 instructional coaches to work at UPSM and UPA schools over the four grant years, supporting three elementary schools, two middle schools, and two high schools. Skill in differentiating instruction is viewed as a key to success in urban school districts due to high rates of poverty, racial and ethnic diversity, immigrant populations, linguistic diversity, and student mobility.

The applicant intends to implement grant activities at the UPSM schools in year one and simultaneously prepare to implement the proposal in the four UPA schools. While the school has good intentions to promote high graduation rates and high levels student achievement, the vision as presented is not comprehensive and coherent. Further evidence of the means of creating supportive personalized learning environments would be beneficial. As a result, the applicant scores in the low range for Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Three UPSM (elementary, middle, and high) and four UPA schools (two elementary, middle, and high), public charter school K-12 districts chartered by GVSU, managed by Detroit 90/90 (a non-profit organization), and governed by Public School Academies of Detroit (PSAD) will participate in grant activities. UPSM schools will be impacted in the first year, while plans will simultaneously be developed for grant activity implementation at UPA schools. The seven school consortium will impact about 2,881 students. The UPSM and UPA districts were selected because they are both managed by Detroit 90/90. Support from Detroit 90/90 administrative and teacher leaders and the PSAD board has led district leaders to have confidence in the abilities of the consortium to meet the goals set forth in its proposal to meet student success.

Overall, the percentage of impacted students of low-income (high-need) is about 72%. Numbers of participating students are provided, broken down by school along with the number of participating educators.

A conflict seems to exist regarding numbers of students impacted. The seven schools from two districts have a total of 2,881 students listed in the table providing participating schools, whereas shortly thereafter, the following is stated, "Detroit 90/90 is a seven-school/two district consortium with about 3,250 students."

While the involved schools, students, and educators are clearly defined, other implementation details are not provided. In

year one, UPSM schools will be impacted, while plans will be developed for implementation at UPA schools. The applicant's approach to implementation would have been strengthened by more detailed development of implementation plans. As a result, the proposal scores in the middle range for its approach to implementation.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

It seems that sections of the application may be missing and details regarding the process of scaling up the reform proposal are very limited. The applicant intends to implement grant activities at the UPSM schools in year one, while plans are developed to implement the activities at the UPA schools beginning in the second year. The application would be strengthened by development of the plans for reform and change implementation throughout the impacted schools.

Given that a high-quality plan that includes a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties relating to the implementation process is not provided in the applicant's proposal, the proposal scores low for LEA-wide reform & change.

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

**10**

**5**

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Summative assessment data is only provided for students in grades 6-8 for the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) in tables within the proposal. In graphical representations, the data is shown extending to grade 3. It is evident that in grades 3-5, the performances of impacted students are well below state averages in both reading and math. Much growth must be accomplished by UPSS schools to achieve the state goal of 85% mastery by the 2021-2022 school year as student proficiency levels vary from slightly above 40% to nearly 70% overall.

UPSS plans to narrow achievement gaps by 2% per year per subgroup. The subgroup with the greatest need for growth is economically disadvantaged students. UPSS will partner with Matrix Human Services to provide assistance to all UPSM and UPA students and families. This partnership will support district families with basic needs, enabling students to concentrate on their academic pursuits.

Graduation rates are provided and in agreement with the UPSM vision, are projected at 90% each year other than the baseline year, for which percentages are actually slightly higher. Additional graduates in coming years will impact graduation rates. Similarly, college enrollment data is provided. Currently, UPA students have a 76% college enrollment rate. This is expected to rise with the addition of UPSM students. By 2015-2016, college enrollment rates are projected to rise to 90%, bringing them inline with the vision of UPSM.

No information is provided regarding post-secondary degree attainment. It may be noted however that UPSM has activities, including Project Lead the Way, that are geared toward promoting success in careers beyond high school.

The application has limitations as proficiency and achievement gap data provided represented only a narrow band of grades. This data also lacks thorough division of performances by subgroup. Goals of the grant are ambitious and achievable, especially as they relate to the impact proposed efforts will have on the capacity of teachers to personalize instruction and in the increased ability of the districts students to focus on learning as opposed to more basic needs. This application would have benefited from further development of goals, along with further development of strategies to address achievement gap narrowing. As a result, this applicant scores in the middle range for LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

It is apparent that the applicant may have either not completed this application, or submitted an incomplete version of the application. "NEED NARRATIVE." is the only text that appears to be entered by the applicant for (B)(1), appearing next to the section title and available points. Based on information provided, the applicant does not have a track record of success clearly presented. Some graphs provided in earlier sections of the application show student growth on grade 3 MAP test data over several academic years. One can argue that graduation rates over 90% for the 2012-2013 school year is an indicator of success.

Given that the applicant has only been in operation for a few years, sufficient evidence to support a clear track record of success is not present. The absence of this essential information relating to a track record of success results in a low score for section (B)(1).

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

**5**

**2**

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The State of Michigan sets forth requirements for LEAs to be transparent in their processes, practices, and investments. District budgets and related changes in budgets must be posted through a link on the district's website home page. Data regarding personnel expenditures, salaries and wages, employee benefit costs, retirement benefit costs and all other personnel costs must be represented in pie charts. The total salary and description of fringe benefit associated costs for the superintendent and any employee earning over \$100,000 must be disclosed. The collective bargaining agreements for each bargaining unit along with information regarding the health benefits plan offered to any district employees must also be disclosed. Actual personnel salaries are not included in this description. While some information is posted, limitations exist to the degree of transparency in processes, practices, and investments. Given that pie charts, which generally involve pooled data, are required and reported per state requirements, it is not evident that personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff are publicized. Furthermore, the application would benefit from descriptions of practices that ensure a high degree of transparency in the sharing of non-personnel expenditures. The absence of detailed evidence to clearly describe transparent practices results in a low score for section (B)(2).

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

**10**

**3**

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The lead LEA, University Preparatory Science and Math (UPSM) and the member LEA, University Preparatory Academy (UPA) are Public School Academies in Michigan (PSA), that are governed by an autonomous school board appointed by Grand Valley State University. The school board is accountable under oath to act in the best interests of the children it serves and is required to conduct its business at open, public meetings with agendas posted in advance. While the board is described as operating autonomously, the LEA is subject to Michigan School Code in several listed ways, including requirements for teacher qualifications, assessments, financial reporting, and auditing.

The applicant has not addressed a plan to give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery that provides students multiple times and multiple ways for mastery demonstration. This sort of planning would likely require autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements. Given that the plan does not provide evidence of goals related to progression based upon mastery, such details are not provided in the proposal. Based on the limited information provided, it is unclear if the LEA has sufficient autonomy to implement personalized learning environments. As a result of the limitations in the applicant's development of section (B)(3), the applicant scores in the low range for (B)(3).

**(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)**

**15**

**4**

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal through their involvement with the District Improvement Team (DIT). The DIT engages stakeholders in the development of district improvement plans, upon which the application was based. This team consists of administrators, representatives from the charter management organization, school administrators, teachers, students and parents. The DIT has four subcommittees, curriculum, parent engagement, budget, and planning, which further represent stakeholders each subcommittee area. Through regular meetings, the DIT and subcommittees established the District Improvement Plan. Following review and approval by the DIT, the plan was then passed to the district's governing board for consideration and approval. Once approved, the plan was posted on the district website and serves as a basis for the LEA's proposal.

Given that the applicant does not have collective bargaining, letters of support with signatures of staff members are included in the proposal. The signatures are not counted and compared to total numbers of teachers in each participating school to ensure that at least 70% of teachers in the participating schools are in support of the proposal. Letters are included from community organizations, including Hometown Heroes, a local PTSA member and parent, Matrix Human Services, Grand Valley Charter School Association, Thompson Educational Foundation, Eastern Michigan Project Lead the Way, and Mocaic Youth Theatre of Detroit.

Based on information provided in the proposal, it seems that the process used to develop the proposal was limited in its approach to gather input from stakeholders on all levels. While the school improvement plan development process does gather stakeholder input, opportunities for stakeholders on all levels to provide both input and feedback to the DIT for the purpose of developing and refining grant goals was not evident. It is also unclear if the signatures provided by teachers of

the various involved schools is a sufficient number to meet the 70% requirement. The proposal could be improved by providing more credible evidence of a high level of stakeholder input across all levels in the proposal development process paired with a means of verifying that a sufficient number of signatures has been provided to ensure support of at least 70% of involved teachers. As a result, the application scores in the lower end of the middle range of scores of section (B)(4).

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

UPSM shares in the Detroit 90/90 model for college and career readiness. The model is based on Four Pillars of College Readiness, which are: 1) Content Mastery, 2) Habits of Mind & Habits of Work, 3) A Robust Support Network and 4) Post-Secondary Preparation. Through implementation of this model, students understand that learning is the key to successful goal completion. Along with the implementation of Michigan's Common Core Standards, students will have the Detroit 90/90 model along with the support and resources to pursue college and career ready goals through college and career readiness standards and related graduation requirements. An advisory program will be implemented to maintain and build strong relationships that will serve the school well as teacher/advisors will have consistent contact with the students over several years to engage students in their learning, keeping students focused on goals, while celebrating successes along the way. Students will also have small, supportive classes, not to exceed 20 students as the small supportive classroom will help students set goals and develop habits supportive of success in college and life. All students at UPSM Middle School must develop an Educational Development Plan, which is updated at least once per year. This form is intended to serve as a tool for monitoring student progress toward academic, career, personal, and social goals. This plan will be used to evaluate and guide student goals through graduation. Additionally, academic records and a variety of standardized test performances (Explore, ACT, MME, PLAN, and MEAP) will be reviewed to measure student progress.

UPSM students have many elective courses to choose from to appeal to areas of individual academic interest. Students may choose advanced foreign languages, Gateway to Technology (engineering focus, supplemented by Project Lead the Way), and advanced courses in mathematics, science, and creative writing. Many teachers sponsor after-school clubs and organizations to extend student engagement, while providing a safe place after school. These clubs cover a variety of academic activities from robotics through environmental science, chess, writing, and debate. UPSM also offers several clubs to support student interest, many of which are typical athletics, honor society, yearbook and newsletter, performing arts, and student government. Many others are not as typical, including specialized clubs relating to gardening, social justice and diversity, and video production. Dual-enrollment college courses are available to students through Wayne State University (Detroit) and Henry Ford Community College (Dearborn, MI), giving students access to the a taste of the college experience while pursuing areas of academic interest. Learning Through Internship (LTI) is a major focus of the student experience, which begins at the middle school, where students are introduced to career pathways that help them align academic goals to career goals for college. Eighth grade students participate in job shadowing. When students reach 9th and 10th grade, they have the opportunity to participate in a one day per week internship that lasts up to 8 weeks. When students are in 11th and 12th grade, internship opportunities are extended to 2 days per week, again lasting up to 8 weeks.

To expose students to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives, students have the opportunity to participate in a unique study abroad program, helping students to experience different global careers and cultures. Student experiences thus far have been in China, Spain, Italy, and Greece. The next exchange trip will be to Costa Rica. These experiences motivate students and deepen their desires to learn. Internship, community service, field studies, and college visit experiences provide students with exposure to diversity within their local communities.

Both UPSM and UPA apply multiple measures of student achievement, including the MAP and ACT exams to understand student achievement and need. Staff members will collaboratively determine pace, scope, and content of multiple interventions to be applied using an RTI model. These interventions may include differentiated instruction, small-group instruction, and 1:1 remediation. Supplemental instruction before and after school will be provided to students K-12 who previously failed core content, are in danger of failing, or did not demonstrate proficiency on content area and/or MAP assessments. Summer school will be provided for students who failed or received lower than a C- on core content during the previous school year, for those whose assessments did not reflect proficiency, and for those who did not meet college readiness as indicated on the EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT exams.

UPSM schools have lengthened class days and are the only district in the state to offer a balanced, year-round calendar in all grades. The school maintains a student to teacher ratio of 20:1, making class sizes among the smallest in the state, and providing an environment where students, known by all teachers, are encouraged, nurtured, and challenged to excel. The school applies theme based instructional approaches. UPSM is a STEM school, which strives to foster innovation,

design, problem solving, systems thinking and collaboration. An interdisciplinary, real-world focused approach helps students understand connections between what they are learning and the real world. UPSM is further striving to turn STEM into STEAM by infusing arts into the curriculum via a partnership of UPSM Elementary with Mosaic Youth Theater Detroit. This infusion will move upward to the middle and high school levels over time. The laboratory environment provides for project-based learning in which students engage in writing, hands-on projects, group projects, and individual projects. The district also strives to promote the college-going culture through a college-prep environment, where pennants, flags, and diplomas are displayed.

UPSM provides students and teachers access to technology to support learning. Macintosh lab carts, Netbooks, Kindles, and Project Lead the Way PC labs are available for use. Students may also check out Netbooks, Kindles, and iPads to extend their learning beyond the school day. Digital learning content provided includes both open source and commercial content. Students and staff may take advantage of distance learning opportunities. Interactive and streaming video resources are available through Michigan Department of Education and Wayne County Regional Educational Service Agency. Online courses provide credit recovery, advanced course, and homebound instruction options. Teachers use the SMART Board Exchange and Skype to engage students in interactive, enhanced lessons.

MAP and Star Mathematics assessments are given to students at least three times per year. Additional testing may be provided to assess student progress for students in need of support. Grant funding would permit UPSM to purchase and implement SchoolNet Instructional Management Suite, an add-on to PowerSchool, to improve student achievement efforts by aggregating district's programs and initiatives around assessment, curriculum, instruction, reporting and analysis. SchoolNet IMS will aid teachers in making informed instructional decisions to ensure consistent and rigorous instruction. PowerSchool is currently used to provide families and students access to their academic records. UPSM provides training to both parents and students to use PowerSchool. Quarterly progress reports are also provided to students and parents.

UPSM has high-quality strategies in place to support high-needs students. The three-tiered system of graduated supports, small classes, and advisor system provide structure and targeted supports to meet student needs. The "Transition to Success" program to be implemented by the UPSM partner organization, Matrix Human Services will provide support to families and students to meet their socio-economic needs through multiple actions aimed at helping families meet their basic needs, allowing students to focus on their academic needs.

UPSM Students check their PowerSchool accounts at least once per week during Advisory to track their college preparedness and to be ready for EDP (Educational Development Plan) progress and update meetings. Middle school students similarly check PowerSchool weekly and in conjunction with parent, teacher, and student Learning Team Meetings. Students and parents are provided training and support to ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to support their learning.

While the applicant's plan strongly supports the development of habits of practice to support long-term goal attainment as well as college and career readiness, the plan has some shortcomings. The applicant's plan would benefit from further description of the use of digital resources to support student learning and engagement. While digital resources are available to provide ongoing, regular feedback, further information is needed to explain how the feedback is used to develop target personal learning recommendations. Personalization of learning for elementary level students needs development. The plan also lacks a timeline, deliverables and responsible parties as required for a high-quality plan. As a result, the applicant scores at the middle range for (C)(1).

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Professional development teams and communities as instituted by UPSM exist as through professional development that is self-selected or assigned by principals. Some professional development occurs in groups. A cluster of teachers may attend professional development sessions together to ensure they are immersed in professional development to support school academic goals. The professional development often takes the form of half-day training sessions. Much of the professional development is provided by GVSU, which provides a wide range of professional development opportunities to UPSM and UPA schools via its Learning Network. Job-embedded professional development is offered to teachers in the form of coaching, facilitated study groups and action research. Every Wednesday, from 1:30 to 4:00 p.m., staff members engage in a variety of professional development activities on a rotating schedule including whole staff Professional Learning Communities, grade level meetings, external coaches training, and organizational continuous improvement and building capacity meetings. A group of teachers will have the opportunity to attain master's degrees or specialty bachelor's degrees as a result of this grant. A committee of staff members across grade levels and content areas surveys staff to identify areas of need and ensures that all professional development is linked to the school improvement plan, UPSM HS Instructional Framework; district initiatives; the Content Expectations (Common Core State Standards, HSCE); Michigan Curriculum Framework; and ACT Standards.

Five instructional coaches will support three elementary schools, 3 will serve two middle schools, and 3 will serve the two high schools, each coach serving approximately 320 students and 18 teachers. These coaches will work with the Director of Curriculum, the Director of Student Development and the Director of Data, Instruction, and Assessments to insure that efforts are directly tied to teacher and school needs. Coaches will assist teachers in developing classroom practices to support the needs of urban districts, which often have high populations of students of poverty, great racial and ethnic diversity, large concentrations of immigrant populations and linguistic diversity, and relatively high rates of student mobility.

The applicant asserts that providing a wide range of ways to demonstrate mastery and differentiate instruction are keys to student success. UPSM has incorporated Gardner's seven intelligences into its curriculum, planning, and academic activities to ensure that all learners are engaged, while helping learners become comfortable with learning styles that may not be natural to them. RTI has been implemented to provide a three-tiered support system based on levels of student need to support student learning. Each student, beginning in middle school will develop a personalized Educational Data Plan to support goal setting and evaluation of progress toward college and career ready standards. Several standardized assessments both as required by the state and those implemented by choice are provided to evaluate student progress. These exams include the MAP, MME, EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT. Instructors meet regularly to discuss and monitor student progress.

A new evaluation system will be implemented as a result of grant funding to support identification of educator performance levels and continuous instructional improvement through clear, timely feedback. This new system will apply to teachers, principals and the CEO. Feedback from teacher evaluations is shared frequently with individual teachers and the entire cohort of teachers. Principals and coaches use the evaluation process to provide recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement. Results of improvement measures are frequently evaluated to modify efforts for continuous improvement in educational practices to support student progress. The plan does not include a means of using the teacher evaluation system to identify highly effective teachers whose reach to promote high quality learning opportunities for students could then be maximized. The applicant's approach to maximizing the reach of highly effective teachers is through educational opportunity and additional degree attainment. The grant proposal supports 7 teachers earning a M.Ed. in Instruction and Curriculum with Emphasis in Educational Differentiation. UPSM also actively recruits high-quality teacher candidates through hiring practices that include leveraging the power of social media to attract highly qualified candidates.

While the plan overall includes regular measures of student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards along with supportive practices to ensure student achievement, additional information is needed. The eventual role of teachers in the schools receiving advanced degrees is not explained. A high-quality plan that requires a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties, is not provided to support Teaching and Leading. The applicant therefore has not set forth a high-quality plan for Teaching and Leading and receives a score in the middle range for Teaching and Leading.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

Detroit 90/90, a non-profit educational agency governs all participating schools. The Board of Directors of Detroit 90/90 oversees the Chief Executive Officer, who in turn manages three teams that support the schools. The Academics Team is the largest subset of leadership. It consists of seven principals, one from each school and other academic content directors. The Director of Data, Instruction, and Assessments provides leadership in the ongoing development, improvement, and evaluation of student data management. The Director of Student Development works with the schools to design programs, strategies, and tools for implementation of student development and engagement programs. The Director of Curriculum evaluates and provides leadership for the district instructional program. The Operations Team manages the electronic and physical infrastructures that support the staffing, facilities, budget and finance, and electronic systems for the schools. This team consists of the Chief Operating Officer, Director of Human Resources, Director of Finance, Director of Facilities, and Director of Information Technology. The External Relations team oversees and facilitates home and community support for all students, including all marketing/recruiting, fundraising, E3 student internship implementation, college counseling, and parent engagement to help parents and families best support their students.

Evidence of autonomy over school schedules is not present. School calendars are synchronized throughout UPSM and UPA to support family needs of common school and vacation schedules. Principals in each building have autonomy to make personnel decisions at the school level and plan their building budgets. Principals set professional development and teacher substitute budget lines to support professional development needs and determine curriculum expenditures based on collective needs of students and staff to provide for student academic needs. Principals have the power and

responsibility to determine a bonus structure and pay allocations for teachers. Principals have further control over funding to support additional elements of the educational environment and process, such as field trips, college campus visits, and small reward/celebratory events to recognize victories of students and staff.

UPSM and UPA have a variety of learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. Graphing calculators, Kindles, iPads, Netbooks, and multiple desktop computers are among technology resources provided to support the use of academic resources and to develop technology skills. Students will engage in a variety of individual and group projects to help students support college and career ready skill development. Dynamic project based learning strategies involving real-world problem solving will help students make personal connections to content and deepen knowledge of studied content. All resources and instructional practices are designed to be accessible to all students regardless of learning style, previous educational experiences, disabilities, or English learning status.

While the proposal has some elements of a high quality plan, the plan lacks a timeline, deliverables and responsible parties to support implementation. The applicant has not addressed a plan to give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery that provides students multiple times and multiple ways for mastery demonstration. As a result, the applicant scores in the lower middle range for LEA practices, policies, and rules.

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

**10**

**6**

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

UPSM recognizes the need to be diligent and purposeful in communication efforts and outreach to parents. Parents have many opportunities to learn how to access their students' records, to learn about school initiatives, programs and events, and to use relevant technology to access a great deal of useful information. The applicant uses a number of traditional modes of communication, including newsletters, emails, and phone calls, in addition to a number of other more advanced systems to support proposal implementation. These resources include websites and the school's student information system (PowerSchool). PowerSchool will enable announcements and exchanges of messages as well as provide opportunities for parents and students to not only see student data, but to be able to synchronize their students' class assignments, test scores, final grades and school events with their own personal calendars through a number of common calendar software programs. Both the website and PowerSchool are accessible via the internet. One Call Now is a phone and texting service used by UPSM to alert parents to important school information. The district also provides parent centers, where parents may access information and have meetings and private conversations with teachers. With grant funding, it is proposed that the existing modes for sharing communications, events, and student performance data will be enhanced, adding such features as teacher web pages, more user-friendly navigation, One Call Now alerts to students, kiosks in middle and high school lobbies to provide parents easy access to information (including PowerSchool), and a community area for computer access as well as job and career exploration.

Technical support will be provided in a number of ways. One method of providing support to parents is through curriculum nights, where parents interact with teachers to learn more about school activities and learn more about helping their children at home. UPSM provides a Parent University, where experts help parents better support students through educating them regarding standardized tests, college preparation, teacher/student/parent interaction, and other related topics. Learning Team Meetings will engage parents in discussions with students, teachers, and administrators focused on student progress, identifying growth areas, and celebrating successes.

With grant funding, UPSM plans to adopt SchoolNet, which will aggregate data from multiple sources, including PowerSchool, to make recommendations for additional learning supports, and securely store and share personal records. The district's data system is current not interoperable. Problems exist in that the network structure does not integrate with other data sources. With funding, this problem could be remedied through a cloud storage option that would merge data and make the data systems interoperable.

Limitations exist in the applicant's proposal. Access by stakeholders to learning resources in and out of school to support implementation of the grant vision is not described. Technical supports provided do not include a focus on supporting stakeholders in using the applicant's technology and related resources for the benefit of student achievement, but rather focus on communication efforts. The applicant has not developed a high-quality plan, which requires a timeline and deliverables with responsible parties identified for LEA and school infrastructure. As a result, UPSM scores in the middle range for LEA and school infrastructure.

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**



	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The full-time Project Director will manage all grant activities and track activities, adjusting work methods and pace as needed to meet goals. Best practices of collaborative work will be shared via a robust and regular communication process with internal and external stakeholders. This process includes monthly meetings and use of a dedicated Google site, Facebook page, dedicated locations on the UPSM and UPA websites, and other methods. Each individual project will have a designated leader and secondary support person who will provide updates for the purpose of evaluating project activities. The applicant provides a table with responsible parties identified to show a plan for ongoing continuous improvement, but the plan is not well developed.</p> <p>While the applicant has some components of a highly effective plan in place, a timeline is not provided. The plan lacks details that would ensure that UPSM is committed to a continuous process of improvement. As a result, UPSM scores in the middle range for Continuous improvement process.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The full-time Project Director will manage all grant activities, including communications, and track activities, adjusting work methods and pace as needed to meet goals. All communications, both internal and external will be reviewed and approved by the Director of External Communication and reviewed by the CEO to ensure accuracy and consistency. The Director of External Communication will also develop and implement a public relations and communications campaign to share the project, its goals, and implementation strategies to inform the community at large, while being cognizant of the investments of both U.S. Department of Education and the City of Detroit in UPSM and UPSA.</p> <p>Best practices of collaborative work will be shared via a robust and regular communication process with internal and external stakeholders. This process includes monthly meetings and use of a dedicated Google site, Facebook page, dedicated locations on the UPSM and UPA websites, and other methods. Each individual project will have a designated leader and secondary support person who will provide updates for the purpose of evaluating project activities. The applicant provides a table with responsible parties identified to show evidence of a plan for ongoing communication and engagement, but the plan is not well developed.</p> <p>Very limited information is provided to fully assess the quality of the applicant's plan for ongoing communication and engagement to support adjustments and revisions to continuously improve its plans. As a result, the proposal scores low in Ongoing communication and engagement.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>While data is provided regarding performance measures and to establish the numbers of students per school impacted by highly effective teachers and principals, the only subgroups specified in the data are male/female and economically disadvantaged/non-economically disadvantaged. This is inconsistent however as female and non-economically disadvantaged data is left out of some tables. Given that the applicant's schools are urban, and claims earlier in the proposal identified a need to support a diverse population of students, further work on disaggregating data to further identify impacted subgroups is necessary.</p> <p>A total of 8 performance indicators across all grade levels is provided by the applicant, however a rationale for selecting each of these indicators is not included. For PreK-3, MAP testing results and disciplinary actions are provided as performance indicators. Each additional grade band has associated performance measures, reflecting college and career readiness goals as well as disciplinary goals. All performance indicators provide targets through the 2017-2018 post grant year. While the goals are ambitious, the reasonableness of the goals is questionable. For example, using the ACT PLAN exam, which is administered in 10th grade, to determine the percent of students at or above the college readiness standard for math, the current female proficiency rate is 11%. It is projected that by the 2017-2018 post grant year, this rate will rise to 63%, reflecting gains of over 5% per year within that subgroup. Similarly high targets are projected for other performance indicators.</p> <p>The proposal as submitted had repetition of content that made the application confusing. While some of the performance measures and targets were reasonable and appropriate, the applicant did not provide a clear, thorough explanation of the application of performance measures. As a result, the application scores in the low range for Performance measures.</p>		

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
--	----------	----------

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Plans to evaluate the effectiveness of investments and make readjustments as appropriate to support grant goals are not provided in detail. Plans do exist to have teams of staff members evaluate progress toward grant goals, but a high-quality plan, including timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties to provide a detailed explanation of a plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of funded activities is not present in the proposal. Evaluating the effectiveness of professional development and technology implementation is not addressed. As a result, the applicant scores low in Evaluating effectiveness of investments.

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

UPSM provides a listing of several sources of funding to support proposed initiatives. These sources include \$9,213,138 from the State of Michigan as foundation aid, and smaller revenues from lunch payments, State funding for Special education, Title I funding, Title II funding, E-rate, and several other funding sources. These funds total \$10,607,006.

Detailed descriptions of the funds are not included. Some funding sources are well-known nationally or as state funding sources. Others are not well known and require explanation. For example, \$100,000 in TEAMS Revenue is listed, with no explanation of what TEAMS represents.

Budgeted items are not clearly represented as one-time or ongoing expenditures. Some descriptions of funding requests provided in section (F)(2) include details that indicate ongoing expenses. For example, for the Project Management fund request of \$708,179.60, the description indicates that the funds will cover a full-time project manager from start to finish of the project. The categories provided are for the most part broad and general, describing entire projects, and mix salaries with other implementation expenses. For example, under Marketing for Enrollment and Community Engagement, the applicant proposes an expenditure of \$667,777.26 which will cover two staff positions, benefits, and consultants fees to "rebrand" UPSM and UPA schools.

While the applicant has identified funds to support the project, it appears that many items are missing. A total of funds requested does not exist with the expenditures provided and no funds are requested to purchase technology in the form of computers or other electronic devices that would support differentiated instructional practices and implementation of a new SchoolNet data system. As a result of insufficient detail and development of the budget to support project goals and limited narrative to supporting the information that does exist, the project scores in the low range for its development of a budget for the project.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has set forth a variety of grant-related projects with related funding and a brief description of the sustainability plan for each activity. The plan fails to include a timeline with deliverables and responsible parties. Support from State and local government leaders is not evident. Plans to evaluate effectiveness of past investments to inform future investments is lacking. While some potential sources of sustainability funds are provided in brief sustainability descriptions, budgetary planning does not include an estimated budget for the three years after the grant term. As a result, the plan does not meet the characteristics of a high-quality plan and section (F)(2) scores in the low range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has developed a partnership with Matrix Human Services which has been named "Transition to Success"

(TTS). Matrix Human Services, a 501(c)3 organization, has a well-established mission to change lives in the Detroit community by helping families meet their basic needs. The intervention process helps families attain support in obtaining food, clothing, shelter/housing, health care, financial supports, transportation, child care, DHS services, family reunification, legal aid, mediation of conflicts and life coaching. If students' basic needs are met, they will be able to focus on academic pursuits and families will be better prepared to support the efforts of their students.

The partnership with Matrix Human Services will have three separate programs. These programs include TTS for Youth 6-14 years old, TTS for Young Adults 15-21 years old, and TTS for Families with Small Children. In each of these programs, a focus on a pathway to economic self sufficiency will be a core theme, with differentiation existing in the types of services offered to the various groups. TTS will serve to transition families and individuals from dependency to self-sufficiency through structured, comprehensive, integrated, and scientifically driven system of supportive care.

A second partnership has been developed with Grand Valley State University (GVSU). All Detroit 90/90 schools, including UPSM and UPA, are chartered by GVSU, an entity recognized nationally for educational excellence. GVSU provides extensive professional development to teachers and administrators in a variety of areas to support instructional practices. As a result of grant funding, GVSU will provide opportunities to six teachers to earn Master of Education degrees, which will help build skills in differentiation of instruction, assessment, methodology, materials, curriculum, and administration. GVSU will also work with UPSM to develop a teacher pipeline program that will provide elementary education students the opportunity to serve as interns, earning credits and valuable experience while on the job. This will be a beneficial practice to institute in urban settings to better prepare teachers in training for the challenges of the classroom.

Several additional agencies are noted as having provided support to the Detroit 90/90 schools. These organizations include the Thompson Foundation, whose mission is to help low income people rise out of poverty and become self-sufficient, the Michigan Science Center, which provides opportunities for students and teachers to combine classroom learning with hands-on exhibits and interaction with professional engineers and scientists, Project Lead the Way, which brings high-quality STEM programming aimed at inspiring a new generation of innovators, University of Michigan, whose faculty and engineers develop advanced engineering-related lessons, providing experiences and career exposure for both students and staff, and Mosaic Youth Theatre of Detroit, whose goal will be to infuse the arts into UPSM, transitioning the focus of educational efforts from STEM to STEAM.

The applicant intends to build the capacity of school staff, by equipping staff with supports to assess student and family needs. Matrix Human services will provide formal training based on eight modules which include

- Understanding Poverty
- Breaking the Cycle of Poverty
- Building Significant, Empowering Relationships with Families
- Collaborative Goal-Mapping with Families
- Supporting Families in Planning and Achieving Goals
- Mobilizing Resources for and with Families
- Empowering Families & Encouraging Volunteerism
- Administering & Evaluating the Transition to Success Model

The school gathers and confidentially shares with staff demographic and other data likely to indicate the need for supports that Matrix will provide. Teachers meet regularly to discuss student progress, challenges, and behavior. This information will further support identification of students and families that could benefit from support.

Matrix will use the Matrix Arizona Self Sufficiency Model to guide clients through the Matrix program, which has eighteen Domains, each of which is a barrier to self-sufficiency. Individual client's progress on the Model and collective clients' progress will form the basis to evaluate effectiveness. The applicant includes 10 population-level desired results for participating students. Eight of these are focused on educational goals of decreasing the numbers of students behind grade level, increasing levels of mastery, and increasing the portion of students on track for college and career readiness. The final two desired results focus on family and community. One result involves reducing disciplinary actions through the support programs implemented by Matrix Human Services. A second desired result is an increase in the level of engagement as a result of the services provided by Matrix Human Services.

As a result of a sound plan to integrate public or private resources in a partnership with Matrix Human Services which augments the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to address the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of the participating students and their families, giving highest priority to its students of poverty, UPSM scores at the lower end of the high range in the Competitive Preference Priority.

## Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>
<p><b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Through its partnerships with Matrix Human Services and Grand Valley State University (GVSU), the applicant has added strategies to build upon the core assurance areas to provide support to students. Matrix Human Services strives to break the cycle of poverty by transitioning families from dependency to self-sufficiency through a structured, comprehensive, integrated, scientifically driven existing and established system of care. Through the assistance of this agency, poor students will have basic needs met, improving their abilities to focus on academics and achievement.</p> <p>Grand Valley University will work with teachers and pre-service teachers to build and strengthen the teaching capacity of the district. Teachers will become skilled in differentiating instruction to meet the needs of the school community. Internships of pre-service teachers will assist in providing valuable real classroom experience, while also providing opportunities to recruit the most qualified interns. As a result of these efforts, student access to highly effective teachers will be increased.</p> <p>While the combination of the efforts described will help the applicant to narrow achievement gaps and promote college and career readiness, evidence provided does not support the capacity of UPSM to turn around its lowest performing schools and effectively personalize learning. As a result, Absolute Priority 1 is not met.</p>		

<b>Total</b>	210	86
--------------	-----	----