



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0102WA-1 for Clover Park School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

In a simple statement overview, Clover Park School District wants to develop a cadre of National Board Certified Teachers as a way of developing a personalized learning system. The articulation of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision is provided as a high quality plan with goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties. The plan does provide a summary narrative of the vision and it discusses the district's work in the four core educational assurance areas.

The district has provided curriculum guides that are aligned to state and national college and career standards.

The data systems used are off the shelf programs that support the academic program. They are Measures of Academic Performance and DIBLES, both of which are assessment type programs.

The district has dealt with a poor performing school by replacing the principal and 50 percent of the staff. The state superintendent has provided coaches to the district to work with other low performing schools with a program called Indistar.

Supporting teachers are discussed through their plan of professional development and coaching. The recruitment section is mentioned via their plan to work with student teachers in the district. Rewarding teachers are discussed through additional pay for Nationally Board Certified Teachers. Retention of teachers is not discussed.

The plan is to have the teachers moving through the 5 year National Board Certification Program use information of student readiness level, learner profile, interests, and previous experiences to "perform targeted individual interventions as needed." This becomes the basis for their personalized learning system. Their portfolio must contain examples of how they support personalized learning. Teachers collect evidence and feedback from students and use this to adjust instructional approaches to improve academic achievement.

The classroom environment will be tailored to meet student needs. This begins with assessment which results in curriculum delivery and teaching methods tailored to the student. Students must master proficiency before advancing. Resident teachers provide the students with choices which makes the students co-designers learning pathway.

This section makes a marginal case for linking National Board Certified Teachers and personalized learning plans. The research proving the link between their coaching program, reflective meetings and the National Board Certification process is sparse. The building of a cadre of National Board Certified Teachers is a good goal for all districts because of the research that is provided in the proposal. The link to a personalized learning plan is weak.

Many of the aspects of a personalized learning system are covered in the vision. The assurance areas are addressed. The research on acceleration of student achievement is provided. Deepening of learning, increased effectiveness of teachers and expanded student access to effective teachers would be addressed with a NBCT program. Data on decreasing achievement gaps and increasing graduation rates or preparation for college/careers is limited. The development of a personalized learning system which supports decreasing gaps and graduation rates is important for the grant. The focus is on development of National Board Certified Teachers, not gap closure or graduation rate improvement.

The data in this section supports a middle score.

**Strengths:**

- Support for staff through a medical resident model is identified
- Reflective roundtables will be used to create a professional learning community and provide feedback on instructional styles
- Support to staff is also evidenced by after-school academies, professional development release days 2 times a

- month and extra money an tuition bonuses for staff moving through the National Board Certification Program.
- NBCT mentors will be used to guide student teachers and first year teachers through their 5 year professional development.
- Consultant Teachers will be trained to gather student data from observations which will give teachers feedback on practice as well as their curriculum content.
- Reflective meetings will support new teachers and move from the needs of first year teachers to data team meetings.
- The National Board Certification training program provides support to new teachers through after school meetings, development of a portfolio and coaching.
- The steps used in turning around their low performing elementary school have become a model for improving schools in other districts of the state.
- A state-based program called Indistar provides coaching, special financing, technology and IEP help for some of their lower performing schools.
- Research studies are presented that show National Board Certified Teachers have an effect of accelerating learning by two months in math and one month in Language Arts.
- The district will use Understanding by Design professional development to improved academic achievement. This evidence based model helps teachers design learning activities to maximize understanding of complex learning goals.
- Coaches who are well versed in Understanding by Design will coach teachers in identifying the type of personalized learning need by each student.

**Weakness**

- Data systems are discussed related to what the district has in place now to assess students. There is no mention of a specific program that will support a personalized learning system.
- The statement using feedback on teacher’s instructional styles is used to provide evidence for closing the achievement gap. No further evidence or data is provided to make this connection.
- The daily meetings between new teachers and the Resident Mentor will be based on an Understanding by Design 2.0 unit planning template. This will guide their development on instructional design related to student needs and building a personalized learning environment. Beyond their description of this event, there is no further evidence or research linking meetings, the template and creating a personalized learning system.
- The focus of this section is on teacher development with an inadequate link to personalized learning.

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

**10**

**5**

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

The district will use their proposal in all 26 schools of the district. Forty National Board Certification slots per year will be made available and these will be allocated based on poverty rates (percent of students who qualify for the National School Lunch Program) to school staff members. This practice has been used on a consistent basis and it targets the neediest schools. This selection process is consistent and allows participation for all schools in the district. Partner universities are identified as National School Certification providers. The implementation process for schools is clear, but the selection process for teachers is undocumented. This rates a medium score.

**Strengths**

- The district has projected that within 4 years of the program implementation, every student will have had at least 2 teachers in this resident program.
- All schools are part of the proposal
- Selection processes defined and matches past practice
- A list of schools is provided as is the specific student demographic information and teacher populations

**Weakness**

- A teacher selection process is not defined. This is an important aspect of the program and developing teachers. Some sort of process needed to be defined such as application process, administrator referral, teachers who have weak test scores, etc.

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

**10**

**6**

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

A Clover Park School District Logic Model is presented and has the elements of inputs, activities, objectives, goals and outcomes as part of the plan. Most of the elements of a high-quality plan are described. Specific responsible parties are not identified or matched with the activities. This project targets teacher development as the vehicle to create personalized learning systems. The personalized student learning process is a secondary outcome to the target of building a cadre of Nationally Board Certified Teachers. Since all schools in the district will be impacted the project, there is projected reform across the district.

In most areas of the logic model, teacher or school activities, objectives or goals are listed above student activities objectives or goals.

The argument that an increase in National Board Certification Teachers will cause all the outcomes listed is not clear. Research was presented that showed an improvement in teaching efficiency (time) but no other research data was provided showing how National Board Certified Teacher impact the other areas (gaps, college enrollment, graduation rate). The goals as indicated in the proposal were rigorous and achievable. Math gaps, the 90% graduation rate, high college enrollment and having 96% effective teachers were strengths. The concentration on National Board Certified Teachers overshadows the goal of creating a personalized learning system. This is evidence for a mid-level score.

**Strengths**

- The outcomes are targeted at improving literacy and math in grades 3, 8 and 10. Decreases in gaps are an outcome in those same grade levels.
- A 90% graduation gap is identified
- A college enrollment rate of 80.6% is identified
- A 96% effective teacher rating is targeted.

**Weakness**

- How outcomes will be measured are not identified.
- The link between National Board Certification and areas such as gap closure, college enrollment rates, and effectiveness of teacher ratings are undocumented.

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

**10**

**7**

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

Clover Park School District describes improved student outcomes in terms of improved student performance on state assessments in literacy and math. Graduation rates and college enrollment rates are also targeted. The only student subgroup shown is low-income, white. Students with disabilities and minorities groups are not shown. The goals were appropriate and achievable. The targets in math, literacy, graduation rate and college enrollment rates were appropriate in a reform proposal. A mid-high score is justified for this section.

**Strengths**

- State test improvement goals of 9.5% over 5 years in grade 3 literacy, of 7.6% in grade 3 math, of 11.9% in grade 8 literacy, of 10.9% in grade 8 math, of 8.6% in grade 10 literacy, and 8.5% in grade 10 math are described.
- Improving gaps in state student achievement tests over 5 years are listed as: 24.6% in grade 3 literacy, 22.6% in grade 3 math, 24.5% in grade 8 literacy, 19.1% in grade 8 math, 24.7% in grade 10 literacy, and 21.5% in grade 10 math
- Graduation rate measured as a 4 year cohort will improve to 90% by the end of the 5 years
- College enrollment rates will equal 80.6% at the end of 5 years.

**Weakness**

- Historical trend test data is not shown. This makes improved student outcome goals hard to determine.
- Low income is the only sub-group identified in the decreasing achievement gap chart
- In a district that has many sub-groups, little data was used to present improvement targets

**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>11</b>

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

Clover Park School District describes some of the successes in academic achievement over the course of the past few years. The information is sparse in nature and only describes achievement gaps (which are not specified) and graduation rates. College enrollment rates have improved at one high school. Persistence rates for 4 years at college are increasing.

Overall there is a lack of detail regarding a clear record of success. The data is limited in nature. Historical trends how all the various subgroups have performed over the years would shed light on how the district has had past successes in academic achievement.

The district has dealt with low achieving schools by replacing the principal and 50% of the staff. Past data is not specified and academic gains after the changes are described. The district says that extra financial assistance has shown to result in improvement. A bit of information as to why these schools ended up in this situation could provide data to support historical improvements. Currently the state provides coaches and an improvement process called Indistar in 3 other buildings. Historical achievement data is not available in the proposal.

Student performance data is available through a variety of means. School improvement plans are based on data. The component where teachers review student data is not described.

Based on the information provided, a mid-range score is justified.

**Strengths**

- District has increased the number of students meeting the state standard by 3% each year over the last 7 years
- A 4% per year closure of the achievement gap is a district goal
- Significant progress has been made on graduation rates. The rates at the 2 high schools were 55% and 45% in 2002. These rates are now 88.4 and 76% and both exceed state averages.
- One high school shows an above the state average on students attending college after graduation.

**Weakness**

- Achievement gaps are not sufficient in detail. Subgroups are not identified nor is the achievement levels of these groups
- Historical data is in a narrative format and lacks details
- High school graduation rates were very low in 2002 and at one school still only 3 out of 4 students graduate.
- Data is provided to the school board, on their web site, during data forum nights, to Parent Teacher Associations and to school councils. There is no evidence that teachers are exposed to data in a formalized process.

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

**5**

**1**

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

The district has included budget documents in the appendix. These include a Local Budget Summary for FY 13-14, General Fund Expenditures and other financing uses for FY 13-14, General Fund Expenditures by object for FY 13-14 and a General Fund Expenditures by program for 2013-14. All of the data is summary in nature. Actual personnel salaries at the school level are not in evidence. Information is published every year but where or how the information is published is undocumented. Based on the sparse narrative and the undocumented evidence of transparency required in this section a low score is appropriate.

**Strengths**

- District data is provided in summary format
- Salary for each personnel member is published every year

**Weakness**

- The manner of publication of budgetary items is not documented
- Local policies, state laws and past practice information for school budgets are not discussed
- School level personnel salaries for instructional staff and teachers are lacking
- The ability to find actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional and support staff is undocumented
- The ability to find non-personnel expenditures at the school level is undocumented

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

**10**

**2**

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

Clover Park School District is a public school district governed by the laws of the state of Washington. The applicant has written four sentences to answer the question related to state context for implementation. There is no mention of a personalized learning system or the environment that may be needed to implement the system. This section is very sparse in nature and only addresses the fact that the district is under state rules, the state superintendent can make rules for public and private schools and state agencies adopt rules to implement the Common School Provisions and federal law. Specific conditions to address a personalized learning system are insufficient. There is no mention of moving from a seat-time model of instruction to a mastery by standard system. Usually changes in state law or local policy needs to be addressed to make that a reality. A low rating is justified.

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

**15**

**5**

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

The Clover Park School district formed a district-wide group called the District Instructional Strategies Committee to work on this grant proposal. The process of engagement and feedback for this grant was very limited in scope. Two sentences described the grant development and feedback process. Feedback was "taken seriously" in the development of the grant. There is no evidence that a broader scope representing the school community was given a chance to provide feedback. The improving of instruction is an important goal and the fact that a committee has been abolished supports the idea of reform. The makeup of the committee shows that most people from the school community have representation and a voice in the topic. The process of establishing the goal of staff retention was not described. The committee was **presented** with the grant idea related to teacher retention. There was no mention of a personalized learning system in this section of the grant. A mid-low score is justified.

Strengths

- The District Instructional Strategies Committee is made up of teachers, administrators, a university liaison, teacher union leaders executive level staff and 3 parents
- District has a committee that is charged with improving teacher instructional practice
- Teacher retention rates are the current focus for the District Committee

Weakness

- The procedure that the District Instructional Strategies Committee uses to target yearly goals is undocumented
- The focus of the committee planning this grant was on teacher retention, not personalized learning
- The committee was "presented" with the concept of this grant rather than developing and refining the proposal based on district data

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>

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

The Clover Park School district sets out a framework for learning in the district. The concept is sparse in nature. The focus is on the development of Nationally Board Certified Teachers rather than the development a a personalized learning system. The evidence of a high quality plan was lacking. The idea is to use what the teachers learn in the program to be certified nationally as the basis for a local personalized learning system. The only research presented about this concept is that in one district National Board Certified teachers shortened learning time for math and language arts.

The district claims to be one of the most diverse in the nation yet there are no details or data presented to show how they will improve the academics of any sub group including high-need students. College and career ready standards are state adopted and part of the local curriculum.

One part of the personalize learning plan is to have students take some sort of assessment. The student and the resident teacher then set out a personalized learning plan using the current courses offered at the school.

Digital learning content is not discussed in this section. This is an important component of a personalized learning system.

The concept of tracking progress toward mastery of college and career ready standards is vague with only a sentence describing the district's data dashboard.

Accommodations and high-quality teaching strategies for high-need students is not discussed.

Overall this is a plan lacking sufficient details. The focus does not address personalized learning systems in an adequate manner. The score for this section is low.

**Strengths**

- Students in the class taught by a National Board Certified teacher learn at faster rates for language arts and math
- Students who have resident teachers have to create a personalized learning plan to meet their college or career goals
- District has many program options for students including vocational courses, college readiness courses, AP, IP Gear Up, Running Start and others
- The diverse student population provides opportunities for exposing individuals to new contexts outside the classroom experience
- The district uses a data dashboard which provides longitudinal student data with sources that include state assessments, district benchmark assessments, information on SAT, ACT and other advanced placement tests
- The state and district have adopted a new teacher evaluation system based on Charlotte Danielson. Principals are being certified as evaluators
- The district has 10 half release days and 2 full day opportunities for professional development
- Their curriculum is aligned to the Common Core State Standards
- District is developing and using formative assessments aligned to classroom standards

**Weakness**

- There is no evidence or research to suggest that 2 teachers in a classroom will help students with their personalized learning plan for college and careers.
- The grant proposes that once a student assessment is taken the student and teacher will determine the course of action for a deep learning experience from the current set of courses offered at the school.
- Because the district is located near a military base, it claims to have one of the most diverse socioeconomic, racial and ethnic populations in the country. This is confusing in light of the lack of gap closing information or academic improvement targets for subgroups
- A data dashboard is used by the district but its link to a personalized learning system is sparse
- Details on the 8 criteria for the new state teacher evaluation system are not described

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

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

The Clover Park School district lays out a plan for the development and support of National Board Certified Teachers. This plan does not have all the components of a high quality plan as defined. The proposal talks about the superintendent's accountability plan, not a specific high quality plan to create a personalized learning system. It does not address the specific target of improving teaching and learning by personalizing the learning environment. It is shown that achievement should be improved based on the data indicated, the plan misses the concept of developing a high quality plan for a personalized learning environment.

College and Career ready standards are required because of state and local district adoption.

The entire plan is based on the National Board Certification training process. It does not describe in detail how this will help high need students or students in other subgroups.

Much research was provided to show the positive impact that a Nationally Board Certified teacher has on student achievement. Shortening instructional time and closing achievement gaps are two that were noted. This process lends itself to building a professional learning community, improving instruction, developing lessons targeted at individual student needs, building strong leadership teams and increasing the number of effective and highly effective teachers available for students.

The state and district has adopted a new teacher evaluation system based on Charlotte Danielson's approach.

Under this plan student achievement could improve. Data presented indirectly shows a relationship to a personalized learning system. The plan misses the target goal for the grant which supports a low-mid score.

**Strengths**

- Teams will be established to build a professional learning community to support instructional improvements and personalized learning.
- National Board Certified teacher training builds knowledge of adaption of content and instruction to student learners
- The district plan to provide coaches for teachers going through the National Board Certification process is modeled on the resident aspect of the medical profession
- The district uses Measures of Academic Performance to track students related to college and career ready standards
- District curriculum and materials are available digitally
- Technology resources include the ability to publish and store documents; web design tools are available for staff use and wireless access points are located throughout the district.
- A Charlotte Danielson Teacher evaluation system has been adopted by the district. Principals must attend training to become credentialed evaluators
- By building a cadre of National Board Certified Teachers, more students will receive instruction from an effective or highly effective teacher
- A five year plan to create and support National Board Certified Teachers is presented. Since it is a district level initiative, the training slots will be prioritized by the Free and Reduced Lunch program data. This will target high poverty schools.
- Data was provided that showcased the effectiveness of Nationally Board Certified Teachers. Research on student achievement, positive effect for minority and low-income students and positive value added data was identified.

**Weakness**

- The district will use the National Board Certification process, the Residency model and the proven expertise of National Board Certified Teachers to create a personalize learning system for students and close achievement gaps. Research data to back achievement gap closure was provided as a web link.
- Much data was provided supporting National Board Certified Teachers but none supported a personalized learning system.

**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:**

The application describes the staffing in place in the Clover Park School District. The description indicates the title and job responsibilities for 2 assistant superintendents, a human resources director, a director of teaching and learning, a director of assessment and evaluation of programs, director of finance, director of compensatory programs, director of special education, a deputy superintendent and a superintendent. This is evidence that the district can support such an initiative.

Although a site council is noted in this section, its actual use and function at the school level is not defined. The use of school leadership teams is not documented.

The ability of a student to progress via mastery of a subject is not in current board policy. The only policy in effect is related to the Carnegie unit and seat time. There is not description of the ability of a student to gain credit via mastery instead of seat time.

The district allows students to retake tests multiple times, until they have shown mastery of the standard. There is no evidence that the district allows mastery of a subject in multiple comparable ways.

There is one sentence that provides information on how the district uses learning resources with high need students. Resources and instructional practices are adaptable and fully accessible to all students. Core and intervention materials have provisions for all learners.

Overall the description in the section is evidence of a traditional school district that has not addressed seat time versus mastery in its local policy. This traditional system runs counter to providing a true personalized learning system. A mid-low score is appropriate.

**Strengths**

- Site-based decision making and budgeting has been a practice of the district.
- Money and staff levels are determined locally

- Students can take tests until they reach mastery of a standard.
- Many schools in the district have adopted a standards-based grading scale.
- Curriculum materials are accessible and adaptable for all students.

Weakness

- Principals decide staffing levels and budgets for their schools. A site council is established via the school-union master agreement. The actual function and use of this council is not defined. There is no evidence that the council has input into local school decision-making.
- The district has no option of providing students the opportunity to advance via mastery of a subject. Seat time is the only method in use at this time.
- There was little evidence of teacher-based teams that review data and support good educational practices at the school level. Teachers are part of the local council. Their role as decision-makers or recommendation body was lacking.

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

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

A specific section answering the questions of D2 could not be found. There is evidence that the district will ensure that all participating students, which in this case is the entire school body, will have access to the content, tools and learning resources provided by their teacher development program.

Any information related to technical support for staff, students and parents is lacking. The district describes a data dashboard and assessment software in other sections but a discussion on inter operable data systems is not in evidence.

The focus of their grant is on teacher development, not a technology infrastructure. Information of the infrastructure component of a personal learning system is sparse. Since data for this section is spread throughout the proposal and the fact there is no discussion on interoperability, a low score is appropriate.

**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:**

Although the logic model addressed earlier in the proposal covers many areas of a high quality plan, this section describes who will do the program evaluation and what data they will gather. The information will be shared in an annual report that will be disseminated to stakeholders. A feedback loop, part of the continuous improvement process is not described. The roundtable mentoring aspect and coaching component, which has been identified as important in the project is not being measured as part of the continuous improvement process. A high quality continuous improvement plan is lacking. A huge financial investment will be targeted at teacher development through the National Board Certification Program. How these investments translate to improved student performance and the development of a personalized data system is not clear. Because aspects of the section are missing and the continuous improvement process misses some critical components cause this to be a low score.

Strengths

- District will bring in an outside contractor with experience in school reform programs to provide and evaluate the plan which will include teacher participation, teacher surveys (that will look at teacher perceptions on growth as an educator), student perceptions (how they felt teachers were aware of their needs), strengths and resources provided, a verbal survey for young students asking about enjoyment of school, and academic outcomes based on state test data.
- State test data will compare student data with teachers participating in the program versus those teachers who are not in the program.

Weakness

- There is no evidence that the district will public ally share information beyond stakeholders.
- Important components of the grant, such as coaching, roundtable professional development sessions are not part of

the evaluation plan.

- There is no evidence of a high quality plan created to implement a continuous improvement process for this proposal. Goals are not identified, activities are not listed, rationale is sparse, and timelines are not evident.

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

**5**

**1**

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

There is no evidence of a high quality plan that addresses ongoing communication and engagement. The narrative in this section describes one process (the Compass System), by which the district can gather information. It also describes that an annual report will be disseminated to stakeholders. Goals, activities, rationale, timelines, and deliverables are not presented. An outside organization—is responsible for the evaluation in this section. A discussion on ongoing communication and engagement is limited in scope. A low score is justified.

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

**5**

**1**

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

Charts are presented in this section of the grant that describe subgroups, baseline data and target data. The charts provide information on the number of students who have effective principals and teachers; third grade literacy state test scores; third grade math state test scores; K-3 students who enjoy being in school; eight grade ACT Explore test composite scores; grades 4-8 state test scores in literacy; math and enjoyment of being in school; the number of low income students who apply for Federal Student College Aid (FAFSA Form); percentage of college graduates or career ready without ACT bonus points; 10th graders who are in the top 2 quartiles of an ACT career readiness measure; and grade 10 state test scores in literacy, math and enjoyment of being in school. The goals appear to be ambitious yet achievable. The socio-emotional data component is measured using the enjoyment of being in school survey. Details of this survey were limited, so the relationship of the survey to the actual requirement is difficult to determine. There is no narrative to accompany this section describing rationale. There is no information on how the measures will impact the actual plan to build a cadre of National School Board Certified Teachers. There is no information on how the measure will impact the development of a personalized learning system. A low score is justified in this section.

**Weakness**

- The only identified subgroup is low income
- There is no evidence of a rationale for selecting most of the measures described
- There is no evidence of how the measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative information tailored to the plan and theory of action. One of the goals described earlier in the grant talked about decreasing teacher turnover, yet there is no data collection on this topic in the performance measures section.
- Since there is no evidence to support the rationale for choosing these items, the impact on a personal learning system is unclear

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

**5**

**1**

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

A high quality plan has not been describe in the evaluation section of this proposal. The Contractor will record and monitor staff participation in the program. Perceptions will be gathered via surveys of staff and students. The impact of the program on student achievement and student well-being will be measured. Should major changes be required, the contractor will work with the district to make changes. There is no discussion of technology and how its use will impact the project. Details on measuring a personalized learning system are not in evidence. An evaluation of effectiveness of a personalized learning system is not described. These issues point to a low score in this section.

**Weakness**

- The goal of the grant is to increase the cadre of National Board Certified Teachers yet a correlation from that to student achievement is lacking detail.
- There is no description of technology use and the impact it will have on the program
- A way to measure the effectiveness of a personalized learning environment is undocumented.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Clover Park will use professional development, existing funds and other internal operating funds as well as RTTT-D funds to support their initiative. One time investments in technology are described in the next section of the grant. Over 14 million dollars of the grant will go toward personnel costs which include resident mentors, consultant teachers, a program administrator and administrative assistant, supplemental pay for consultant teachers and supplemental pay for the teachers going through the National Board Certification Program. The budget is appropriate for developing the cadre of National Board Certified Teachers. The link from creating the cadre to creating a personalized learning system is weak.</p> <p>Additional grant money will be used for professional development in Understanding by Design and capacity building.</p> <p>Technology will be purchased that will include video cameras for video of resident teachers and laptops to support the National Board And Resident Educator program.</p> <p>The budget is described in detail and includes narratives that describes how the money will be spent. The bulk of the money is directed at the building of a cadre of well supported National Board Certified Teachers. A description of how the money will impact the development of a personalized learning system is obscure. The basic questions for this section are covered indicating a mid-high score.</p> <p>Sustainability will be achieve by cost savings related to the high turnover of staff. The district comes up with a 1.5 million dollar figure that will be saved because of a decrease in the turnover rate. How this figure was calculated was not described. There also was no evidence to suggest that creating National Board Certified Teachers will cause a decrease in staff turnover.</p>		

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Although the technology for this program is identified as a one-time cost, the district claims that the program will be sustainable because the teacher turnover rate will be decreased by 75%. They identified the cost of this turnover rate as 2 million dollars per year. The way this figure is determined is undocumented. The savings to the district is identified as 1.5 million dollars a year which will be redirected back into this teacher retention/building National Board Certificated teachers program. The justification for that figure is also undocumented.</p> <p>Based on the information provided in the proposal, there is a method to sustain the program. The relationship of retention and National Board Certification to personalized learning systems is insufficient. A high quality plan for sustainability is not described. Support from state or local governments is not discussed. There is no mention of productivity or the evaluation of the program other than the improvement of retention rates. How the figures are determined--cost savings and percentage of teachers staying are undocumented. Since the sustainability is described but not documented, a middle low score is justified.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>There is no information related to this in the proposal.</p>		

**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>		

The information in this proposal is targeted at retaining teachers, building and supporting a cadre of National Board Certified Teachers. The link to creating a personalized learning system is vague. Research data on that specific item is lacking. Many components of a personalized learning plan are described. These included work in the common core standards, the recruitment, development, retention and retaining teachers. Turning around lowest performing schools was described in terms of personnel changes and through some state coaching.

Details are lacking on how the district will use data systems in a personalized learning environment to improve the academic program. The creation and use of a learning management system is sparse.

There is evidence that the district is comprised of a highly mixed demographic body. Academic data on subgroups is not identified or targeted in the proposal. Graduation rates below 90% are identified at the 2 high schools. The grant targeted teacher development instead of closing achievement gaps in the student population. Although some research was provided that supported National Board Certified Teachers and gap closing, the identification and target of these sub-groups in the district was sparse.

Based on the information provided, the district has many problems that need to be addressed (teacher turnover rates, diverse student population and pockets of low academic achievement). The link between teacher development to improve academics, and creating a personalized learning system using common core standards is not made.

The establishment of a personalized learning environment based on the proposal does not meet the criteria of meeting the requirements.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>81</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



## Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

**Application #0102WA-2 for Clover Park School District**

### **A. Vision (40 total points)**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<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> The applicant details several ideas for teacher professional development which are centered around teacher achieving National Board Certification (NBCT). However, the applicant does not articulate how this achievement will accelerate student achievement or promote a personalized learning environment. In addition, the applicant does not state how many teachers are expected to achieve NBCT each year during the project. Professional development is critical to teacher performance and ultimately student performance. However, professional development should support an instructional program and/or initiative. The program is not clear in the information provided by the applicant. Overall, the applicant fails to address three of the four educational assurance areas with the proposed NBCT program. The only assurance area thoroughly described throughout the narrative is teacher evaluation. There is no mention of a comprehensive evaluation system for principals and superintendents.		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		

The applicant states the process for selecting the schools which participate first in the project will be those which qualify for the National School Lunch Program, however, the project is open to all twenty-six schools in the system. This includes 12,098 students participating each year. The number of students from low-income families is 8,094 (67%). The applicant lists all schools that will participate in the program.

The applicant does not provide additional demographics of the student population.

The number of participating educators is approximately 120 each year.

It is unclear how the proposed professional development project, alone, will implement school and system reform.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
--------------------------------------------------------	-----------	----------

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

The applicant's logic model describes inputs, activities, objectives, goals, and outcomes for the National Board Certification (NBCT) project. Four of the eight activities are student-centered, but it is unclear how they will occur as part of the proposal thus far. For example: the applicant states one activity is a student led personalized learning plan. There is no input to support this activity or expectation. The five inputs are all teacher-centered and the applicant does not demonstrate or provide the connection to meaningful reform that will improve student learning outcomes.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	----------

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

While the applicant does include achievement gap targets, the applicant does not state the state ESEA targets, therefore, it is unclear if the end-of-grant expected performance on summative assessments meets or exceeds the state's targets.

The annual goals for the performance on summative assessments is not ambitious. For example: the average expected annual increase on grade three literacy assessments is approximately 1.5%. The applicant only provides subgroup information for students from low-income families for the summative assessments.

The applicant provides ambitious annual expectations for the decrease in achievement gaps, however, the applicant does not provide the data for the students populations other than the data for white students. The annual information provided is the expected decrease in the achievement gap of white students.

The graduation rates and college enrollment rates are achievable and significant, however, they only specify the expectations for students in low-income families.

Overall, the applicant's response to this criterion is weak due to the omission of baseline data and targets for subgroups other than low-income.

**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>7</b>

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

The applicant provides some data to support success in the past four years in advancing student achievement. For example, the applicant has increased the number of students meeting the state standard on the MSP K-8 by at least three percent for the last seven years. A notable strength in previous success is the applicant's significant increase in graduation rates at both of the system's high schools. Since 2002, Lakes High School graduation rate has increased from 55% to 88.4% and Clover Park High School has increased from 45% to 76%. The applicant does not detail the interventions responsible for this increase. This is a weakness.

The applicant did not detail any ambitious or significant reforms in the elementary or middle schools. The data provided by the applicant is in narrative form, not historical. Also, student performance data is made available to the public in several ways including an annual school board meeting, regular data nights at each school, site councils, PTSA meetings, and on the applicant's website.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant provides the actual personnel salaries at the school level for school-level instructional and support staff, instructional staff only, teachers only, and non-personnel expenditures as forecasted. These are published every year which sufficiently addresses this component of the criterion.</p> <p>The applicant does not describe a high level of transparency regarding the ease of finding the published information or where it is located. Specifically, the information is not posted in a highly prominent place such as the Internet.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant is a public school district within Washington State and is governed by the State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This demonstrates sufficient autonomy to implement a personalized learning plan. However, the applicant did not clearly demonstrate evidence of this.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant stated a District Instructional Strategies Committee (DISC) was formed in the development of the proposal and was charged with how to improve teacher instructional practice. Furthermore, the committee was charged with increasing teacher retention rates this year. The committee consisted of 14 members which included three parents. DISC was small and only addressed one group. This is too small for a district with approximately 12,000 students. Also, the applicant stated the committee was "presented with the proposal." This is not evidence of engagement.</p> <p>The applicant's teacher union has officially supported the application.</p> <p>Community letters of support have been included.</p> <p>No students were included in this process which is a weakness.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>Overall, it is unclear how the significant focus on teachers earning National Board Certification (NBCT) will engage and empowers learners. The applicant has not made the connection between the two. The applicant states students will have two adults in their classroom, a resident teacher and a resident mentor. Their specific duties and expectations are not clearly articulated.</p> <p>The applicant states a personalized learning plan and an individualized-assessment model as it relates to career and college readiness has been in place in the system. Given this fact, it is unclear why the applicant needs additional funding if this model is working and in place.</p> <p>The applicant inadequately describes how the teachers will address each student's individualized interests. It is also unclear how the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching is a high-quality strategy for high-need students.</p> <p>The applicant fails to make a connection between the NBCT and a teacher/principal/superintendent evaluation system. This is also true of the assurance areas for college- and career-readiness and a robust data system. In addition, the applicant does not evidence a high-quality plan for the improvement of learning and teaching.</p>		
<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant's approach to improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment is primarily increasing the number of teachers pursuing and obtaining National Board Certifications (NBCT). There are components of</p>		

this process which the applicant details and are considered strengths within this criterion. For example, the development of professional teams (roundtables), after-school collegial cohorts, and feedback-oriented data teams are all components which will help educators improve their instruction. However, it is unclear how NBCT alone represents a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who take a rigorous course of study.

The applicant details the training and systems in place to improve progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.

This applicant clearly addresses increasing the number of highly effective teachers. The utilization of Share Point, a virtual environment for teachers to share and collaborate, is an efficient and effective technology to address professional development. However it is unclear how this meets the college- and career-ready component of this criterion.

#### 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>13</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant has practices, policies, and rules in place that facilitate personalized learning as defined by each component of this criterion with the expectation of giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of seat time. The applicant has a central office capable of handling the project. In addition, each school has a leadership team. The applicant sufficiently addresses and describes practices and policies that facilitate personalized learning resources as detailed in the narrative.		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant did not specifically provide information for this criterion. Even throughout the application, there was little to no evidence detailing the interoperable technology systems that would be used by students and school personnel. The applicant did describe strategies to ensure participating students, parents, and educators have appropriate levels of technical support.		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant's continuous improvement process includes utilizing the Compass Data System, annual student and teacher surveys, and academic outcomes of students regarding literacy and mathematics in grades 3, 8, and 10.  In order to provide timely and regular feedback on the progress toward project goals and opportunities for corrections, the surveys should occur more regularly. In addition, the use of only assessment scores in grades 3, 8, and 10 does not support the inclusion of all students in the project as previously stated. None of these components evaluate personalized learning environments or the impact they have on students.  The applicant does not describe the components of a high-quality plan. There is limited or no evidence supporting the goals of the project's continuous improvement process.		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant sufficiently describes the method, Compass System, for assessing the project. However, the results of this will only be shared annually with stakeholders. This does not provide the capability to continuously review the project for improvement opportunities.  The applicant does not detail any engagement practices. Specifically, there is not an expectation for the stakeholder to		

react, respond, or become engaged in the continuous improvement process.

The limited review opportunities and expected reactions to the process are both weaknesses of a high-quality plan.

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

**5**

**1**

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

The applicant meets this criterion by detailing fifteen performance measures. However, the applicant does not provide a rationale for the measures. In addition the only subgroup reported on is low-income. In addition, the applicant does not provide rationale for the measures stated. Due to this limited information, it is unclear and unlikely the measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative learning.

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

**5**

**2**

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

The applicant does not provide the necessary components for a high-quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the project other than use of an external evaluator. There are limited or no clearly stated goals, or expected outcomes. These components are necessary for a high-quality plan.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant provides a budget and narrative which supports the project. However the significant focus on personnel for National Board Certifications does not support a personalized learning environment. No outside funding is noted by the applicant.		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> Given the significant amount of funding and time devoted to personnel and the fact that the cost of teacher turnover within the first five years of employment costs the applicant over \$2 million per year, the sustainability of the project is weak. There are no stipulations for teachers once they receive their National Board Certification. Also, the applicant has not provided data or research to support the proposed project will significantly decrease the turnover rate.  The applicant does not provide any information regarding future support from state and local government leaders, financial support, or a description of previous sustainability projects.		

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b> Not applicable.		

**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 focus on professional development for teachers is noteworthy and the National Board Certification (NBCT) is a significant accomplishment for teachers. However, the applicant does not make a sufficient connection between the NBCT and personalized learning environments for all participating students. The project clearly does not address three of the four core educational assurance areas. Specifically, the applicant does not comprehensively address three of the four core educational assurance areas. And the one area partially addressed within the proposal (teacher evaluation) does not provide or support convincing evidence to decrease achievement gaps. The applicant does not address principal or superintendent evaluations in the application.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>90</b>



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0102WA-3 for Clover Park School District

### 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>
<b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant sets forth a coherent reform vision that builds on aspects of the four core educational areas. The strength of this application lies in the recruiting, developing and retaining effective teachers by designing a teacher induction and resident educator program that is ongoing with support through the early years of teachers' careers; notably lacking was any mention of developing principals. The application also states that the district has adopted college- and career-ready standards and uses assessments aligned to them. These assessments (e.g., MAP, DIBELS Next) measure student growth and can inform teachers about where student needs exist. There is no mention, however, of building data systems that can take these separate assessment and integrate and synthesize the information to inform teachers and principals how they can improve instruction. They also state that they have turned around a low--performing school by reconstituting it and stating that that was a good decision; no data are provided to indicate the type of improvements made outside of replacing 50% of the staff. The applicant articulates a clear, though arguably questionable, approach to accelerating student achievement. The basic theory of action is that, by recruiting strong new teachers and developing them into NBCT-certified teachers, they will accelerate student achievement, deepen learning and personalize support. One piece of evidence that they cite is a Harvard study that notes that students of NBCT-certified teachers achieve one and two months more learning in English and math, respectively, than a comparison group. This presumes that all new teachers will achieve NBCT certification and that all NBCT-certified teachers have similar results. There is no plan B. The environment described also relies on NBCT-certified teachers being more effective at personalizing learning environments. While it is a laudable goal for the district to want their teachers to gain the skills necessary to attain certification, it is questionable that the district has the ability to make this happen. In their application, they state that all CPSD teachers are trained regularly and encouraged to achieve personalized learning environments. In the next sentence, though, they state that "only the most highly-effective teachers are able to provide the differentiated instruction required to enact this environment."</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant states that all schools will be eligible for participation and that the neediest schools (by Free and Reduced Lunch numbers) will get first program slots as this is the district policy for programs that are in high demand. The applicant</p>		

also provides a list of the names of each school in alphabetical order by grade level; there is no indication of rank ordering the schools by need. They provide numbers of participating students, high-need (8,094) and low income (8,094). They further state that all students will be impacted during the course of the grant but do not explain how that will necessarily take place unless placement of resident educators in classes is done on some basis other than need as identified earlier. The explanation lacks the elements of a high-quality plan as it fails to address a rationale for the placement of educators as it relates to implementing their reform outside of the following of common practice and how these placements will support school and district-level implementation efforts.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
--------------------------------------------------------	-----------	----------

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

The applicant provides a logic model and clearly identifies the inputs, outputs, and assessments that will be used to measure outcomes. The proposal, however, lacks the narrative to qualify it as a high-quality plan. For example, of the outcome measurements, 12 are state assessments, 1 is graduation rate, 1 is college enrollment and 1 is a teacher measure. There is no rationale provided for choosing these or how these specific measure will demonstrate that the district has provided a personalized learning environment for students. That is not to discount the importance of these measures, but lacking the rationale provides readers with no way of determining how the personalization of learning will be measured or how these measures can serve as proxies that allow one to make the connection that personalization has taken place. Because there was also no explicit plan for how teachers will be assigned, it's also impossible to determine to what extent they will be impacting the grades identified for measuring the success of the program nor in what way that this program will support district-wide change.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	----------

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

The applicant should be lauded for their goal of having 80% of students (more than 68% low-income students) enrolled in college in the year post-grant. It is also ambitious to work toward closing the graduation gap and getting all students to 90% ( a 10% increase over the baseline year) and low-income students to nearly the same level (88.6%; a 13.4% increase. However most of the student achievement goals are achievable, though not terribly ambitious, especially in the early grades. For example grade 3 goals in literacy are to increase by 2%/year the number of students achieving proficiency. At the end of the investment, the overall district will still have more than 25% of their children less than proficient. At that same level, low-income students have been identified as targeted for closing the gap, yet they close the gap by only 1.6% if both goals are met as proposed. Similar goals are proposed in grade 3 math with 1.3 of children being less than proficient at the end of the grant period. There is also no information that indicates how the schools' performances compare to state goals. It is unclear, because there is no narrative to describe it, how the district's vision of 96% effective teachers could exist with student achievement at these levels so low and not being accelerated more than proposed.

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>

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

The district has shown success in increasing graduation rates at two of its high schools by more than 30%-age points in each and has one of those now above the state average in college attendance. They claim to be making progress in increasing student achievement in grades K-8 by at least 3%/year for the past 7 years; no raw student data, charts or graphs are provided to support this claim. The district also reconstituted a low-performing elementary school in the past year and states that they have excelled. Outside of replacing 50% of the staff and the principal, no mention is made of the reform plan that was enacted; no data are provided to support the claim of the district excelling nor is there any specific reference as to what it is that the turn-around school has excelled in (e.g., improved reading or math scores, etc.). The applicant has some evidence of making performance data available to students and parents. They state that data are shared with the community annually at the September board meeting and on the district's website. Schools also hold data forums and all schools have site councils where parents and secondary level students are encouraged to attend. No mention is made of how the availability of these data help teachers and students to improve instruction.

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

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

The applicant lacks evidence of a high-level of transparency in the school expenditure practices and processes. The applicant indicates that salaries for each "personnel member" are published every year in the local budget summary which was included in the appendix. The applicant refers to the same document for actual personnel salaries for instructional staff only, teachers only, and non-personnel expenses. The budget summary document itself provided only general categories of expenses and does not provide evidence that costs are broken down by individual by school; no information in the narrative is provided to clarify whether this information is available

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

**10**

**3**

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

The four-line narrative in this criteria cites the authority of the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) as having the authority to set the rules that govern the operation of the applicant as a public school. The applicant does not describe whether the resident educator program as proposed requires any waivers from regulatory oversight. As it is, there is nothing in the plan as proposed that indicates that "school" will necessarily be different and, therefore, the district is likely to have sufficient autonomy to implment their proposal. It is not clear that the conditions exist to be successful, as described earlier by applicants' recognition of the rarity of current district teachers, even though they have PD and are encouraged to achieve personalized conditions that lead to differentiating instruction, being able to achieve ambitious differentiation for students.

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

**15**

**3**

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

The applicant used a district-wide committee to develop the application. These included 14 people, the majority of them associated with the school, including district-level administrators, principals, teachers, the union president; there were also 3 parents of low-income children. The applicant provided the signature of their union president and letters of support from one higher education institution, the mayor of the city and the state superintendent; they also stated that other letters had been promised and were on their way. For a district of more than 12,000 children the stakeholder engagement seems less-than-minimal. While there is mention in the narrative that feedback was solicited from the district-wide committee and it is clear that the 14 identified people were meaningfully engaged, there is no indication that a wider net was cast nor is it clear in what ways feedback found its way into changes in the text itself. There is no evidence of key stakeholder groups being invited to the table for developing the proposal or for providing feedback. The proposal as it stands is also heavy on teacher professional development with little mention of students and improving the context for learning. More parental involvement or involvement from youth advocacy groups would have likely seen more attention to student needs being explicitly addressed rather than being an outcome of better teacher training.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>

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

The applicant points to the primacy of educators as supporters of student learning and has some elements of a high-quality plan that describes how their educators will support students in setting goals and monitoring their progress toward meeting college- and career-ready goals. They mention that the district has diverse racial and ethnic demographics with whom student interactions will help motivate and deepen student learning; surprisingly, none of these high-need demographic groups are mentioned in the goal setting by subgroup as being part of the goals. There is also no mention of parental involvement as being key to helping students improve their learning and master critical academic content.

The applicant states that students will have access to high-quality instructional approaches and environments because the approaches (that are never named) are based on research conducted, generated and compiled by the National Board. The lack of specific named strategies make it impossible to determine exactly what instructional approaches will be taken, other than that they are ones that are currently in practice within the Resident Educator program at the district. There does appear to be a dashboard system in place that contains longitudinal data on student progress on meeting state standards (that are aligned to college- and career-ready standards). In disucssing accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students, the applicant cites their use of a new evaluation tool; no specific narrative is provided to explain how this ensures that students have access to these accommodations and strategies, only that the district has the potential for

assessing the extent to which they exist within teachers' repertoires. Again, all the narrative focuses on teachers and there is no mention of how parents will be brought into this grant to support learning

The applicant states that teachers have 10 early release days at which they have time to understand and employ the tools and resources provided to them so that they can help students to manage and track their learning. There is no mention of how students are provided training and/or support in this, although the implication appears to be that the teachers will do this individually.

in general, this lacks the specifics of a high-quality plan and leaves many unanswered questions regarding specifics sub-criteria.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>
------------------------------------------------	-----------	-----------

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

The strength of this application is the creation and development of professional learning communities aligned with the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teacher Certification. The phase in of the collaboration of new teachers together and with their mentors from roundtable participants to learning communities is planful and clearly communicates high-quality planning for that aspect of teaching and leading. These communities are likely to increase teachers' capacities to adapt content and instruction to meet individual student needs as teachers and students implement a personalized learning environment. Regrettably, the previous lack of a high-quality plan for learning makes the building of capacity somewhat tenuous as it is still not clear from the applicant how teachers will personalize the environment, only that they will. The applicant has explained that they have a new evaluation system in place that is based upon Danielson's Framework for Teaching. Used effectively, this can provide teachers with feedback to improve their practice; there is no mention of how the teacher evaluation system will help principals improve their practice nor any mention that there is a principal evaluation system or how it plays into teaching and leading.

It appears that educators have access to and will know how to use resources through the residency programs and within the communities of practice. The roundtables are appropriately cited as a way in which teachers can identify approaches that will be useful for optimizing learning. The applicant also states that resident educators have electronic access to the districts' high-quality learning resources from work or home so that they will have them available for planning. Teachers also have access to a variety of tools to provide feedback to each other and students; these include virtual environment access, webdesign tools, and a cloud-based management system, as well as wireless access points throughout the district.

The applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of NBCT-certified teachers. The evaluation system is appropriately aligned with teacher effectiveness research and trained principals will be able to work with mentors to assess and help teachers take steps to improve the individual and collective effectiveness. The phase-in approach of the learning communities will complement information provided by the evaluation system to improve individual and collective effectiveness. The roundtables leading to professional learning communities also has the potential to increase student performance and close achievement gaps, although the metrics that are provided as goals for the applicant only cite closing of the achievement gap for low-SES children, so it is unclear to what extent the applicant is focused on other high-need gaps that may exist.

The applicant appropriately states that having more NBCT-certified teachers will increase the number of students who receive instruction from highly effective teachers within the district. There is no mention of principals being highly effective and there is no high-quality plan to ensure that hard-to-staff schools, subjects or specialty areas will have equitable access to the resident educators.

**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>7</b>

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

The applicant has some practices and policies that may facilitate personalized student learning. The central office appears to be staffed sufficiently ((Directors of Finance; Assessment and Evaluation of Programs; Compensatory Programs; etc.) to oversee the implementation of the plan and handle the release of a federal grant from a district perspective. The applicant states that each school has a site council that participates in decision-making and budgeting. They also have the potential for transitioning to a mastery learning model as some assessments allow for retesting. They also have curricular resources

available for ELL students. Currently, however, it does not appear that the district has the policies and practices in place (nor are they part of the proposed plan) that will facilitate personalized learning. Their current model of course credit is based on seat time and Carnegie units. There is no mention of autonomy or flexibility on the parts of the site council to make site-based decisions on schedules and calendars that may facilitate a transition to a mastery-based personalized learning environment

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
---------------------------------------------------------	-----------	----------

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

There is little explicit information provided that allows a reader to assess the extent to which the school infrastructure will support personalized student learning outside of the school day and site. There is no mention of how the plan will ensure that all participating students and parents will have access to the necessary content outside of the current web-based tools. Given that the subgroup targeted by the applicant is low-income students, the lack of mention of hardware to content appears to be a significant oversight in helping these students and their parents access content to support learning. There is no mention of any technical support provided to parents and others. There is no reference to the ability of students and parents to export data in an open format. There is no mention that the district has or will develop interoperable data systems.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>

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

The applicant states that they will contract with an outside evaluator, CoBro Consulting, who will use the Compass Data System to allow CPSD staff to enter and manage implementation data. This will allow for feedback that is as timely as the ability of staff to enter the data collected; this is potentially a strong aspect of monitoring the continuous improvement process. The consulting firm will triangulate data from student test data, surveys of teachers and students, and Compass data to monitor and measure implementation efforts. The narrative, however, lacks several elements of a high-quality plan, specifically in terms of specific timing of surveys and identification of the responsible parties within the district for entering the data and any timeframes expected for their entry. There is no mention here of how the applicant will publicly share information gleaned from these efforts to monitor implementation.

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

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

The applicant proposes to use the Compass system to provide ongoing communication to participants in the program. The evidence that they provide indicates that the Compass report will be able to information on what trainings teachers have attended and the number of hours they have spent in training. There is no narrative that indicates that the system is capable of providing additional information (e.g., increases in teacher knowledge or change in practice as a result of training) that will allow users to continuously improve plans. The applicant does state that the consultants will provide an annual report on progress toward goals to all stakeholders; there is no plan stated for maintaining ongoing communication with external stakeholders.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
-----------------------------------------------	----------	----------

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

The applicant provides an appropriate number of performance measures but provides no rationale for their inclusion. Most of the student achievement goals are achievable, though not terribly ambitious, especially in the early grades. For example grade 3 goals in literacy are to increase by 2%/year the number of students achieving proficiency. At the end of the investment, the overall district will still have more than 25% of their children less than proficient. At that same level, low-income students have been identified as targeted for closing the gap, yet they close the gap by only 1.6% if both goals are met as proposed. Similar goals are proposed in grade 3 math with 1.3 of children being less than proficient at the end of the grant period. Because all of the student performance measures are state end-of-year tests, they will not provide timely and formative information upon which program designers can tailor its program to successes or failures; because these are all state tests, program supervisors will be unable to improve the measure over time to appropriately measure the implementation. In order to provide performance measures that are more closely aligned with a need for formative

information, one would expect that the applicant would have used one or more of their MAP tests or other measures collected within the Compass system.

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

**5**

**1**

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

The applicant will work with a consulting firm to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of grant activities. The logic model provides some evidence of the general elements of a high-quality plan by showing what data will be collected for short-, medium- and long-term outcomes. The applicant does not provide sufficient detail, however, about more precise timing of various aspects of data collection that provides evidence that information will be available for making adjustments and revisions in a timely fashion.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

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

The applicant has clearly identified the costs associated with the project. The great majority of those costs are personnel-related, as is appropriate for the proposed plan. The costs include travel and conference registration for Resident Mentors to gain training to enable them to take on this new role. While most of the costs seem reasonable, there were several that were of concern. First, the Resident Mentors are being paid a salary of \$125,000/yr plus benefits. There are two concerns about this: 1) it does not appear that there are any provisions for their receiving any increases over the course of the grant (although this may not be a problem, there was no description provided that the district has the autonomy or flexibility to flat fund a position or that these positions were somehow exempt from collective bargaining); and 2) at that salary, it seems a bit superfluous to have them paid an additional \$55/hr for facilitating round tables (one would reasonably expect that this responsibility would be in the scope of their work). Also, the \$2200 for a laptop seems excessive; a good Macbook Pro starts at \$1300. The largest concern, however, is that all funds are from the grant and the district does not appear to be investing in this initiative; this lack of district investment makes it appear that the activities of the initiative are only important to the extent that someone else is willing to pay for them and makes sustainability questionable.

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

**10**

**2**

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

The applicant makes a strong argument for the use of savings (estimated at \$1.5M) of retaining teachers as a way to decrease the expense of the district's estimate of \$2M/yr of cost associated with teacher turnover. They further state that these savings will go back into the CPSD NBCT program to support resident educators at the 120-participant level. However, they lack the elements of a high-quality plan. Given the lack of district investment in the original plan, for example, it is unclear how these savings will be able to support the program at that level. The mathematics don't seem to work since the \$1.5M savings would support salary only of 24 resident educators (this does not account for either raises or benefits). There is no narrative to indicate that resident educators eschew raises, what other funds will be used, or how the additional funds will be secured. This criterion requested a three-year post-grant budget; none was provided. Therefore, there was no indication of financial support from state and local government leaders.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

NA

**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>The applicant has not coherently and completely addressed how it will build on the core assurance areas to create personalized learning environments designed to improve learning and teaching. Their focus on recruiting, developing and retaining highly-effective teachers has clear merit. The details of improving learning through a focus on NBCT-certification, however, is insufficient to necessarily personalize learning environments. The applicant articulates a clear, though arguably questionable, approach to accelerating student achievement. The basic theory of action is that, by recruiting strong new teachers and developing them into NBCT-certified teachers, they will accelerate student achievement, deepen learning and personalize support. One piece of evidence that they cite is a Harvard study that notes that students of NBCT-certified teachers achieve one and two months more learning in English and math, respectively, than a comparison group. This presumes that all new teachers will achieve NBCT certification and that all NBCT-certified teachers have similar results. There is no plan B. The environment described also relies on NBCT-certified teachers being more effective at personalizing learning environments. While it is a laudable goal for the district to want their teachers to gain the skills necessary to attain certification, it is questionable that the district has the ability to make this happen. In their application, they state that all CPSD teachers are trained regularly and encouraged to achieve personalized learning environments. In the next sentence, though, they state that "only the most highly-effective teachers are able to provide the differentiated instruction required to enact this environment."</p>		
<b>Total</b>	210	62