

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2017 11:06 AM

Technical Review

Applicant: Lansing School District (U374A170037)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Evidence of Support		
1. Evidence of Support	30	30
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	18
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	4
Total	115	112

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - TSL - 10: 84.374A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Lansing School District (U374A170037)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Evidence of Support

1. In determining evidence of support of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

General:

Overall Comments:

The applicant thoroughly described a plan as part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning to support rigorous academic standards for students.

Strengths (if applicable):

The overall proposed project has demonstrated it is a part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The district's strategies are well aligned to Michigan state's strategies with purposeful statements on practical and measureable outcomes at the district level. The identified goals within the strategy have clearly identified linkages to educator effectiveness and improving student achievement trends while fitting in the larger context of the community.

There is evidence that the goals of the project will not only impact the quality of education experiences in Lansing's high need or impoverished schools but also support district-wide reform. Based on the statement of commitment to a renewal project in Lansing, the project has the potential for greater success outcomes by leveraging it alongside district mandates, concerns for stagnating or at-risk communities, and improving academic and social outcomes. To that end, the proposed project clearly articulates the need, context, and strategies for implementing the project as a part of a broad transformation supporting the community at-large.

Page e22-23

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of the project services.

Sub Question

General:

Overall Comments:

A plan to involve collaborative partners is detailed extensively by the applicant, which increases the effectiveness of project services.

Strengths (if applicable):

Given the proposed nature of the project, collaboration with key partners is an integral part of the strategy. The proposal demonstrates a clear mapping of project partners and their core responsibilities relative to the proposed goals of the Rewarding Educator Achievement and Performance (REAP) project. It is important to note the array of partners leveraged from the Michigan Department of Education to independent coaches to support the efforts outlined in the project. The proposed effectively demonstrates the maximization of these services by balancing the training, coaching, evaluation, and observation requirements to ensure the project is piloted well.

The identified partners also help to support the overall integration of key expertise to ensure the program is fully deployed for sustainment. The involvement of local / regional / national organizations demonstrates the commitment to bringing a range of perspectives while increasing the program's overall capacity. The appropriateness of the select partner involvement is exceptional and supports the strategic goals and aims outlined for implementing the project.

Page e27-28

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

Reader's Score:

- 3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)), using community, State, and Federal resources.**

General:

Overall Comments:

The applicant described the current district transformation plan that will allow the new recruitment strategies to build on related efforts to improve relevant outcomes.

Strengths (if applicable):

The project is set forth within a few initiatives. It is clear that the project will help to substantiate district-wide reform by 1) impact efforts for district-wide improvement that leads to positive social and academic outcomes for high-need students, 2) expanding reform to focus attention and resources on the improvement of instruction and 3) school leadership aligned to newly adopted state of Michigan policies pertaining to teacher and principal quality. This is extremely important in leveraging other efforts in conjunction with the project to increase stakeholder buy-in and to ensure long term gains are met through sustained systems, practices, and policies that are supported by the district reform.

In this regard, the project clearly demonstrates both alignment with the State department of education and similar efforts centered on district improvement. Additionally, it differentiates itself based on its tailored focus to teacher and school leadership quality to ensure the impact of educator quality retention is clearly realized. In particular, the given strategies within the context of the reform and other efforts can only support and strengthen the district

Sub Question

transformation and impact sought by concentrating efforts to improve high needs schools. This is important since 26 out of 27 of the schools are classified this way and the data demonstrates that improvements in the quality of education could be equally impactful to the struggling community.

Page e27

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

Reader's Score:**Selection Criteria - Need for Project**

1. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

General:

Overall Comments:

The state assessment data was cited to show systemic issues that will address the needs of students at-risk of educational failure.

Strengths (if applicable):

The proposed project provides sufficient data to support that its services will address the needs of students at risk of educational failure. Based on the geographic and demographic information provided the district landscape consists predominantly of high need schools; serving a range of vulnerable students. The data clearly points out the disparities in achievement scores across the district between high performing and low performing elementary, middle and high schools. Coupled with the comparative gaps in achievement and unequal distribution of highly effective educators across the lowest performing schools, the proposed project makes a clear distinction between sources of the problem and how the services and goals will seek to provide a long term solution for the inequity of teacher quality.

Therefore, strong support is given based on the need and proposed strategy alignments. The project's design and rationale further clarify how balancing the inequities and implementing an educator centric approach to tackling many of the associated problems of educator effectiveness and student achievement are closely tied to supporting at-risk student populations both inside and outside of the classroom. Thus, closing the achievement gaps in lowest performing schools and redistributing or building the capacity for highly effective educators and school leaders across all schools.

Page e19-20

Sub Question

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

Reader's Score:

- 2 (2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.**

General:

Overall Comments:

The applicant thoroughly identified the nature and magnitude of gaps and opportunities to improve student services, infrastructure, and opportunities with the proposed project.

Strengths (if applicable):

Specific gaps in services have been identified. More importantly opportunities to improve various services and the infrastructure have been clearly and succinctly addressed in the proposed project. The proposal demonstrates a good understanding of the current weaknesses and has provided clear evidence of data supporting the identified gaps.

Identified gaps in student access to effective educators in high-need schools; outlined are five factors determining the gaps and magnitude. Of these factors impacting the equity gaps, clear strategies to close the gaps were defined. In addition, the strategic alignments with Michigan Department of Education (MDE) clearly provide a pragmatic and achievable approach to addressing the gaps through the proposed project with tactical and objective means for reaching the goals and implementing new strategies at the district level. It is evident opportunities for addressing the problem have been clearly identified and outlined based on the prognosis.

Page e19-22; e31

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the Project Design

- 1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.

General:

Overall Comments:

The applicant provided a strong rationale for the project by connecting the premise of educator/leader effectiveness, retention, and student achievement.

Strengths (if applicable):

There is strong rationale for the project. Given the district composition, the disproportionate allocation of human resources amongst the disparities in student achievement and educator performance, and goal for district reform, the proposed project connects the premise of educator/ leader effectiveness, retention, and student achievement. In this regard, there is applicable and sound strategies are displayed to address the gaps and needs of the Lansing School District and provide overall support to existing efforts to improve the education system and community. Additional evidence supports Lansing's ability to administer the grant based on past experience with awards and similar programs.

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

General:

Overall Comments:

The program design provides for collaborative planning and is strongly aligned to state reform initiatives. The proposed project is appropriate and will address the needs of the target population.

Strengths (if applicable):

The program design demonstrates collaborative planning and strong alignment to state reform initiatives. The research and review of human capital systems, performance based compensation strategies, educator evaluation and improvement plans is well integrated and documented throughout the project plan. This is highly commendable given the focus on reform and support requirements to make this program highly successful are interdependent with other statewide and district efforts.

The research based strategies and soundness of the program's plan demonstrates high quality and attention to program design based on the components and summary of the REAP logic model. There is strong evidence based on their assessment of effective practice in implementation and a clear framework for project evaluation based on core performance management goals and metrics. Again, the strategic framework for this project is clear, incorporates a range of stakeholders, accounts for impact, and demonstrates focus on high need schools.

Page e32-34

Weaknesses (if applicable):

Sub Question

No weaknesses identified

Reader's Score:

3. (3) The extent to which the grant activities will be evaluated, monitored, and reported to the public.

General:

Overall Comments:

The applicant thoroughly described how the grant activities will be evaluated, monitored, and reported to the public.

Strengths (if applicable):

Evaluations used for this process are clear. There are two interconnected tiers of support described by which defined tools and instruments are described for each area. Multiple measures speak to the strength of the program and the data objectives of the project. A cross sector of measures have been outlines to support project sustainment, ongoing tracking, and reporting. At length, the program's evaluation methods and frameworks for deployment are detailed, research based, and strategic. The evaluation methods range from program level to individual performance. The comprehensive approach to evaluation demonstrates strong support for the grant activities full implementation as well as probability of learning and integration for continuous improvement throughout the district.

Page e35- e51.

Weaknesses (if applicable):

The applicant did not include a plan that describes the evaluation frequency. The plan included in the application contains yearly increments which does not allow for frequent monitoring of project objectives.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

General:

Overall Comments:

The management plan was clearly defined with appropriate timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths (if applicable):

Lansing School District which has experience with grant administration will serve as the fiscal agent of REAP. The grant management plan provides detailed measures for (1) Equal Access; (2) Timely Implementation; (3) Budget Oversight; (4) Procedures; (5) Personnel; (6) Timeline; (7) Feedback and (8) Dissemination of Results. The quality management plan is well constructed, detailed, and clear. The timeline is for five years and includes tactical key objectives by quarter and a responsibility assignment matrix for accountability. The details of the plan will serve well during the deployment cycles and phases of the project. They are clearly defined and measurable goals to support the implementation of project plan.

Page e51-e56

Weaknesses (if applicable):
No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

1. (1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

General:

Overall Comments:

The plan for continued support was adequate described in the application. The applicant identified letters of support that demonstrate the commitment to the project.

Strengths (if applicable):

Continued support after federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support is fully outlined in the proposal. Key stakeholders such as the Board of Education to the Central Office to School Leaders to Teachers, Superintendent Canul, and school district support are well documented.

The original intent and design of the REAP program was completed in collaboration with a Planning Task Force comprised of district administrators, human resource professionals, finance officers, curriculum specialists, school principals, teachers, non-instructional professionals and union leaders. The collaborative produced an assessment of needs to address reform strategies demonstrating vested stakeholder interest, promoted widespread educator buy-in and support of Human Capital Management System (HCMS), and the ongoing development and implementation of program initiatives. In furtherance, the commitment for matched funds solidifies the support and how the REAP plan will be embedded in to the district's infrastructure for continuous improvement. Again, the collaborative nature of the planning, choice of key partners, and supported program infrastructure provide strong potential for long-term success.

Page e56

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency of organization at the end of the Federal funding.

Sub Question

General:

Overall Comments:

The collaborative partners identified in the proposal developed a comprehensive plan that describes how the schools will continue addressing the needs of educators and students beyond the grant.

Strengths (if applicable):

The highly collaborative planning and design of REAP was established to increase the likelihood that educators would adopt and integrate outlined strategies into daily practice. The incorporation of the proposed strategies and project elements has “manageable continuation expenses.” As deemed in the project narrative, costs will be covered through the district and school budgets.

From the beginning the planning and instrumentation of preliminary discovery strategies demonstrated strong potential for ongoing program implementation and integration. As a result, sustainable practices were built into the collaborative planning process to ensure REAP schools were able to meet the ongoing needs of educators and students beyond the program’s federal funding. Again, the proposed project includes detailed sustainable strategies for comprehensive HCMS, educator quality support and partnerships. To that end, there is strong potential and rationale for the incorporation of the program based on the matching funds, budget considerations, and strategic alignments with MDE and Lansing District Schools (LDS) goals.

Page e56-e58

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators

- 1. Projects that are designed to address the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both teachers and School Leaders, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA or LEAs the project will serve. At a minimum, applicants must:**

(1) Identify the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA(s) the project will serve;

(2) Identify relevant factors used in determining such gaps, such as data on availability of school resources, staffing patterns, school climate, and educator support; and

(3) Describe how the strategies proposed for closing the identified gaps are aligned to and are consistent with the strategies identified in the State's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, approved by the Department in 2015.

General:

Factor/Sub-criterion

- (1) Identify the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA(s) the project will serve;

Overall Comments:

The applicant thoroughly addressed the gaps and weaknesses in student access to effective teachers. The plan includes significant detail that explains how effective teachers will be utilized to support the schools across the Local Educational Agency (LEA).

Strengths (if applicable):

As explained in the gaps and weaknesses, the competitive preference priority is clearly stated and constitutes a look at the disparities across high performing and low performing schools in comparison to the inequities in educator and school leader quality across the LDS alongside lowest poverty schools and highest poverty schools to illustrate gaps and the distinction between "high needs". LDS a predominantly high need school district with 26 out of 27 schools classified in this category based on the Free and Reduced Lunch federal guidelines meets this criteria indiscriminately based on the data presented in the project proposal.

The project proposal does an excellent job of presenting the insufficiencies within the LDS and connecting the purpose to improve equitable access to effective educators by 1) providing data on the enrollment and composition of the student teacher population, 2) defining the correlation between effectiveness and student and or teacher performance, and 3) depicting the relevance of proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math between schools with high versus low performance and educator effectiveness.

Page e19

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

(2) Identify relevant factors used in determining such gaps, such as data on availability of school resources, staffing patterns, school climate, and educator support; and

Overall Comments:

The applicant identified factors that substantiate the need for the proposed project.

Strengths (if applicable):

Factors for determining gaps were well outlined. The applicant included significant data that describes the level of experienced and qualified educators (pgs. e90-e98). The rationale for identified gaps was met with strong strategies to support closing the gaps. Strategic plan alignment demonstrated a fully sustainable approach to participating in state plans and meeting department of education goals.

Page e22

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

(3) Describe how the strategies proposed for closing the identified gaps are aligned to and are consistent with the strategies identified in the State's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, approved by the Department in 2015.

Overall Comments:

The strategies proposed on pages e99-e101 thoroughly describe a comprehensive plan to close the identified gaps that are aligned to and are consistent with the State's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators.

Strengths (if applicable):

The proposed project plan for Lansing School District has aligned its strategies to (MDE) strategies. A table was constructed with specific strategies to demonstrate clear alignment. District strategies are well documented, clear, and concise. The plan described on pages e99-e101 describes how the school district intends to engage the MDE during the implementation of the project to act in an advisory capacity to further assure alignment.

Page e22-e23

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

- 1. Projects that are designed to attract, support, and retain a diverse and effective workforce, including effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, from historically underrepresented populations. At minimum, applicants must provide:**

A description detailing their commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse workforce.

General:

Factor/Sub-criterion

- (1) A description detailing their commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse workforce.

Overall Comments:

The applicant was thorough and thoughtful in providing a detailed plan that describes the commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse workforce.

Strengths (if applicable):

The project proposal fully outlines the LDS commitment to diversity in the workforce. Under the Management Plan there are stipulations for implementing equal access Initiatives and under partnerships there are strategies. A description detailing the commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse workforce is explained on pages e23 and e24, which describes how the applicant intends to honor the commitment to the project.

Page e22

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No Weaknesses Identified

(2) Their plan for attracting, supporting, and retaining diverse Educators.

Overall Comments:

The plan for attracting, supporting, and retaining diverse educators is thoroughly defined on pages e23 and e24.

Strengths (if applicable):

A focus on leveraging regional collaboration efforts through partnerships with HBCUs to recruit minority educators to teach and lead in Lansing District Schools has been identified as a resource for attracting underrepresented populations. Other partnerships have been vaguely described (Page e23) to support customized recruitment programs and alternative certification methods to recruit a more diverse workforce. The HCMS system has been enhanced to demonstrate investment in supporting and retaining the diverse educators.

The plan for diverse educators is well documented. Multiple strategies exist from recruitment to retention to support the plan. Emphasis on partnership and development are core strategies described to ensure there is a plan for executing recruitment goals, specifically, diverse workforce.

Page e22-24; e35

Weaknesses (if applicable):

Additional strategies for recruitment could be identified.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2017 11:06 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2017 11:24 AM

Technical Review

Applicant: Lansing School District (U374A170037)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Evidence of Support		
1. Evidence of Support	30	30
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	18
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	4
Total	115	112

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - TSL - 10: 84.374A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Lansing School District (U374A170037)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Evidence of Support

1. In determining evidence of support of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

General:

The applicant provided convincing evidence that the proposed project is part of a collaborative effort to improve teaching and learning and supports rigorous standards for students. The district has laid the groundwork in addressing the need to improve teaching and impact student achievement.

Strengths: The district has embarked on numerous initiatives which, in retrospect serve as a foundation for the proposed REAP project. For example, they were successful in passing a bond to improve the infrastructure of campuses and align coursework to career based pathways. They acquired grant funding to create 12 magnet schools and implement strategies to create safe welcoming climates. They were also awarded grants to integrate the arts across disciplines and grades. The workforce has participated in training about student expectations and instructional improvement strategies. They piloted an educator evaluation system using an effectiveness rubric and linked the results to the system to performance based stipends for teachers who met district attendance goals. The proposed project will leverage the resources available locally, regionally, and nationally to improve systems for everyone in the educational community.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of the project services.

General:

Given the description of the partners and their record of success, it is evident that the applicant has created a collaborative that has the capability of maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Strengths: The applicant shows that the entities selected to participate in the proposed project have a wealth of knowledge in the areas of operations, training, educator evaluation and effectiveness, and educator preparation. These areas of expertise are pertinent to the implementation of the proposed project activities. The partners in this initiative are: Ingham ISD, the Michigan Department of Education, Michigan State University, The Marzano Center, Battle for Kids, TNTP, and N.Y.C Leadership Academy.

Sub Question

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)), using community, State, and Federal resources.**

General:

The discussion provides clear evidence that the proposed project is intended to build on similar efforts to improve educator effectiveness and students outcomes.

Strengths: The applicant clearly articulated previous attempts to make improvements across the district that would contribute to gains in social and academic student outcomes. Heretofore, a great deal of attention had been given to student focused activities. However, the district is using this opportunity as a platform to broaden its focus to incorporate strategies that will improve instruction and will lead to desired student outcomes.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:**Selection Criteria - Need for Project**

1. **In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.**

General:

The applicant provided compelling evidence that services of the proposed project will address the needs of students who are facing circumstances that place them at risk of educational failure.

Strengths: Data as recent as 2016 show 42.3% of the children in Lansing live in poverty. This is excessively high when compared to the state poverty rate of 23.7%. The per capita income in Lansing is \$19,430 which is well behind that of the state and nation which are \$26,143 and \$28,555 respectively. 46.1% of the students in the state participate in the Free or Reduced Lunch program, while 67.28% of the students in Lansing qualify for the program. Data show poverty is a risk factor. The applicant provides further evidence that the students are at risk of failure citing the fact that their schools have failed to meet state standards and are in Priority status. According to the applicant 26 of their 27 schools are high need and the district has been assigned a red designation which is the equivalent to an F. Student achievement on state assessments show in 2014-15 71.5% of the 3rd graders scored below basic in ELA and 66.7% scored below basic in math. 76.7% of the 5th grade students scored below basic in English and 90.7% scored below basic in Math. 97.2% of the 4th grade students were below basic in science and 94.2% were below in social studies. 86.9% of the 8th grade students were below basic in English and 95.8% were below in Math. The 7th grade students were below basic in science and social studies with scores of 94.9% and 92.8%. 66.1% of the 11th grade students were below basic in ELA, 90.8% were below basic in math, 90.8% were below basic in science and 79.9% were below basic in social studies. Additionally, the 2014-15 graduation rate for district was 61.65%. All of these support the need to implement an initiative that address systemic issues that ultimately impact student outcomes.

Sub Question

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

The applicant presents information that illustrates overarching needs and gaps in their school district as well as the correlating project strategies to address them.

Strengths: The applicant has four areas of identified need. First, they explicitly state they do not have the resources to implement effectiveness-based HCMS across all school consistently. They do not have the expertise to evaluate educator effectiveness objectively across all schools. They do not have a process to connect educators with support to increase effectiveness. Lastly, they lack strategies and resources to meet the equity plan mandate of the state department of education. Through this project the applicant intends to improve and expand the HCMS and PBCS for the purpose of promoting equity across the district and enhancing educator effectiveness. They will also use training from Marzano to build fidelity and objectivity into the evaluation process. In an effort to connect educators with the support they need, they will use PGPs that are linked to elements of the rating system. To ensure all students have equal access to high quality learning, they will provide professional development for administrators and HCMS personnel that encourages the equitable distribution of highly effective educators in schools around the district using incentives for teachers.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the following factors:

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.

General:

Information presented clearly shows a great deal of research was conducted to support the implementation of the proposed project to address the identified difficulties.

Strengths: The applicant provided convincing evidence that the proposed project is based on sound rationale. Prior to the development of REAP, the applicant convened a Task Force to review systems and strategies to evaluate, train, and reward educators. As a result of their research, they were able to blend components that addressed the need to equitably assess educator performance, increase their effectiveness, and improve student achievement.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Sub Question

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

General:

The applicant provided an excellent description of the steps taken that led to the design for the proposed project to ensure it would address the identified needs.

Strengths: To ensure they were taking the correct approach to address the needs of the proposed population, a Task Force conducted research of human capital management systems, performance-based compensation strategies, educator evaluation protocols and educator improvement plans. The selected design received endorsement as Evidence of Effectiveness studies that meet United States Department of Education What Works Clearinghouse standards. The logic model further supports the design and flow of the project.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the grant activities will be evaluated, monitored, and reported to the public.**

General:

The application contains a well-defined description of the processes that will be used to monitor and report. However, the evaluation of project activities is not thoroughly described.

Strengths: The plan to monitor and report grant activities is thoroughly outlined. For example, information in respect to the progress of the project will be presented through reports, presentations to the Board and other stakeholders. District level personnel will monitor the implementation of the teacher evaluation process to ensure administrators are utilizing the tools equitably.

Weaknesses: The frequency in which the evaluation activities are to occur is not clearly delineated. Therefore, it is not clear if the intervals of evaluation will allow feedback and modification in a timely manner.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

General:

The management plan is solid and contains mechanisms that will support the successful implementation of project activities.

Strengths: The applicant presented a management plan for the proposed project that clearly demonstrates systems will be put in place that will lead to the achievement of the objectives on time and within budget. Additionally, staff and organizational responsibilities are well defined and the timeline, along with the accompanying milestones are successfully outlined. For example, the project director, to be hired at 1.0 FTE will be responsible for maintaining the program documentation. The district finance office will ensure the efficient spending practices are adhered to, the evaluation process will be ongoing. An advisory board will work with the project director to identify other programs and funding sources that can be leveraged to support the proposed project and systemic changes. The timeline, presented for five years captures relevant project activities.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

1. (1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

General:

The sustainability plan is well crafted and demonstrates the applicant has a realistic plan for continuing the project after Federal funding ends.

Strengths: The applicant presented a well-developed plan with plausible strategies for sustaining project activities after Federal funding ends. For instance, there will be an elimination of staff and technology that are needed at the startup of the project as the system will be integrated into the institution. Costs associated with software will become an investment of the institution and training will be conducted online thus eliminating travel expenses. In addition to these changes, the advisory board will continue to cultivate partnerships that will complement the activities of this initiative.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the Federal funding.

General:

The applicant showed it is very likely that the activities of the project will be integrated into the district after funding.

Strengths: The applicant thoroughly demonstrates the intent to incorporate the aspects of this project into their evaluation practices and training activities. They will also use these activities to build educator effectiveness tools that lead to positive student outcomes. For instance, they will continue to engage stakeholders through the advisory group for the purpose of ensuring the strategies that are being incorporated are addressing the equity gap and that students have access to qualified teachers.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators

1. Projects that are designed to address the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both teachers and School Leaders, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or

how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA or LEAs the project will serve. At a minimum, applicants must:

(1) Identify the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA(s) the project will serve;

(2) Identify relevant factors used in determining such gaps, such as data on availability of school resources, staffing patterns, school climate, and educator support; and

(3) Describe how the strategies proposed for closing the identified gaps are aligned to and are consistent with the strategies identified in the State's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, approved by the Department in 2015.

General:

The applicant clearly outlined circumstances that impede student access to effective educators within its district. Recognizing these, a targeted effort ensued to determine the best strategies to address the identified deficits. The chosen approach will work in concert with the State plan to increase student access to excellent educators.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant provides strong evidence that it is keenly aware of the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers and/or School Leader in their High-Need Schools. The identified gaps include a disparity in the ethnicity of teachers and students, a disparity in the effectiveness of educators in highest performing and lowest performing schools, and a disparity in the effectiveness of educators in low-poverty schools and high-poverty schools. They convened a Task Force to pinpoint the difficulties as well as the most effective strategies to address the identified difficulties.

(2) The applicant conducted a comprehensive review of data to determine the gaps in their system that are contributing to the lack of teacher effectiveness and student outcomes. A correlation was drawn between poverty rates on various campuses, as determined by Free or Reduced Lunch percentages, and educator effectiveness. Data were also reviewed in regard to turnover rates as well as student performance in English and Math as correlates with teacher effectiveness.

(3) The applicant thoroughly describes how the strategies proposed for closing the identified gaps are aligned and consistent with the strategies identified in the State's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, approved by the Department in 2015. In an effort to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, the state of Michigan intends to create an infrastructure that supports the ongoing identification and evaluation of strategies that focus the removal of barriers that impede access to effective educators. They will also pilot strategies that are designed to improve educator retention in high-poverty and high-minority schools. The applicant, in response to the State plan will conduct forums to discuss ways to close equity gaps and cultural proficiency. They will also make data-driven decisions and improve their recruitment practices. New teachers will be supported as early as induction. Mentors will be assigned to new teachers and they will have growth plans. Further, leadership opportunities will be made available to support those who wish to advance within the district.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. Projects that are designed to attract, support, and retain a diverse and effective workforce, including effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, from historically underrepresented populations. At minimum, applicants must provide:

A description detailing their commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse workforce.

General:

The applicant's plan to attract, support, and retain a diverse and effective workforce, including effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, from historically underrepresented populations is expansive. In addition to working with Michigan State University and the University of Michigan, the applicant will recruit candidates from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The plan does not however, fully explain how the applicant intends to balance the campuses in this districtwide initiative.

Strengths: In attracting a diverse workforce, the applicant intends to partner with colleges and universities who prepare highly qualified educators. They will actively pursue partnerships with HBCUs in this regard. They will support the further development of the entire workforce through targeted and sustained professional development activities. In regard to retention, teachers who remain in priority or focus schools for three or more years consecutively will receive bonus points.

Weaknesses: The application does not clearly demonstrate how the partnership with HBCUs will change the complexion of the campuses. According to the applicant, more than 80% of the teachers district-wide are White while 74% of the student population is not white. Recruiting teachers that mirror diversity of the student population does not speak to anticipated attrition or the methods that will be used to retain the diverse recruits.

Reader's Score: **4**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2017 11:24 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2017 11:34 AM

Technical Review

Applicant: Lansing School District (U374A170037)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Evidence of Support		
1. Evidence of Support	30	30
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	18
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	4
Total	115	112

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - TSL - 10: 84.374A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Lansing School District (U374A170037)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Evidence of Support

1. In determining evidence of support of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA has proposed the adoption of the Rewarding Educator Achievement and Performance (REAP) program to aide in student achievement. Specifically, they have documented that high poverty campuses have less access to effective teachers (p. e21). Lansing School District presented evidence that noted the level of academic proficiency of students on some campuses and discloses the previous school year state rating (p. e29, e30, e34). Academic improvement, through learning and support, is solely reliant on the execution of the REAP program.

Strengths (if applicable):

The presentation of achievement data noting student deficiencies helps to present a clear picture of the status of student academic achievement. The adoption of the REAP program will support the district proposal to implement higher teacher standards to ultimately support high academic standards. In addition, the LEA details previous efforts to promote positive school reform through Michigan Standards Alignment/Training and Instructional Improvement (p. e25).

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of the project services.

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA proposed partnership with seven entity partnerships through the REAP program to specifically support the newly proposed Human Capital Management System HCMS (p. e26-27). Based on the description, the services focused on coaching and training for teachers and principals while implementing the Marzano Model.

Strengths (if applicable):

The proposed plans linked previous support efforts to new partnerships such as continued effectiveness alignment

Sub Question

and training with Ingham ISD and new support initiatives with the Michigan Department of Education. Value-added student assessment training will be provided by Batelle for Kids and support for the Master and Mentor teacher will be executed by the Marzano Center (p.e26).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:

- 3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)), using community, State, and Federal resources.

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA listed five previous efforts to improve the outcomes of the school district. Two efforts (Promise Pathways, Magnet Schools) specifically align to the intent of the proposed project (p. e25). As stated in the proposed project, the LEA seeks to build their HCMS, educator evaluation system, and performance based compensation program. A substantial amount of information was presented that supported their past efforts.

Strengths (if applicable):

The previously demonstrated support and efforts to implement change within the district were identified as strengths. The LEA incorporated complementary projects that targeted the social and emotional state of students in the district (p.e27) The presence of these former programs will lead to the district accomplishing the anticipated outcomes.

Weaknesses (if applicable):
No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

- 1. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question

- 1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA addressed several extensive barriers that prevented progress from occurring in their district. The applicant detailed the sub groups (English Language Learners, Special Education) total percentages compared to the total district population. However, the applicant did not provide specific services or improvement strategies that will address the needs of these student populations (p e29 –e32).

Strengths (if applicable):

The LEA was able to identify the some of the needs that were associated with the at-risk population. REAP improvement strategies (p. e31) will indirectly address the needs of the student populations. The address is indirect

Sub Question

through the Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports. The LEA documents that TSL funding will provide resources that will promote student and educator achievement (p. e32).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:

2 (2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA specifically identifies and addresses four gaps that will be addressed through the use of grant funding. These gaps note districtwide areas of refinement and expressed how the proposed entities will help improve and reinforce the effectiveness after implementation. The support will be carried out in campuses designated as Tier 1 and/or Tier 2.

Strengths (if applicable):

The use of REAP is highlighted for every identified gap concerning the need for the project and distinguishes services that will be offered to Tier 1 and Tier 2 campuses through REAP. The LEA acknowledged that their current systems do not support the current challenges that the school district is faces (p. e32). The LEA offered adequate detail and evidence of support that links student achievement data to REAP improvement strategies (p. e30).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the following factors:

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA provided a well-developed rationale for selecting REAP to be implemented districtwide. The district designated a Task Force that conducted research and reviewed the existing systems in Lansing School District. The LEA provided quoted evidence that validated their use of funding and project requirements (p. e32-33). The LEA stated that their Task Force was intentional when selecting improvement strategies to impact effectiveness.

Strengths (if applicable):

Evidence of effectiveness rationales are given to define every major program to be implemented. Six specific programs are mentioned (p. e33) and the REAP logic model states that the improvement of student achievement is a result of effective educators being accessible in struggling schools. The district's proposed perspectives (REAP)

Sub Question

are research based for the following indicators: evidence of effectiveness; evidence of promise. The adoption of this program fully validates implementation of the proposed instructional model, and this selection undergirds the framework of the entire project (p. e33).

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:**2. (2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.****General:**

Overall Comments:

The LEA plans to prioritize services through REAP to specified campuses. Tier 1 and Tier 2 campuses are classified through state designated letter grades. At Tier 1 and Tier 2 campuses, designated services will take place to ensure project fulfillment. The LEA noted that 25.9% of campuses in the district received the lowest letter grades from the state.

Strengths (if applicable):

The LEA provided an outline of support strategies that will occur at Tier 1 and Tier 2 campuses. The LEA provided an overview of effectiveness competencies for teachers and principals under the Marzano Model (p. e39). Strengths were identified for this sub-criterion because the efforts to prioritize services are further noted. The LEA provided four objectives that focus on improvement of educator effectiveness, increase student achievement, and effectively implementing the human capital management system (p. e30).

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:**3. (3) The extent to which the grant activities will be evaluated, monitored, and reported to the public.****General:**

Overall Comments:

The LEA provided an outside firm that will be utilized to evaluate grant activities. Profiles were given for individuals that will carry out evaluative services to the district (p. e47). A FORECAST model will be used to evaluate services to be reviewed. Within this framework, evaluators will rate grant activities on the model, marker, measure, and meaning. there is a lack of information concerning public notification of the grant evaluation.

Strengths (if applicable):

Goals and objectives are clearly stated and measurable for baseline data to be extracted. In addition, the goals and objectives allow the district to begin the rated and regulation of effectiveness per the implementation of REAP. (p. e48).

Weaknesses (if applicable):

The LEA failed to note the frequency of evaluation for the proposed grant activities. Only grant activities were noted on the goal, objectives and project indicator table. Evaluation frequency will enable the district determine the effectiveness levels during the year of implementation and serve as a template for reflexive practices to occur.

Reader's Score:**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA presented a well-developed guide and specified eight elements that would contribute to the grant management plan. These elements specifically address the district responsibilities/accountability, timelines, and track for achieving goals (p. e48) noted in the grant application. A milestone implementation timeline was also presented that notes year 1-5 of goals to accomplish by the district (p. e54).

Strengths (if applicable):

The LEA presented detailed plans that established the federal mandates of the award recipients. The district plans to employ a well-qualified personnel to lead, manage, evaluate, and guide the district with fidelity. The management goals of the proposed project are ambitious as they required that 100% of district educators to play intricate roles in their effectiveness rating, instructional learning, and support (p. e48).

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

1. (1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

General:

Overall Comments:

Key elements of the grant are addressed for continuance such as HCMS, quality supports, and partnership after the grant period elapses. The LEA offers a sustainability plan after grant funds are no longer available and plan to work with the teacher union to negotiate a salary schedule to be developed after federal funds have depleted (p. 56-57).

Strengths (if applicable):

Based on the presented information, it is evident that the key elements of educator support and renewal through REAP will continue. The district, program administrators, and the newly created advisory board will lead the sustainability plan after grant funds are no longer available (p. e58).

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No weakness identified

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency of organization at the end of the Federal funding.

Sub Question

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA incorporates an adequate plan to address project purposes and activities by the end of the grant period. The district expressed the intent to position schools to continue with the REAP program so that equity, effectiveness, and student achievement will continue (p. e58).

Strengths (if applicable):

REAP sustainability strategies were tabled at the Tier 1 and Tier II level. The plan proposes that the school district will work with the salary schedule for teachers with union representatives.

Weaknesses (if applicable):

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators

1. **Projects that are designed to address the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both teachers and School Leaders, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA or LEAs the project will serve. At a minimum, applicants must:**

(1) Identify the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA(s) the project will serve;

(2) Identify relevant factors used in determining such gaps, such as data on availability of school resources, staffing patterns, school climate, and educator support; and

(3) Describe how the strategies proposed for closing the identified gaps are aligned to and are consistent with the strategies identified in the State's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, approved by the Department in 2015.

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA specifically identifies and addresses four well-developed gaps, based on need that will be addressed through the use of grant funding. These gaps note districtwide areas of refinement and express how the proposed entities (effective teachers and campus during implementation. The support will be carried out in campuses designated as Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 (p. e34). The LEA provided an adequate view of needs before gaps were identified. The foundation of these needs were based on the lack of student academic achievement and effective educators in the classroom (p. e30). REAP improvement strategies specifically addressed the noted gaps by the district. The LEA provided adequate alignment district strategies to the Michigan Department of Education strategies. The district strategies were further developed to address the needs and identification of gap (p. e31). The district documented that it currently lacked the strategies to meet the equity plans of the state department of education.

Strengths (if applicable):

The district expresses the intent and focus of the proposed project through the REAP program incorporates by providing data that identifies high needs campuses and assessing the effectiveness level of classroom instructors. The LEA incorporated the REAP program to drive professional development in the district. This incorporation will assist campuses in changing school climate and ensuring that there is an adequate amount of resources and support available to facilitate grant activities. Because of these inserted programs and the elevated support the school climate is likely to change. The comprehensive alignment between state strategies, district strategies, and the proposed project plan are identified strengths in the proposal. The district has aligned the policies of Michigan Department of Education strategies to local strategies including research validated evaluation, effective student growth measures, and educator effectiveness. Because of their prior success, the district commits to revising its approach to instructional model that were implemented

(p. e28).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
No weakness identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

- 1. Projects that are designed to attract, support, and retain a diverse and effective workforce, including effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, from historically underrepresented populations. At minimum, applicants must provide:**

A description detailing their commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse workforce.

General:

Overall Comments:

The LEA provided information for recruitment, retention, hiring, placement, promotion, dismissal, and tenure. The LEA offered statements of assurance that the district would be committed to recruiting and hiring a diverse workforce. However, besides recruiting at Historically Black College Universities, there is a lack of a plan to address the creation and maintenance of a diverse workforce (p. e36). The LEA offered statements of assurance that the district would be committed to recruiting and hiring a diverse workforce. These statements aligned with federal law concerning non-discriminative employer practices; however lack innovative methods for attracting and supporting diverse educators. The LEA only mentioned one main action method to attract minority educators through recruitment efforts.

Strengths (if applicable):

The LEA proposes to link with organizations of color to promote a more diverse teacher population. The LEA formulated a plan to address diversity in the school district. The plan includes engaging and hiring teachers from ethnic groups that are not proportionally represented in the current Lansing School District teacher population.

Weaknesses (if applicable):

A plan to address the comparative demographic stats of the almost 83% white teacher staff and 74% minority population is limited. The LEA noted acknowledgement of this disparity but fails to note a more defined plan of integration in the existing majority teacher population (p.e36-37). The LEA fails to specifically discuss how they will retain diverse educators other than the performance based compensation system and enhanced human capital management system. In particular, the LEA did not fully detail how they will address, continually support, and retain the new ethnic population of educators that will be hired by the district (p. e.24).

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2017 11:34 AM