



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0153WA-1 for North Central Educational Service District 171

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The MOU created for the CADERA project provides a comprehensive and coherent outline of the roles and responsibilities to be undertaken by each participating Educational Service Agency in the consortium. The vision for the project includes breaking down both geographical and ethnic/race barriers by making learning accessible via a Share Portal, a digital network that allows students to self-select college- and career-preparation activities, while capturing the curricular work of students and instructional work of teachers.</p> <p>This section is scored an [8]. The CADERA proposal contains a comprehensive plan that addresses each of the core assurance areas - activities and instructional programs focus on college- and career- readiness standards and expectations; data systems are in process of development in order to capturing information to correlate innovations to academic success; and, teachers and administrators are afforded flexibility in designing and developing programs to best meet the needs of students – all with the intent to affect reform at rural schools, historically the lowest achieving schools, with the least academically-successful students. The proposal is clear in its goals to improve student engagement using a digital portal that will allow access 24/7/365, thereby creating a personalized learning environment for both students and educators. The project seeks to mitigate geographical boundaries for students and educators via web-based systems that foster learning networks. Data systems that are currently used to capture existing ESA projects data will be expanded to better analyze the efficacy of project goals to determine viability and scalability of project activities. The proposal puts forth a plan that extends and improves upon programs already in place within CADERA ESAs (Project Lead the Way, Kids First New Mexico). The proposal would have been strengthened with an explicit description of what the classroom experience would be like for students and teachers.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The CADERA proposal identifies ESAs from 5 states (Alaska, Arkansas, New Mexico, Washington, West Virginia) coming together to address specific needs of rural schools/districts. CADERA seeks to create a highly personalized system, both structurally and instructionally, by accessing a web-based network that will afford 24/7/365 access by administrators, teachers, students, and parents.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal includes a framework for creation of a Share Portal, an Internet-based, virtual network. The portal will allow districts to enter any one of the five project areas, determined by their readiness and abilities to implement the reform areas outlined by the project. • The plan is ambitious in the work to be accomplished as well as in the amount of coordination that will have to occur across the country. • Criteria clearly delineates that ESAs were selected based on high levels of poverty and high-risk student population, and/or for proven experiences with implementing change processes at the district level. All listed schools include data corroborating their qualifications to participate in CADERA. • The CADERA Share Portal proposal allows districts to enter any one of five project areas, allowing for differentiation of access and readiness. Districts and schools will be supported at which ever level they enter, with professional development and coaching available at all levels of the project. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no explicit indication as to which of the schools invited by districts to participate in CADERA are categorized 		

as persistently low-achieving or low-performing.

This section is scored an [8], as The CADERA proposal is comprehensive and of high quality. Efforts have been made to address the unique needs of rural schools/districts in providing students access to technology, knowledge of careers and the requisite learning to participate in a field of choice, while also providing educators virtual access to professional development and peer networks.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Logic Model outlines a plan to create a virtual/online professional learning community and create a new model for personalized student learning. By nature of the ESA structure, scalability can flow through the parent organization, AESA, with access to 80% of all students in the United States, and 80% of all certified teachers.

Strengths:

- The Logic Model shows activities that are ambitious yet achievable given the structure. Two change models are identified, one to address technology access across rural communities, and the other to address career explorations.
- Templates have been created to capture feedback on the attributes for a high-level change process to measure the level of difficulty associated with broad-scale adoption of an activity/project, the types of change inherent in the activity/project, and how to carry out the change needed. Detailed checklists will also be completed, which will document what is currently in place, what is in being worked on, and what is not yet initiated. Data from these templates and checklists will lead to formation of action plans to meet site needs.

Weaknesses

- While teachers are clearly addressed in the Implementation, Outputs, and Outcomes sections in the Logic Model diagram, principals are not explicitly mentioned until long-term Outcomes. The model does not reveal how and when principals fit into the implementation plan.
- Under Implementation Activities, the model does not address unit or lesson design or the professional development that will be needed to help teachers formulate instructional units of study.
- While the CADERA proposal is built on putting the technology into the “cloud, the narrative acknowledges a lack of access by parents and students to resources and devices, yet the plan does not specifically address how the devices or means to access the cloud will be addressed.

This section is scored an [8]. The CADERA project included all components of a high-quality plan that supports extending its reforms both within CADERA LEAs and beyond. Creating flexible learning environments will allow students to learn at their own pace while exploring college and career options. By nature of the ESA structure, scalability can flow through the parent organization, AESA, with access to 80% of all students in the United States, and 80% of all certified teachers. Using AESA funding base and shared personnel and support, the CADERA Share Portal will be disseminated across the country, with the capacity to expand to fit the needs of each participating ESA. Data systems and the protocols to capture information have been/are being designed to obtain feedback as to effectiveness of activities/projects. These data will be used to gauge scalability of the CADERA Share Portal in order to benefit other rural districts/schools. The CADERA proposal includes innovative support from public-sector partnerships that will generate media and marketing support for its scale-up. The proposal would be strengthened with the additional of information as to how the project proposes to help students and families obtain access to requisite devices and the connectivity to use them.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The core of the CADERA proposal promotes student mastery and competency, and departs from a strict adherence to traditional concepts of achievement. The project provides for assessment to be applied often and in varied situations (project-based learning activities, traditional class work settings, internship evaluation). The project is focused on allowing students to work at their own pace on their own goals, supporting the project’s premise that personalization of the learning experience, coupled with connections to college and career readiness experiences, will engender engagement and therefore, achievement.

Strengths:

- The project’s gr. 5-8 career explorations focus establishes early introductions to career information and pathways as

- a means to improve engagement and learning choices.
- Alignment of projects and lessons to CCSS/AS is already underway. Alignment will be required to assure all work is supporting student achievement.
- Several achievement goals and graduation rate goals for subgroups show a decrease to the achievement gap, when compared to Overall over a 4 yr period.
 - Prescott - EOC Geometry: Hispanic showed a gap of 2 pts below Overall scores, to ending above Overall scores by 2.1, eliminating the gap completely.
 - Prescott – Gr 6 Math: Hispanic showed a gap of 20 pts below Overall scores, to ending above Overall scores by 15.8, eliminating the gap completely and significantly.
 - Hope – Grad Rate: African-American continues to surpass Overall with 5.0 above Overall scores; Econ Disadvantaged continues to surpass Overall with 1.1 above Overall scores.
- Las Vegas City – Perf on Summ: Gr 11 Math, Econ Dis shows a decrease in gap, from a gap of 3.3 pt, down to a gap of 2.3 pt; Gr 10 Reading, Econ Dis shows a decrease in gap, from a gap of 0.4 pt to eliminating the gap and ending 3.6 pts above Overall; Gr 11 Reading, Econ Dis surpasses the Overall, from 0.8 above to 1.8 above Overall; Gr 11 Math, Econ Dis shows a decrease in gap, from a gap of 7.2 pts down to a gap of 5.2 under Overall.
- West Virginia clearly indicates methodology for determining growth set at 4% per year, far exceeding the other LEAs.

Weaknesses:

- The stated goal of at least 2% gain per year on average for all LEAs does not lead to ambitious results when examining subgroup growth. All proceeding calculations made from final grant year compared to baseline year as reported.

Alaska: Minimal improvements expected for a good number of schools. While the majority of schools/districts participating have population sizes too small to include in a valid analysis of outcome goals, the Craig City LEA contains sufficient number of students to analyze LEA goals for improved performance, expectations and decreasing achievement gaps.

- Minimal Decreasing of Achievement Gaps
 - Craig HS: AK Benchmark Reading: All grades, AK Nat: minimal improvement recorded of 0.5% pts over a 4 yr period.
 - Craig HS: AK Benchmark Math: All grades, AK Nat: minimal improvement recorded of 0.3 % pts over a 4 yr period.

Arkansas: Unclear why all subgroups are not reported for each goal area – some goal areas include a complete list of subgroups, while others do not. Minimal expectations for a number of LEA schools. While many schools are below or just at the threshold of having comparable population sizes, several LEAs include sufficient enrollment for analysis. The following areas show minimal improvements or expectations to closing gaps.

- Minimal Growth in Proficiency status and growth
 - Genoa: Gr 11 Literacy, Econ Dis = 1.77 % pts growth over 4 yrs
 - Genoa: Gr 11 Literacy, the gap between Overall and Econ Dis grows from 20.99 to 21.9 by the end of 4 yrs
 - HopeGr 11 Literacy, over 4 yrs, gap between Overall and Af-Am grows from 8.45 to 8.9; for Hispanic, from 5.88 to 6.2; for Econ Dis, from 6.77; for Stu w/Dis, from 18.38 to 19.3
 - HopeEOC Geometry, over 4 yrs, gap between Overall and Af-Am grows from 7.27 to 7.6; for Econ Dis, from 1.75 to 1.8
 - Prescott: Gr 11 Literacy, over 4 yrs, gap between Overall and Hispanic grows from 5.0 to 5.2; for Econ Dis, from 8.0 to 8.4; Stu w/Dis, from 58.0 to 61.0
- Widening of Gap in Graduation Rates compared to Overall
 - Prescott: Econ Dis, over 4 yrs, gap grows from 1.63 to 1.8
 - Prescott: Stu w/Dis, over 4 yrs, gap grows from 10.56 to 11.4

- Widening of Gap for College Enrollment Rate
 - Prescott – all subgroups show a widening of gap, not a narrowing of gap

New Mexico REC#3: Performance on Summatives – many schools show a significant drop in percentages (as high as 35.5 points) between baseline year and year one. No explanation provided. The following are examples of minimal improvements or expectations to close gaps.

- Clayton HS: Gr H3 Math: gap widens from 12.6 to 20.6 over 4 years
- Des Moines HS: Gr 7-11 Reading: gap widens from 12.0 to 15.0 over 4 yrs. Gr 7-11 Math: gap widens from 17.0 to 28.0

New Mexico REC#4: Performance on summative assessments show no changes positive or negative to gaps. Increases to overall are matched by all subgroups, maintaining a “status quo” with regard to the spread between subgroups and Overall.

Washington: Performance on Summatives – many schools show a significant drop in percentages (as high as 68.1 points points) between baseline year and year one.

This section is scored a [4]. While the goals and objectives of the personalized learning model are defined to support the goals of each student, it is unclear if these goals will be further delineated to address the needs of subgroups, specifically for English learners, students with disabilities, or those identified as being at-risk. Taking into account the various reporting structures among the states, it is unclear how the ESAs will reconcile the varied collection methodologies. The data presented does not show a consistent application of growth for all reported subgroups, at all sites. The proposal does not present a plan that demonstrates ambitious goals and objectives with regard to student achievement, graduation rates, and college enrollment being applied to all ESAs and to each participating district/school.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The CADERA ESAs show an extensive listing of projects and programs targeting student learning, achievement, and equity. Several programs have received recognition (state and national) as innovative models: from robotics, engineering, and mathematics, to creating internships, online options, and CTE classes as well as creating parent outreach centers.

Strengths:

- Project Lead the Way has received national distinction as a new model for CTE, applicable country-wide. The project saw 70% of graduating students choosing STEM fields as majors.
- A School Innovation Zone in Cabell County, WV, provides alternative pathways toward graduation requirements, with the imbedded personal flexibility model introduced to CADERA participants.
- 42% of Hope Academy students have increased math scores in one year. The Academy’s focus on “soft skills” and project-based learning.
- The Kids First, New Mexico Wins program is a wide-ranging program addresses each of the core RTTT-D goals, with results showing significant progress by students in the participating ESA districts compared to state averages.
- The CADERA proposal provides sufficient evidence it has the capacity to publish data in meaningful and useful ways for students, parents, and educators via State Report Cards, annual meetings, and postings on websites.

Weaknesses:

- While the PLTW program has received significant recognitions, the graduating numbers (10 students) does bring into question the relative size of the project and how this might affect scalability. More information is needed with regard to participation numbers.
- Anecdotal evidence provided for the AKPIRC. Not possible to verify stated findings.

Anecdotal evidence provided for Hope Academy and improvements to Reading and Science achievement and college acceptance rates, but no values provided.

- The Washington Lake Chelan Progress to Proficiency Program provides vague reference to doubling the number of students scoring proficient, without any values provided. Similar statements are made about Science results.
- Implementation dates for several of the projects shared as evidence of a record of success are outside of the four-year period specified in the application
- Initiatives in Alaska have addressed the needs of Alaska Natives, a subgroup with persistently low achievement. While the information is commendable, data is not provided to substantiate the claims.

This section is scored a [6]. The CADERA ESAs support many innovative programs that are meant to address student achievement, engagement and career connections. Project claims are made, but many are not supported with numbers to substantiate.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored a [5]. The CADERA proposal demonstrates high levels of transparency, including validation of ESA-level processes, services, and supports to constituent districts, as their charter requires that they provide technical assistance to low-performing schools. Documentation of salary and benefits reports are included with the application.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9
--	-----------	----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored a [9]. The ESAs, by charter, are created to service low-performing schools, and have autonomy on behalf of the districts and schools served, and are set to participate in programs that use federal, state or other funds. In Alaska the SERRC is a non-profit, and is funded entirely by grants and contracts. All are governed by boards of directors and must support improvement of educational programs to high need schools. While the MOU's included in the proposal secure autonomy at the state level, the narrative would be strengthened with explanation of how project objectives and goals will be safeguarded by CADERA leadership.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	12
--	-----------	-----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The CADERA proposal includes letters of support from non-profit agencies, post-secondary education, healthcare agencies and organizations, public agencies and private businesses.

- A unique partnership has been formed with a prominent Foundation and with a business entity that both support the tenants of the CADERA proposal. They will provide additional supports that will benefit the project, especially toward scale-up.
- The format employed to list supporting organizations and entities is cumbersome and difficult to navigate, especially when corroborating the letters supplied in the Appendices.

This section is scored a [12]. It is evident the proposal is in its second rendition, revised based on ESA, district, and school-level input as well as evaluator comments from the previous competition. Student input is said to have influenced more inclusion of “real” experiences in course instruction. The evidence is not clearly defined in what is meant by “informal outreach” to parents and students, or how the information was formalized into revisions during the planning process.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The CADERA proposal contains two areas from which to pull all of the structural elements that create a high-quality plan. The timeline in this section is reasonable and provides time to build infrastructure for the new Share Portal. In an earlier section, key personnel are identified with accountability measures included to keep the project targeted and focused on

improving the classroom experience and expanding those experiences outside the four walls of a traditional program.

Strengths:

- The CADERA proposal is built around the use of a web-based Share Portal as an innovative strategy to enhance career education. The portal will create a personalized learning experience for all students, through career exploration, career planning, project-based math and literacy, focus on foundational and soft skills, and through participation in virtual career academies.
- Several of the ESAs have projects that have created new avenues for students to access credits toward graduation.
- Career exploration is a key feature of the Share Portal. Early implementation of the career focus has been built into the project in order to strengthen later instructional programs and increase student engagement.
- 16 career exploration sites will be developed during years 2-4 to help students identify career occupations, links to post-secondary education and training programs to support each area.
- The Share Portal is structured to accommodate meeting students needs both during and after the school day. Access will be available 24/7/365, enabling students to participate in learning-on-demand.
- Math-based project learning will incorporate differentiation of content as well as learning activities to meet the needs of every student, allowing all students to work from their ability levels forward. All content will be aligned to CCSS/AK standards and assessment expectations. Students will engage in classroom activities as well as through the web-based digital Share Portal, reinforcing uses of technology aligned to real-world applications.

Weaknesses:

- One component of the Virtual Career Academies incorporates virtual shadowing of mentors. What is not clear is how these partnerships and the experiences generated via virtual shadowing, or the capture of homework, will be articulated with the regular classroom teacher. While mention is made of design teams working on implementation questions, there is no outlining of protocols being considered or that have been developed to assure adherence to high-quality experiences and strategies, given these academies are being modeled after existing programs currently running in one of the CADERA ESA states.
- It is not clear why project-based mathematics is listed as a supplemental program only in middle school and as an intervention program only in high school. Given the needs of students, it is not clear why project-based mathematics couldn't be used as both a supplement and as an intervention.

This section is scored a [16] as the CADERA proposal presents a coherent, strongly articulated vision for programs focused on creating personalized learning opportunities for all students. Project-based learning is used as both a regular classroom application and as an intervention. The proposal describes an innovative learning tool in the Share Portal, that, due to the technologies inherent in its use, will provide students first-hand experiences with technology and its application toward college- and career-readiness. While the pieces to a high-quality plan can be identified in several places in the proposal, the timeline provided in this section sets out in greater detail the curricular reform area and activities, but lacks identifying key personnel who will be responsible for the stated goals.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The CADERA proposal sets forth an ambitious plan to support teachers and principals in the transition to 21st century skills and career demands. The proposal clearly articulate goals for preparing students toward readiness for post-secondary education and training, for first jobs, as well as for future careers. The proposal articulates a plan that will depend on implementation by highly trained educators.

Strengths:

- The proposal defines the need for differentiated types of training, and outlines several innovative and cost-effective ways to bring together educators from across the states to work in a virtual environment to collaborate, plan and teach.
- Teachers will be trained and provided the tools to create project-based learning activities. Professional development will be highly individualized, allowing teachers to self-select from a menu.
- The CADERA project will leverage existing work by WV's Support for Personalized Learning website for inclusion in the Share Portal, providing CADERA educators with state-of-the-art, customizable PD opportunities.
- The needs of students are being matched with digital tools that will allow students more time and greater access to resources previously unavailable. Embedded in the proposal will be twice annual collection of student feedback on all aspects of the CADERA project. This feedback will be used to align to existing curricular content or become the

genesis for creating new content.

- By nature of the ESA structure, there is alignment of CCSS/AS to curriculum, and with CADERA work, this alignment will be extended to include career-infused education tools, both digital and traditional.
- Virtual PD webinars and coaching under the CADERA project are given as targeting school leadership, with reasonable objectives given for the PD, including reflective practices establishing higher expectations under CCSS/AS, collaboration strategies, assessment comparisons, and connecting national career clusters and pathways to CCSS/AS.

Weaknesses:

- It is not clear how the project, dispersed among the five states, will determine baseline readiness of its educators. While students and families in rural programs can be access-challenged, the proposal does not address how educators will be surveyed to determine access-readiness.
- The proposal focuses attention on project-based learning in mathematics, but does not clearly delineate how other subject areas will/might be impacted. The Approach to Learning diagram shows project-based math and literacy, but no explicit narrative that describes developing literacy via project-based learning.
- While feedback from evaluation systems will be used to identify PD needs, the ESA evaluation system descriptions focus primarily on teacher evaluation and not on principal evaluation. While the narrative provides that each of the five states have teacher and principal evaluation systems in place, the narrative only explicitly defines two a principal evaluation process for two states. It is not clear what the other three systems entail regarding principal evaluation and how they mesh with the RTTT-D notice.

This section is scored a [17]. While the pieces to a high-quality plan can be identified in several sections within the overall proposal, the timeline provided in this section does not identify key personnel who will be responsible for the stated goals. The timeline does provide more detail for activities to be accomplished than the plan presented in Section (A)(4)(e), but the time frames are generic, with almost all terms running the length of the grant (9/14-6/18), with no incremental breakdown to implementation steps per activity, nor reasonable timeframes for the implementation.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The ESA structure provides strong correlations to the requirements within the RTTT-D notice. By charter, ESAs must provide support and services to districts/schools that are low-performing. The policies and organizational structures within each ESA are comparable, and do not conflict or impede the implementation processes initiated under the CADERA proposal.

Strengths:

- All schools in the CADERA project (96) have School Teams, with each district having a District Design Team. School teams work collaboratively with site leadership to address each factor defined in the notice.
- Existing projects and curriculum will be leveraged for inclusion and use by CADERA teachers. These materials are fully aligned to CCSS/AS and incorporate embedded assessments to determine mastery. The supplemental units contain the design components for project-based learning.
- Each participating district will enhance existing data system structures to monitor curriculum area mastery, provide students with formative assessment information, and generate diagnostic information from summative assessments to establish competency achievement along learning progressions. These structures clearly provide multiple, comparable ways for students to demonstrate mastery of standards.
- These same learning progressions demonstrate accommodations will be articulated for Special Needs students, allowing for differentiated access and personalized instructional plans.

Weaknesses:

- Not clear who the Professional Development Directors are or their position(s) within the CADERA hierarchy.
- While the collaborative nature of work by School Teams and site leadership is the accepted practice, these have not become Board-approved policy. This raises the possibility of future issues with such processes.

This section is scored a [14], as the he policies and organizational structures within each ESA are comparable, and do not

conflict or impede the implementation processes initiated under the CADERA proposal. The proposed data systems alignments and enhancements will help ESA member districts realize personalized learning pathways that afford students multiple comparable ways to demonstrate mastery of content and standards.

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

10

8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The objective of the CADERA proposal is providing universal access by all stakeholders to the tools and resources that currently exist and to expand this access via the Share Portal.

Strengths:

- Students are afforded access to personalized learning through RTI models adopted by most CADERA schools, allowing for organized and systematized access to content and resources based on student need.
- Regular evaluation of data on students, grade, content areas, and school effectiveness will enable revisions to the school plan, supporting CADERA's goal to keep the learning experience based on student goals and readiness.
- PD for teachers and principals will provide support specifically targeted on implementation of CCSS/AS. Existing PLC structures at sites will be folded into the CADERA network to further develop access by teachers to content, training, and collaboration across boundaries.
- Resources are made available to students and parents both in and out of schools through various state "special student courses of note": the EAST program (AR), the Alaska Learning Network (AK), IDEAL-NM (NM), mobile/tablet computing (WA), and Learn21 (WV). These programs will be used to supplement CADERA programs.
- ESA structures make available Web-based programs to rural schools that might otherwise not be available, due to cost or size. The technical support and training provided all stakeholders via each ESAs will be leveraged and amplified by the CADERA project in the form of additional personnel, maintenance of the Share Portal, connectivity, and uploading of materials to the Share Portal.
- The project provides for the export of data in an open format for use in other systems. The ESA model nationwide is that systems be interoperable, allowing flexibility in areas such as staffing

Weaknesses:

- RTI is given as an example of CADERA infrastructure promoting access to needed resources and tools. What is not clear is which students are afforded access to RTI model benefits, or if all students are wrapped into the use of RTI structures and scheduling.
- Overall, the information and focus in this section is predominately on student support, with minimal reference to parent support structures. It is unclear how the project will leverage programs such as Learn21 to help parents become better educated in the new directions in curriculum as well as in strategies to help students succeed with college- and career-readiness.

This section is scored a [8] as the CADERA project has the capacity and infrastructure to support personalized learning in each ESA. Student needs and teacher development are strongly supported by existing projects. These projects will be folded into the CADERA project, thereby providing more technical support to each ESA, supporting their missions to provide technology services both in and out of the school building, differentiated to meet the needs of students, teachers, and principals, and to some extent, parents.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The CADERA describes an evaluation process supported by extensive data collection and analyses to determine how teaching and learning services are delivered, and the impacts of those services.

Strengths:

- Extensive work by an independent evaluator will be done to conduct all monitoring and feedback tasks. The evaluator's tasks will include the coordination of evaluation processes and all data collection. The evaluator will also conduct a contextual analysis, thereby identifying both barriers to and promoters of implementation.

The project's evaluation focuses on three impact statements around which ongoing and continuous re-assessment will be based. These impact statements are directly linked to evaluation research questions.

Weaknesses:

- Indicators will measure the implementation and impact of the CADERA project against three impact statements. These indicators have been pre-determined and will also emerge as the project progresses. However, the indicators have not been provided for review and therefore it is not possible to substantiate their significance within the evaluation structure submitted.
- It is not clear how reliability of the data will be determined, especially for the most rural of schools and districts. No information is provided to illustrate how the evaluator will reconcile data to classify an activity or program as either a barrier or promoter of implementation.
- While there are three impact statements, only two are reflected in the evaluation research questions. It is unclear why the evaluator will not collect data or provide consistent feedback on the third impact statement. The third impact statement revolves around evidence of student and teacher change directly associated with CADERA's implementation.

This section is scored a [9]. CADERA's continuous improvement process contains all aspects of a high-quality plan and is ambitious in scope, given it is meant to capture the "sheer breadth of participation". Multiple feedback loops exist both within the project as well as within the various state projects themselves. While the outlined Continuous Improvement Cycle is connected to the project's logic model, it is not clear how the logic model has influenced the indicators already created, what they will measure, and how reliability of the data will be determined. The lack of inclusion of the third impact statement as an evaluation research question creates a discrepancy and disconnect between logic model, theory of change, and continuous improvement cycle delineated in this section and therefore weakens the overall credibility of the plan.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The CADERA proposal is of high quality with respect to having an articulated plan to capture data via the virtual network, sharing findings with all levels of project management by written submissions, teleconferencing, webinars, as well as through conference presentations. The plan clearly articulates how these reports will be provided monthly, quarterly, or annually, as determined by the continuous improvement cycle structures embedded throughout project activities. The proposal provides thorough development of informational materials to be created and dispersed to the public and all stakeholders. The evaluator will be responsible for training of project leadership and district/site leadership to help build capacity at the district/site levels. This section is scored a [5].

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The CADERA project includes a set of applicant-proposed performance measures with no data yet available. The project is geared to collect and analyze results gained from tools to be designed, developed and implemented by 2014-2015.

Strengths:

- Data for the performance measures will be measured and reported annually after 2014-2015. Tables for the performance measures currently show these fields blank, as data is not yet available to establish baselines from which to make projections.
- Rationale for each measure is reasonable, with each aimed at capturing student intentions, interests, socio-emotional growth, or preparedness for post-secondary work or career placement.
- Each ESA state has or will have systems that match student achievement data with teacher and principal evaluation processes. These data are reflected in several of the performance indicators.

Weaknesses:

- Alternative student outcomes (i.e., student portfolios), are provided as performance measures. While innovative and specifically linked to career-readiness, the data to be collected is predominantly attitudinal in nature – 4 surveys with each collecting affective data. No discussion provided as to how these subjective data points will be used toward evaluation of all key outcomes in section (E)(4). No indication what percentages will be needed to validate survey findings.
- Only "some" ESAs will be using portfolios and rubric scoring – no clear indication how many or which ESAs will be

involved.

- Not clear how data measuring the completion of a Transition Plan (a performance indicator) can be used to gauge effectiveness or success of CADERA activities/programs.

This section is scored a [2]. The CADERA project is commended for its focus on the student, and his/her perceptions of college- and/or career-readiness. While these data points are important, equally important are more objective data focused on determining the efficacy of the curriculum and implementation models espoused by the CADERA project. The information presented in this section was skewed more toward collecting affective types of data.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The 8 Key Outcomes developed will be evaluated with a focus on change over time in aggregate-level data. These data will provide CADERA leadership with information regarding interests, and perception of readiness, as well as academic achievement data.

Weaknesses:

- It is not clear how the various state measurement processes and scales will be reconciled in order to determine increases to Key Outcome #1, does CADERA increase the number of effective and highly effective educators.
- For key outcomes relating to student surveys, there is no indication that student achievement data will be used in any way to correlate perceptions to achievement results.

This section is scored a [3]. The plan allows for regular (typically annual) use of evaluation measures. High standards will be applied to analysis. 8 key outcomes will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the CADERA project. It is unclear how impacts will be reconciled between achievement and survey data. Measuring student perceptions of readiness to graduate is not necessarily the same as measuring a student's achievement record.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The bulk of funding will be devoted to the development and operation of the CADERA virtual network. Toward that end, existing funding sources have been leveraged in support of infrastructure work and professional development.

Strengths:

- WA has identified \$4.8 million in leveraged funding. Other state matches are not provided.

Weaknesses:

- Clear listing of schools designated under federal improvement status is missing. Vague references to "some".
- Vague references made about leveraging funding to support district initiatives. It is not possible to correlate the information to specific ESAs or LEAs.
- Contradictory information provided regarding CADERA districts from WA (9) and this section referencing 11 districts in CADERA from the WA ESA.
- It is not evident that agreements are in place to leverage personnel from all ESAs and agencies for purposes of CADERA. It is not clear if AESA's approval to these personnel agreements is sufficient or binding.

This section is scored a [4]. There are contradictory statements in terms of districts participating, and there is a lack of clear identification of schools for program improvement. While the budgetary items listed are adequate in providing needed personnel, materials and supplies, and there is evidence of leveraging state funding sources to support the CADERA project, the leveraging information comes from only one of the 5 member states. Given the application was initiated over a year ago, it is reasonable to expect comparable funds leveraging from the remaining 4 member states.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The vision for CADERA’s virtual network includes belief that once states experience the benefits of the digital tools, their alignment to CCSS/AS college- and career-readiness standards, and data evaluation to assess student outcomes and teacher effectiveness, the CADERA model will be sought by ESAs across the country.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • CADERA will be leveraged to assist ESA AK in aligning current services and resources in order to operationalize the state’s CTE plan. CADERA objectives will become institutionalized within the CTE plan. • Agreements are in place in NM that ensures continuance of the CADERA project post grant years. REC staff will be trained in the tools and resources of CADERA to continue providing support to districts/schools/educators. • ESA WA will extend CADERA tools and services by coordinating with Title I programs and funding sources. School Improvement coordinators will be invited to attend and contribute to the career-readiness and project-based learning web tools as well as on CCSS/AS trainings. • RESA WV will use CADERA to fill a void for career-driven education and will work to sustain the work of the project. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CADERA partnering with the AR Dept of Career Education to explore feasibility of adding CADERA’s work in online courses to their offerings is in theory only at this time. • WA will invite partners and leverage Title I personnel and programs, but there is no evidence of agreements that CADERA tools or services will be sustained by these partners. <p>This section is scored a [6]. CADERA ESAs have suggested several sustainability models for consideration by the project. As other national ESAs join the CADERA model network, sustainability will be assumed by AESA. As this work is still very much a theoretical concept, there are few confirmed agreements (2 out of 5 states) to sustain the work of the project. While a post-grant budget is provided, it does not include budget assumptions or potential sources. It is not evident that purposeful planning for post-grant sustainability has been thoroughly addressed. In the Implementation Plan provided in section (A)(4), post-grant work is included in only two line-item areas, and not directly, but only in the listing of the time span provided in the timeline.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ripple Effects WSIS program is a proven technology-based tool that provides an intervention system based on the socio-emotional and behavioral needs of students. It provides students with access to over 400 topics addressed via interactive lessons, videos, cognitive framing, and game-based quizzes. The WSIS provides online tools that assess social-emotional competencies. It consists of software in multimedia tutorials, and skill-training modules.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships have and will be established with parents, community social service providers, youth-serving organizations, businesses, and other community stakeholders, through trainings and access via software “stations” throughout the community. • Many of the CPP indicators are already part of CADERA evaluation and their data will be used to assess success of the CPP. • Community/school partners will initiate a written, site-specific implementation plan based on correlation of student achievement data with the WSIS software to create a program of service tailored to the specific needs of the local community and schools. • One goal of the CPP is to determine scalability across rural communities regardless of geographical location. Patterns of high-risk will be used to create rural intervention models that have universal applicability. • A private organization has been identified and is poised to develop a national social media strategy to support the 		
--	--	--

work of CADERA and the CPP.

- There is evidence that community partnerships will work using a consensus-building, decision-making process.

Weaknesses:

- Explicit evidence is not provided that official partnerships have been established beyond WA, where the model project originates. While many letters of support have been offered as evidence, there is little to verify that the originators have in fact been part of a design team or have provided input in a structured way to the project.
- It is not clear how the CADERA project/ CPP can impose a consensus-building, decision-making process onto its community/school partners.
- There is no direct indication that connections will be made between the work of CPP and decreasing achievement gaps in the narrative. It is not known how the CPP project will use progress/success as a way to correlate positive influences within the scope of the larger CADERA project.
- Parents are identified as a “community partner”, and it is not clear how parents specifically will be engaged in decision-making processes. It is unclear what standing parent voice has amongst all community partnerships.
- It is not clear if students will be referred to use the WSIS, or if it is purely self-selected use, or if the WSIS modules and lessons will be embedded within the larger CADERA offerings.

This section is scored a [8]. Rural community needs present a challenge to service providers and schools alike in meeting the needs of students and families with socio-emotional and behavioral issues. The capacity of a software program to capture student competency in socio-emotional and behavioral areas, coupled with the ability to provide skills-training and tutorials is a demonstration of the power of technology. While the project is innovative, more is needed with regard to showing direct connection between proposed outcomes and the larger CADERA performance outcomes referenced.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The CADERA proposal meets the priority in its vision to create personalized learning environments for students via digital platforms. The challenges of providing current and relevant resources to both students and teachers are addressed by the CADERA vision. The digital platforms/programs are structured to provide students with courses built around college- and career-ready standards, preparing them for graduation career preparedness. The digital platform will level the playing field for rural districts by providing cost-effective access to high quality professional development and resource materials. Students within the CADERA project will be more engaged by nature of technology tools and the relevance embedded in project-based learning opportunities. Students will be provided a learning environment tailored to better meet the unique needs of rural students.

Total	210	152
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0153WA-2 for North Central Educational Service District 171

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a high score based on the applicant providing a compelling vision for transforming education in rural schools across the country. The focus on linking rural schools at both the student and staff level through a trans-community, system-level response makes sense and holds the promise of transforming education for students who live in isolated communities.</p> <p>(a) The applicant provides a description of the challenges inherent to rural communities with regards to personalized learning (including a lack of flexibility for different learning styles and skill sets) and building upon work in four core educational assurance areas. The shared vision presented in this section provides an innovative approach to supporting small, isolated, rural districts' ability to (a) personalize education through career and college exploration, (b) link to real-world opportunities aligned with college and career readiness utilizing new and emerging technologies, (c) support the development of highly effective educators based by networking teachers and administrators across the country, and (d) support struggling schools by aggregating rural student and teacher data to determine program impact and continuous improvement.</p> <p>(b) The approach that is articulated in this section is clear and credible and provides an opportunity for rural districts to work together to accelerate achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through a personalized student support. The credibility of the approach stems from the use of technology to minimize the isolated nature of small, rural communities and to link both students and staff to a network of learners across other isolated, rural communities. The inclusion of a range of districts from multiple states and the link to the Association of Educational Service Agencies (ASEAs) will support the development of a project that may be scaled to include all types of rural settings. This approach lends to the credibility of the implementation.</p> <p>(c) The description provided in this section does not articulate clearly what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers. The proposed vision clearly aims to transform the educational experience, though the applicant has not provided specific details at the student or classroom teacher level. This section would have been stronger had the applicant provided a more complete picture of specific actions that will be taken to personalize education at the classroom level.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a high score in terms of supporting high quality implementation of this proposal based on meeting all of the criteria outlined for this particular section. The only concern specific to this area was the lack of disaggregated data provided at the school level. The following provides an overview of each sub-criterion:</p> <p>(a) The applicant provides a rationale for the selection/invitation for Education Service Agencies to participate to include selecting regions that represent categories defining rural America. The ESA's then invited LEAs to participate who in turn invited middle and high schools to participate. The primary driver behind the process was ensuring the consortium represented the broad category of schools that would be defined as rural.</p> <p>(b) The applicant provided a list of participating schools from each LEA.</p> <p>(c) The applicant provided the total number of students participating to include the subgroups specified in this criterion. It was difficult to identify school level demographic information. Providing this information would have made this proposal stronger.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant received a high score for this particular section based on the evidence provided that support the ability to scale the reform across and ultimately beyond the participating districts. This applicant identifies two change models that will support the implementation of the reform proposal to include both technology access and extending career exploration in academic programming. These two models, coupled with the logic model provided in the application, will help the</p>		

applicant reach its outcome goals and ultimately improve student-learning outcomes. As an example, the logic model specific to the development and support of highly effective teachers requires the use of technology, via the proposed Shared Portal, to support teacher participation in a variety of professional development activities (i.e. virtual workshops; live capture lesson studies; virtual professional learning communities; etc.). In the absence of the change model specific to technology, the articulated logic model would not be capable of impacting teacher effectiveness. This represents an innovative approach in support of teacher effectiveness in small, isolated, rural communities.

In terms of scaling this project beyond the participating schools and districts, the proposal identifies a national organization (AESAs) as a key partner and ultimately a source of disseminating the model across other rural communities throughout the country. The project's use of cloud-based technology lends itself to being scalable and the support of the ASEA will provide a natural venue to encourage and support participation of other districts.

The applicant did not provide a clear and coherent plan incorporating all of the various elements of a high quality plan identified in the notice (goals, objectives, deliverables, timelines, persons responsible, etc.). Specifically, a timeline, identification of specific deliverables, and identification persons responsible were not clearly delineated. Including all of the elements of a high quality plan would have made this section stronger.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a medium score based the lack of ambitious goals set across many of the schools within the consortium. The lack of ambitious goals suggests the proposed project may not result in a transformation of education in rural settings. For example, estimating at least a 2% gain per year on average for all LEAs may be achievable yet is not ambitious. It would certainly not be ambitious for the schools in New Mexico where they have the maximum percent of students meeting benchmark in reading and math is 59.7% and 46.9% respectively. Furthermore, the applicant did not identify State ESEA targets for each LEA as specified within this criterion. The following provides feedback specific to each sub-criterion in this section:

(a) As reflected above, the anticipated 2% annual growth does not reflect an ambitious goal for the project. As an example, schools in New Mexico have relatively low overall achievement as compared with other participating districts and are projected to make modest annual gains in reading and math. For example, the overall mathematics achievement of 10th grade students in the West Las Vegas Schools has been around 18%. The anticipated impact of the grant would yield a rate of just over 22%. This is not an ambitious goal. Furthermore, anticipated growth throughout the grant for 7th grade reading are the same for all students (47.8% to 52.8%) as for students with special needs (5.9% to 10.9%). This same type of modeling for growth was identified across many districts/schools in the data presented. While this growth may certainly be achievable, it is not ambitious.

(b) As reflected in the discussion presented in (a), anticipating growth that is equal across subgroups will not decrease the achievement gap. Furthermore, some districts identified differential growth that will actually increase the achievement gap (Klawock City Schools - 15% point difference in 3-10 math in 2012-13, projected 17.6% difference in 2017-18. Blevins School District college enrollment rate for all students in 2012-13 was 49% points higher than students with special needs. The 2017-18 projects a difference of 54.1 % points. The applicant does not provide clear and compelling evidence that their project will decrease the achievement gaps presented across the consortium.

(c) As reflected in the discussion presented for (a), the data and projected growth specific to graduation rates were not deemed to be ambitious across the consortium. Again, several schools anticipated average yearly growth that is incremental at best and was applied equally across all students and the various subgroups. This does not reflect ambitious goals that would align with an innovation yielding the potential to transform education in rural communities.

(d) As reflected in the discussion presented for (a), the data and projected growth specific to college enrollment were not deemed to be ambitious across the consortium. As an example, The data from Washington LEA's projected Oroville growth is from 37% to 40%, while Entiat's growth is projected to grow from 75% to 81%. While this growth may be achievable, it is not ambitious.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not provide evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years specific to increasing student achievement and/or eliminating achievement gaps. The applicant would have been stronger if more examples were cited and clear evidence of success was provided. The overall score in this section was low based on the lack of data supporting a clear track record of success specific to increased student learning and/or decreasing the achievement gap. The following provides specific information for each of the sub-criterion:</p> <p>(a) The examples provided as evidence referenced the implementation of innovative programs and practices yet did not provide compelling data supporting growth in achievement or the reduction of achievement gaps over the past four years. While some data was provided (i.e. number of students from PLTW programs majoring in STEM areas; increase of 12.5% over 6 years for the AKPIRC initiative; and the one year results of the Hope Academy of Science and Technology) there was no way to determine the significance of the efforts as trend data was not provided, nor was baseline data provided to assess the overall impact of the innovations.</p> <p>The schools or programs identified as improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps did not all include data sets demonstrating a clear record of success over the past four years. For example, the Washington ESD 171 program indicated it nearly doubled the percent of middle school students who met math standards and that the region reach historical high percentages of students passing 5th, 8th and 10th grade assessments. This data would suggest the program has demonstrated a clear record of success, though it is difficult to ascertain the overall impact based on the limited data provided. Likewise, the New Mexico Regional Education Cooperative provides evidence of a successful program, yet the lack of historical data regarding the percent of "C" or above on NMPED grades does not identify whether or not these levels are an improvement. The two West Virginia examples (Simulated Workplaces and Mingo County Stem Programs) did not provide any data specific to student achievement.</p> <p>The specific example of Tudor Elementary School in Alaska provided a specific example of a school or program that increased student achievement and reduced the achievement gap as data from 2004-05 was presented and compared to data from 2009-10. The proposal would have been stronger had the applicant provided complete data sets demonstrating increases in achievement and/or reduction in achievement gaps for all of the examples provided as evidence of a clear track record of success.</p> <p>(b) Not all of the examples provided included evidence of effective reforms in the lowest achieving schools. The Washington ESD 171 stated that math MAPS scores increased significantly in each of the following three years - yet actual data is not provided. The New Mexico example provides state-wide data for 3rd grade achievement increases as a state - not specific to a low performing school or district. The Bering Strait School District example did provide data supporting a positive impact on persistently low performing schools.</p> <p>(c) The applicant did provide a description of how student performance data is available to various stakeholders across the districts in the participating ESA's.</p> <p>The overall score in this section was low based on the lack of data supporting a clear track record of success specific to increased student learning and/or decreasing the achievement gap. The lack of complete data sets made it difficult to ascertain the overall impact of the efforts described. Furthermore, not all of the examples fit the criteria (i.e. the New Mexico example that was specific to a state-wide effort). The applicant would have been stronger if more examples were cited and clear evidence of success was provided.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a description of the extent to which the ESA's provide financial information to the public. However, the information provided in the description and in the appendix is not specific to school level expenditures as outlined in this particular criterion. Furthermore, the applicant does not make a statement or provide evidence specific to the current level of availability of actual salaries and non-personnel expenditures at the school level across participating LEAs. As such, the applicant received a low score.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant scored a high score based on the information provided specific to the state context for implementation in each of the States represented in this proposal. The applicant has provided a brief description of individual state laws that support the various ESAs role in supporting LEAs efforts to impact student achievement. For example, New Mexico state law specifies a governance framework for ESAs including a Joint Powers Agreement between REC's (ESAs) and each school district. The evidence cited suggests that ESA's in each state have the authority and autonomy to implement the project as described in the proposal.

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

15

9

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a medium score based on the extensive list of partners and organizations committing support from non-profit agencies, post-secondary education, healthcare agencies and organizations, public agencies, and private businesses and for profit groups. Furthermore, the support of the Harris Foundation of Texas and the initial conversation with KDM & Associates represent the type of partnerships necessary for successful implementation. The applicant did not receive a higher score based on the following:

The applicant did not provide a detailed description of specific outreach efforts at the district or school levels and thus the ability to ascertain the engagement of students, families and teachers is difficult to assess. The applicant did provide signatures of union representatives who support this project though not all districts have unions. In those districts, the criteria asked that teachers be surveyed specific to their support. Evidence of teacher support in non-collective bargaining districts was not provided.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Overall, this section of the proposal is strong as elements of a high quality plan are evident throughout this section. The proposed use of the Shared Portal, in conjunction with the students personalized career plans, provide a unique opportunity for students in rural communities to have their learning opportunities expanded and ultimately personalized.

There were a couple of areas of concern including the role of career and college coaches and how they would interact with students as described in this proposal as well as the development of a coherent assessment system capable of providing specific and timely feedback to students. Even with those two specific concerns, this section received a high score. The following provides a brief overview of each sub-criterion in this section:

(a) (i) The proposal will utilize a career-driven education model incorporating career exploration and personalized career plans as part of the personalization plan. This plan begins in middle school with a focus on career exploration that is integrated into the mainstream curriculum. This proposal aims to develop virtual support of both exploration and career planning.

(ii) The applicant identifies critical roles for college and career coaches as they will be providing "on the ground" support for career planning. The budget for this proposal suggests that 10.5 FTE will be allocated for both types of coaches. It is hard to imagine 10.5 FTE being able to service the 96 schools well and to provide individualized feedback to students participating in the project. The applicant states that career coaches (7.0 FTE proposed) will "...work with students throughout the career exploration process, serving as mentors and sounding boards as students explore realistic opportunities. Considering this proposal aims to serve nearly 24,000 students, 7.0 FTE in career coaches does not lend itself to the support suggested by that statement. Overall, the portal concept infused with career opportunities and application is sound. However, the applicant does not clearly delineate the role of the classroom teacher in this overall process. Several references are made toward integrating the work into the school day, yet clear parameters or expectations are not provided.

(iii) The applicant's Shared Portal and the work described in this proposal would create opportunities for students to pursue learning in career pathways that currently do not exist in rural settings. This component part of the project will allow students to pursue areas of interests. Project-based learning is identified as a key strategy to be developed and employed utilizing the Shared Portal. The applicant clearly identifies how project-based learning will be used to support deep learning while students pursue individual interests.

(iv) Utilizing technology to expose students to a range of careers via the Virtual Career Academies is an excellent concept

that yields great potential and opportunity for students in rural communities to be exposed to a range of learning contexts and perspectives not readily available to students at this time. The proposed use of project-based learning through the Shared Portal creates opportunity for students isolated in (often) homogenous settings to interact in real time with students from diverse backgrounds living in other parts of the country. Overall, the use of the Shared Portal to increase rural student exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives is outstanding.

(v) The application of project-based learning utilizing a virtual learning platform will support the development of problem-solving skills, communication, critical thinking, and communication. Incorporating the career planning throughout a student's secondary education experience will incorporate and utilize goal-setting and will support critical thinking. The applicant identifies individual skills reviews to direct students to areas of focus specific to academic skill development.

(b)(i) The individualized career plans will serve as the primary means for developing personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development to ensure the student achieves his/her learning goals and ultimately graduates college and career ready. As stated previously, the use of both the career plans and the Shared Portal (supporting the Virtual Career Academies), the applicant has proposed a means of diversifying the context and perspective students have in rural parts of the country and is one of the strongest elements of this application.

(ii) The project will provide online, on-site eLearning tools, and 24/7 access to increase the variety of instructional approaches and environments for students in rural communities. The two primary delivery models for high quality approaches include the use of project-based learning and Shared Portals. These two models provide a range of possibilities in terms of various instructional approaches and environments. This element of the proposed project is very strong.

(iii) The applicant describes how it envisions developing and "hosting" high quality content via the Shared Portal. The development and vetting of the content across the consortium is a strong element of this proposal and seems to be realistic in ensuring high quality content is both developed and shared across the various rural communities.

(iv) The applicant identifies a structure and means for developing systems that provide regular feedback at the individual student level. The various component parts of a potential system for feedback (embedded assessments, teacher assessed work through the portal, curriculum monitoring, etc.) as well as the proposed "human element" is complex and the applicant does not provide links between various types of assessments and how they will be combined to develop an effective system. Providing greater clarity as to how the various component parts of the feedback system will be linked would have made this particular section stronger.

(v) The proposed use of the Shared Portal to increase access for high needs students to high quality learning opportunities is one of many strengths in this particular section. As stated previously, the use of technology will enhance the variety of learning opportunities for all students - to include at-risk students.

(c) The applicant identifies training at the beginning of the school year (by coaches and school teams) as the primary means of providing training and support of students with follow up training being provided via webinars. This approach seems reasonable and appropriate.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a strong score for this section based primarily on the Shared Portal tool's potential to eliminate the isolation of teaching in a rural community and to provide individual staff with the ability to personalize their own professional development. Furthermore, the applicant provides elements of a high quality plan (goals, activities, rationale, deliverables, etc.) throughout the section. The following provides feedback specific to each of the sub-criterion:

(a)(i) The applicant identifies how the portal would be used to support specific professional development to include supporting teacher's ability to support students in personalizing the learning environments. This includes supporting professional development specific to project-based learning and the use of the Shared Portal as an instructional tool within core content areas to include mathematics.

(ii) The utilization of the Shared Portal and the proposed development of a bank of learning opportunities from across the consortium provide rural educators with the tools to respond to individual student needs and interests. This aspect of the proposal is strong in that students in rural communities opportunity to learn.

(iii) The applicant proposes to use learning trajectories to both structure the delivery of content within mathematics and reading and to position embedded assessments. The logic presented in this particular criterion is sound though the overall development will take time considering the intent to position such assessments and trajectories within project-based learning opportunities. Providing more detail in terms of how this particular component part of the project will be developed and implemented would have strengthened this particular section.

(iv) The applicant has identified elements of teacher and principal evaluation systems from each of the participating states and references utilizing the systems to drive professional development workshops, webinars, and coaching. While not addressed directly, the use of the Shared Portal as described in other parts of the proposal will lend itself to sharing resources and tools to improve individual teachers and principals.

(b)(i) Virtual learning opportunities for staff, to include virtual coaching, will be used to enhance current professional development within rural settings and to support the full implementation of this project. A variety of virtual tools (i.e. webinars, virtual professional learning communities, etc.) will be used to support teachers ability to personalize learning and support students within a career-driven education model. The Shared Portal provides a means for teachers to network with other professionals beyond the geographic boundaries of the rural community in which they teach.

(ii) The Shared Portal provides the means for sharing high quality learning resources that are either purchased by the consortium or developed by members within the consortium. The development and implementation of the portal is the strongest element of this application and will support access to high quality learning resources for teachers involved in this project.

(iii) The link between assessment tools and student needs (in terms of specific resources or approaches) is not as strong as it needs to be. The applicant could have made a stronger case for this link by further articulating how the various assessment components will be used to drive students to specific learning resources.

(C) As discussed above, all participating school leaders and leadership teams will have the training, policies tools, data, and resources that will support their ability to implement effective, personalized learning environments. The Shared Portal will provide the means for delivering training, data, and resources across the various rural communities and reflects an innovative approach to linking isolated leaders and leadership teams into a network of support.

(D) The network of over 2000 teachers from the 96 schools across five states via the Shared Portal provides an opportunity for professional development, shared curriculum development, and delivery of differentiated opportunities for kids that does not currently exists in rural communities. This network will support the ability of rural districts to increase the number of students receiving instruction from effective and highly effective teachers including those in hard-to-staff areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scored a high score based on evidence specific to a high quality plan to implement an overall governance structure, autonomy and flexibility provided to school teams, and personalization strategies that provide opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in multiple ways while also increasing the availability of learning resources to all students including students with disabilities and English learners. The only area in this section that could have been improved or expanded upon was each district's ability to grant credit for learning that is not linked to seat time. The following provides an overview of each sub-criterion:

(a) The described governance structure (including a consortium Leadership Team, District Design Teams, and School Teams) provide a level of organization that can support tall participating schools.

(b) The applicant states that each school team will have sufficient autonomy and flexibility to implement the project. This autonomy is supported by the MOU's signed by district Board chairs and superintendents.

(c) The applicant provides several examples of opportunities to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery in a number of participating states. Many of the examples are specific to virtual learning, while the examples from Alaska and West Virginia represent opportunities to earn credit by proficiency or mastery for opportunities outside of the traditional classroom setting.

(d) The articulated personalization strategies for students living in rural settings contained within this proposal represent an

opportunity for students to demonstrate mastery at multiple points of time and in multiple ways.

(e) As with (d) the articulated personalization strategies will provide learning resources that are adaptable and full accessible to all students. This proposal lends itself to significantly increase the capacity of rural districts to serve students with disabilities and English learners.

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

10

6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The overall score for this section is medium based on concerns regarding the accessibility of technology for all schools and students and the level of infrastructure available to support the technical assistance needs required for full implementation of the project. The following provides specific feedback to each of the sub-criterion:

(a) The applicant addresses the types of resources that will be made available as part of the Shared Portal to include special student courses from each state. However, the strength of the proposal in terms of the potential of the Shared Portal is dependent on students being able to access the portal both during the school day and outside of the school day. The applicant does not specify how students and parents will be ensured access via the appropriate technology at both the school level and outside of the school day. Including information specific to student access would have made this section stronger.

(b) The applicant will ensure stakeholders receive appropriate levels of technical support through existing technology infrastructure provided by ESAs within each of the participating regions. The assumption that ESAs will be able to handle the increased load of fully utilizing the Shared Portal may be unrealistic as the amount of technology interface and use will increase significantly. Including information regarding ESA response to an increase use of technology would have made this section stronger.

(c) The applicant identifies that the information technology systems will utilize an open data format that meets this particular criteria.

(d) The applicant identifies and ensures that participating LEAs and schools use or will use interoperable data systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Overall the continuous improvement model being suggested is strong and the applicant received a high score for this section.

The applicant has provided key elements (i.e. logic model or improvement cycle, key research questions) of an effective continuous improvement process and has identified the use of an external evaluator to help construct a coherent plan.

This approach seems reasonable considering the breadth of participation and the challenge of implementing such a project across seven different ESAs in five different states. The overall organization of the project with the three-tiered governance structure (project, LEA, and School) will lend itself to engaging the multiple stakeholders in continuous improvement processes.

Furthermore, the applicant has identified specific elements of a high quality plan to include specific research questions to be considered (goals); activities that the evaluator and the various levels of the consortium will engage in; deliverables in terms of how information will be processed; and who will be responsible for the various aspects of the continuous improvement process.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a high quality plan with specific timelines and deliverables that align with a fluid continuous

improvement process. The inclusion of specific feedback and engagement mechanisms, utilizing the nine data sources at quarterly intervals, provide for an ongoing communication and engagement process. The inclusion of interviews and surveys of both staff and students will provide the necessary "ground-level" engagement strategies to incorporate into an overall improvement process. The only potential shortcoming of the plan is the lack of direct interface and engagement with parents. The overall score for this section is high.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The overall score for this section is high based on the inclusion of the required measures, a rationale for selecting each measure, the appropriateness of the collection of measures, and the plan provided to constantly monitor the effectiveness of each measure in supporting project implementation. The only concern specific to the measures is the stated intent of the applicant to develop three specific measures. The concern is detailed in the following:

(a) The development of specific measures (Expectation and Academic Engagement Scale; Social Skills Development Scale, College/Career Transition Preparation Scale) to be used across the consortium and to gauge the implementation and impact of the project is ambitious. While the applicant referenced literature to support such measures, the applicant clearly stated it would be developing these measures yet did not provide enough detailed information as to how these measures would be developed to ensure a high levels of validity and reliability. Providing such information, or utilizing existing measures that have been validated or deemed reliable within the research literature would have made this particular section stronger. The applicant did identify a review process specific to improving the developed measures over time that will be discussed below.

(b) The proposed measures will provide a wide range of information (academic, social-emotional, etc.) supporting the applicants ability to gauge the impact of implementation of the project across multiple districts in multiple states. The measures, assuming all are valid and reliable, yield the potential to provide timely, formative information that can be used to inform the project as it progresses. Overall, the breadth of measures and the selection of the various measures is strong.

(c) The applicant provides a very detailed overview of how the measures will be reviewed and improved over time.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a strong score for this section based on the quality of the elements of a high quality plan for evaluation proposed in this section. Specifically, the applicant has proposed eight key outcome questions to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the investment. These questions and the recommended methodology (focus on change over time) will provide the necessary information to evaluate the program. While not stated specifically in this section, it is assumed the external evaluator will take the lead in this evaluation and that the existing continuous improvement infrastructure will support these efforts. The elements provided illustrate elements of a high quality plan though the applicant did not identify a specific timeline for the evaluation activities.

The only concern identified in this section is the use of the term "aggregate-level data." The applicant did not provide a clear description of what aggregate level analysis means in relation to the various sub-groups this project intends to serve. Clearly identifying what "aggregate-level data" means would have made this section stronger.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The overall budget section is strong with only a couple of areas of concerns that are listed below. In assessing this particular section, accessibility to individual devices and to networks is assumed even though the project serves many rural communities. This issue is addressed in other sections and is not applied against the overall rating for the budget section. The following provides specific feedback to the sub-criterion for this section.

(a) The applicant clearly identifies all types of funds that will support the project to include a line item example from the lead applicant articulating a variety of external support, LEA, State, and other Federal fund support. The inclusion of other

funds that will be supporting the overall project reflects how this project fits within the existing infrastructure and that RTT-D grant funds would be used to innovate and enhance what already exists.

(b) The contractual costs for development of the virtual network and associated costs of supporting teacher professional development both seem reasonable and justified based on the proposed budget. Furthermore, the applicant provides clear, detailed costs for development of tools and for licensure costs associated with the tools that are reasonable considering the type of programming being proposed.

The costs associated with the CADERA infrastructure is reasonable and justified based on the scope of the project. The only concern in this part of the budget is that 10.5 coaches (career and college) does not seem to be nearly sufficient in providing services to nearly 24,000 students.

Another concern regarding the overall budget is the limited amount of resource to support the independent continuous improvement contractor. Considering the necessary development costs associated with the evaluation plan and the cost of implementing the various survey tools and processes, the overall budget for evaluation may not be large enough.

(c) The applicant identifies that a significant portion of funds in the budget are one-time investments supporting the development of the virtual network as well as other expenses (including project staffing) that will not need to be sustained beyond the life-cycle of the project. Furthermore, the applicant provides a itemized list and cost for licensed products that will need to be sustained beyond the term of the grant. Assuming the developed products (and their instructional value) are realized, the associated costs to be sustained could be assumed in future LEA or ESA budgets.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	9
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a high score for this section based on the relatively low cost of sustaining the initial investment and the potential for the on-going costs to be mitigated by an increase in Shared Portal use through scaling efforts supported by the ASEA. While the applicant did not directly address how it would evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes in this section, the overall evaluation plan was presented in section E1 and provides an overview of how the applicant will evaluate the project with regards to both outcomes and productivity.

The applicant has identified several means for sustaining the project beyond the term of the grant. The idea that the project could be scaled to include other ESAs through the support of a national organization (ASEA) is intriguing and would effectively lower costs for the consortium. The applicant also identified opportunities specific to each participating state that could contribute to sustainable funding of the project in alignment with existing state initiatives and efforts. This includes utilization of Career and Technical Education (CTE) resources, Federal entitlement resources, etc.

As stated in an earlier section, some costs would need to be assumed as part of the LEA's annual budget (i.e \$48.01 licensure fee). All of the potential funding streams beyond the life of the grant are reasonable and possible in terms of supporting the sustained elements of the project based on the budget assumptions provided.

The only concern with this particular section is based on the overall support of State agencies in Arkansas and West Virginia. The sections for these two states do not reflect as strong of a commitment or as great of potential to realize additional funding streams as Alaska, Washington and New Mexico.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a high score based on the innovative method of delivering social, emotional, and behavioral support via the developed Shared Portal. The applicant's use of a technology delivered, evidence-based strategy is an innovative means of providing support for students in isolated, rural communities. While this priority asks for integration of private and public agencies, it is assumed that most of the rural communities lack the type of private and public agencies available in

more urban settings and thus the score for this section was not impacted by the lack of integrated services. The only issue with this section was that the applicant did not include annual performance measures against the identified population-level results identified.

The applicant identified 7 desired results that align with and support the applicant's overall proposal and meet the stated criteria to include educational results and family and community supports. Furthermore, the applicant identifies means of tracking specific indicators and how this information will be used at the community level, with various partners, to structure supports for individual students and families as well as for the community as a whole. As with other aspects of this proposal, the inclusion of technology-supported interventions within the context of a Shared Portal presents the potential for isolated communities to build upon the shared learning of other communities facing similar issues or circumstance.

The overall program will be continuously improved following a model from Washington state (*I Am New School*) that employ specific structures and processes to guide implementation and improvement efforts.

As with other components of this project, the ability to build the capacity of staff and the community will be supported by utilization of the Shared Portal. Utilization of the WSIS system will allow staff to assess the needs and assets of participating students as well as the needs and assets of the school community via the Ripple Effects. This is a strength of this project as this type of resource is currently not available in these rural communities. Furthermore, the utilization of the Shared Portal will create the possibility for a virtual clearinghouse of ideas and strategies that will be developed through the *I Am New School* process. This structured support through a virtual network of professionals and communities is innovative and holds the potential to provide supports in rural communities that currently do not exist.

The only issue in this particular section is the lack of ambitious and achievable performance measures proposed for the desired population-level results. The lack of including any annual performance measures did not support the sub-criterion specific to the Competitive Priority section. Including these measures would have made the overall section stronger.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant met the criteria for Absolute Priority 1 in support of each of the four core assurance areas through the development and implementation of the Share Portal. This tool will provide rural communities with the necessary infrastructure to personalize students' education; support teacher effectiveness via virtual professional development, professional learning communities, staff development, etc.; deepen student learning specific to content aligned with college and career readiness; and support schools that are struggling via a shared network of teachers and school leaders. Evidence of meeting this criterion can be found within the various sub-sections of the proposal with the majority of evidence being found in subsections C (1) and C (2).

Total	210	165
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0153WA-3 for North Central Educational Service District 171

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores high in articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. CADERA is building on educational assurances, however only three assurances were defined; increase student achievement and personalized learning, increase the number of effective and highly effective teachers, prepare for deep systematic change through validation of outcomes and scale up to rural educational systems nationwide. CADERA articulates a credible approach to accelerating student achievement by using a web based network for rural education. This web based program allows students from the five states to have access to the best quality education delivered from the most effective teachers. CADERA explains the classroom experience however only explains this to be project based and takes place within the context of careers. Students will be working at their own skill level but there is a lack of evidence of what this will look like. As this is an excellent plan of students working at their own level through trajectories, it is unclear what this plan will look like resulting in a loss of points.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores high for approach to implementation. CADERA demonstrated a collaborative approach to selecting schools to participate in this project. CADERA is unique as there will be schools from five states participating. There is clear evidence the planning group met weekly to develop a vision and project design. The meetings focused on staffing and program resources, teaching and learning goals and systems in place in which to build. There is mention of using evidence based strategies and reviewing research, however there is not mention of what this evidence of research is resulting in a loss of points. CADERA clearly defines the total number of students and teachers from each state who will participate in this project. Each group of students is categorized as high need. CADERA's approach to implementation supports high quality LEA-level and school level implementation, it lacks evidence of evidence based strategies and research used to design this plan resulting in a loss of points.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores high in LEA-wide reform and change. CADERA includes a high quality plan which describes how their reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform. This reform can be seen in their logic model for both teachers and students. There are clearly defined inputs such as funding, career coaches, and best practices, implementation such as professional development and the creation of a share portal, outputs and outcomes such as highly effective teachers and students with stronger behavioral and social emotional skills and improved graduation rates. There is a plan in place to continuously evaluate the progress of this project which demonstrates a high quality approach to effective reform and change. This plan includes annual and quarterly feedback. CADERA plans to scale up and provide district wide reform by following Everett Rogers Diffusion of Innovations which are relative advantage, simplicity, compatibility, trial ability and observability. This approach will be used in other LEA's, ESA's and schools as a model for distant sites educational reform. CADERA has a clear focus of gathering information to continuously improve this project to best meet students learning needs.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores low in LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes. CADERA's vision to improve student learning and increase equity is demonstrated with this plan. There is clear evidence of performance on assessments by each state. There is evidence of decreasing achievement gaps on average by 2% each year, however in some cases these results will increase achievement gaps resulting in a loss of points. The goal of CADERA is to increase graduation rates by 2% which does not seem like an ambitious goal to make change. There is not a goal established for college enrollment as there are only percentages given of the current 12th grade students who attend college. The lack of an ambitious goal results in a loss of points. CADERA will use highly qualified staff, stakeholder support, a Planning group to continue to refine this plan, a focus on project based learning and the creation of Virtual Career Academies. There is a clearly defined timeline representing the activity, deliverable and party responsible. This plan has achievable goals resulting in a score of 5 in this category.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores in the medium to low category for demonstrating a clear track record of success. There is evidence from several schools that success is happening and achievement gaps are reducing. An example of this is the evidence provided about Tudor Elementary School, a low achieving school. In 2004-2005 state testing data with 2009-2010 data reflects significant gains for Hispanic students. These gains are attributed to a variety of teaching strategies and parent outreach. As this does show learning and achievement increasing, there is not clear evidence of every participating school and their learning gains resulting in a loss of points. Student performance data is made available in a variety of ways such as State Report Cards, meetings, district website and newsletters. This shows CADERA's commitment to making student performance data available to students, parents and educators.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores high for increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices and investments. There is a clear level of transparency from each state. Personnel salaries for school level instructional and support staff are made available. This information can be found in the published annual reports.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores high for state context of implementation. CADERA provides a thorough explanation of each state and expectations to implement the personalized learning environment. An example of this is given in New Mexico where ESA's are governed by a Board of Directors. This structure is provides a framework for the ESA's. They may participate in cooperative programs with the use of federal, state and other funds in accordance with all applicable laws. By providing this explanation for each state CADERA receives all points in this category.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	10
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores medium-high in stakeholder engagement and support. CADERA provides evidence of teacher support and involvement by school with signatures from the superintendent, mayor, school board representative and teachers union representative from each participating school. A proposal development team was created. This team provided weekly updates to the vision, design and implementation of this project. Schools were then asked to distribute this information to parents, teachers and students to garner feedback. In addition, community organizations wrote letters of support for this project. Engaging all stakeholders is a key component to getting a program to be successful. As there is evidence of support, there is not evidence of meaningful support of what each organization contributed to the program other than supporting the plan resulting in a loss of points.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores high in learning. CADERA has a clear plan for students to understand what they are learning. This will include the student creating their career plan not having the plan created for them. This plan will be in the Share Portal and students will be able to access this both at home and at school. There will also be career videos for students to view to pique interest in specific careers to better form a career path. Students will also have access to diverse cultures as they will be working virtually with students across five states. This will give the students the most exposure to career opportunities across the United States. Students will be exposed to high quality instruction through the use of the Share Portal and project based instruction.</p> <p>Ongoing and regular feedback will be assessed by teachers. This plan will include teachers receiving a report on students</p>		

career interests and a window on whether students need to attend college or career training. In the project based learning, curriculum monitoring is competency based and will assess student skills for each topic moving students forward when they master a topic. Both monitoring tools are beneficial to student success and show an ambitious and achievable plan.

Accommodations for high need students will be addressed as these students will have extra teacher or paraprofessional help to complete tasks as well as the opportunity to work at home with their family for extra support. There seems as if there should be additional educational resources available for students with high needs instead of additional staff resulting in a loss of points.

Finally there is a training component that will take place in the beginning of the school year with follow up workshops and webinars throughout the year for students who need it. A timeline is available to verify dates and activities to reach these goals.

CADERA receives a score of 18 for this high quality plan. CADERA provides key goals, the rationale for activities, timeline, deliverables and parties responsible to complete this plan. CADERA provided clear rationale for selecting the activities for students as well as timelines outlined for each year of implementation. CADERA also identified all responsible parties and deliverables to be used. This plan gives students personalized learning plans with the support of teachers.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CADERA scores in the medium category for teaching and leading. CADERA's approach to professional development is of high quality. This is evident through the phases of professional learning. This phase includes planning, teaching and training, coaching and reflecting. There are various activities such as onsite and virtual training, initial onsite training, virtual and onsite coaching, virtual workshops, webinars and video presentations. Teachers will be able to adapt curriculum to implement project based learning as well as use the Share Portal. There is not evidence of a plan to frequently measure student progress toward meeting college and career readiness. There is mention of tailoring student learning to meet student needs however there is not mention of a plan to measure this resulting in a loss of points. There is not evidence of providing teacher and principal effectiveness in this plan. There is mention of an evaluation system which provides feedback, however, there is not a clear plan of how this feedback will give recommendations and supports for improvement.

Teachers will be trained to identify optimal learning approaches to respond to individual student academic needs. An example of this is coaching to effectively teach project based learning as well as live video capture. CADERA will use high quality learning resources such as web based programs as well as project based resources. Both learning resources will focus on college and career readiness. Since this is an individual plan for students, student needs will always be met. This plan is set up to give students who need more time just that but at the same time push students to succeed at faster pace if that is what they need. This approach is high quality as it meets the needs of the individual student. This process will be monitored twice a year with student input through focus groups.

There is not clear evidence of Information, from the teacher evaluation system that helps school leaders and school leadership teams assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement. There is mention of skill building to create highly effective teachers, however this does not meet the requirement of this plan. There is clear evidence of training, systems and practices to improve school progress. This can be seen virtual professional development and coaching.

There is evidence of a quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers. This plan includes video taped lessons. This is a compelling idea, however more activities could be done to ensure CADERA meets student needs resulting in a loss of points.

CADERA demonstrates a quality plan for teaching and learning. The plan they have outlined has key components to success such as professional development phases and a plan to monitor and provide feedback however there are missing components such as teacher and principal effectiveness and providing additional activities for students to receive instruction from high quality teachers resulting in a medium score for this category. Because of the missing elements, this plan does not qualify as high quality.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
--	------------------	--------------

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	13
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores in the high category for LEA practices, policies and rules. CADERA provides evidence of governance structure comprised of a Leadership Team, District Design Team and School Teams. The structure allows all voices to be heard and all stakeholders to have a say in the implementation of the project. There is evidence that school leadership teams will have the ability and flexibility to design their school day to best meet students needs. There is not evidence of schools having control over budgets resulting in a loss of points. CADERA provides examples of programs that are working to give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery, however, not every school is using every program. This is left up to the individual school to decide which program works best for their cross section of students. Also there is mention of the Share Portal being available to students at anytime, which is a great idea, however this does not explain how it affects students progress and to earn credit. CADERA provides evidence of giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times in multiple ways through project based learning, and continuously embedded assessments to determine mastery before moving on to the next strand. CADERA shows a commitment to providing resources and instructional practices that are fully adaptable to all students. This is evident through the use of continuous skill reviews embedded into the software. There is also the ability to use natural voice audio to allow full participation for visually impaired students of students with below average literacy skills, fully descriptive and energetic screen displays describing each learning component for students with hearing impairments and customized career planning components to identify college and work opportunities for students.</p> <p>CADERA has a high quality plan to implement this project. There is not evidence of how the Share Portal will effect student progress to earn credit resulting in a loss of points.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores medium in LEA and school infrastructure. CADERA outlines a plan by state that all students will have adequate technology available to them regardless of income however it does not explain how they will receive this technology or what this technology will be resulting in a loss of points. The technological aspect of this plan seems rather large and if not delivered properly can cause a problem for students to progress. CADERA is committed to ensuring students, parents, educators and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of support however they do not outline a specific plan with appropriate levels of support or a wide range of strategies resulting in a loss of points. CADERA mentioned that students and parents can export their information in an open data format through the Share Portal however there is not mention of how this information will be used in other electronic learning systems, resulting in a loss of points. CADERA does have a system in place where schools use inter operable data systems. There is an explanation of how each state will use this information and the capability of each state's system.</p> <p>CADERA's plan to to have adequate technology is fair. There is lack of evidence and explanation of the delivery of this technology and how students will be able to access this technology resulting in a loss of points.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores high for continuous improvement process. CADERA outlines a quality plan for implementing rigorous continuous improvement with monitoring conducted on a quarterly basis . There are evaluative questions used to monitor this plan as well as an outside evaluator to document the progress and outcomes of the plan. Because there is not mention of how this feedback will be publicly shared with stakeholders, which is a key component to a high quality plan, CADERA has a loss of points in this category. CADERA outlined a quality plan however it is not high quality due to the missing information of how they plan to publicly share information with stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CADERA scores high in ongoing communication and engagement. CADERA has outlined a plan to measure implementation, student achievement and outcome data captured on the Share Portal. There is also evidence of ongoing</p>		

monitoring of data sources. This information will be shared with leadership teams monthly the first year and quarterly after that. There is only mention of sharing this information with internal and external stakeholders digitally in year 3 with a link on the Share Portal resulting in a loss of points. There is clear evidence of communication with families through parent organizational meetings, student take homes, mailings to social service agencies and businesses as well as community meetings. There is also an approach mentioned to bring businesses in to discuss career opportunities, learn what other employers look for in new hires and share different career information which is a major emphasis on career and college readiness.

CADERA scores high in this category for providing a plan to foster ongoing communication. This plan is lacking evidence of how stakeholders will be invited to give and share input on the plan. Because there is not clear evidence of stakeholder responsibility CADERA loses points in this category.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CADERA scores low for performance measures. There is a plan outlined to measure continuous improvement however there is incomplete data in the Appendix to support this plan. There is also mention of monitoring social and emotional growth through an online evaluation which does not seem ambitious or achievable resulting in a loss of points. There is a plan in place to review information, data and procedures to determine the extent to which ongoing needs are being met. Open and ongoing discussions are planned with CADERA management to ensure any problems with the quality of performance data is met and improvements are documented and improved. This shows dedication to continuously improve this plan.

CADERA provides a rationale for the measures selected. The rationale is sound. CADERA has a clear plan to continuously review and improve this plan with ongoing discussions. The annual targets for this plan do not seem ambitious or achievable as in the appendix many sections are left as TBD which is a lack of ambitious and achievable goals. TBD does not show the goals or expectations for students so it is difficult to see what CADERA's expectations for students will be.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CADERA scores low for evaluating effectiveness of investments. CADERA has a plan to pose eight key outcome questions to evaluate effectiveness of investments. These questions will evaluate this plan, however they do not address professional development and activities that employ technology. This does not qualify as a high quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of this project because there is not a timeline or deliverable provided for this plan.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CADERA receives a medium score for budget. CADERA's proposal for their budget identifies all funds that will support their project. It is reasonable and sufficient to support this proposal and thoughtful rationale was given for each investment. There was clear identification if these costs would be a one time cost or an ongoing cost. There is not money allocated for technology for students to use and have access to as previously described in this plan resulting in a loss of points. There is concern that the money allocated for technology will truly be enough to cover the ambition of this plan. If the right amount of money is not allocated to properly fund a technological plan such as this, personalized learning environments will be affected resulting in a loss of points. The budget leaves unanswered questions of how such rural communities will be able to sustain the technology of this plan. Although the budget seems to be sufficient, it does not seem reasonable to provide this much technology to such rural areas resulting in a loss of points.

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

10

6

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CADERA scores medium in sustainability of project goals. CADERA has a plan to sustain the project's goals after the

term of the grant. CADERA noted that the Share Portal enhancements and Virtual Career Academies enhancements as well as professional development will become operational costs after the term of the grant. It does not seem possible to absorb this cost after the term of the grant. According to the budget, this seems as if this would be a large sum of money that could not be absorbed into an already existing school budget. There is no reference to how this will happen. There is also mention of models of sustainability of the grant but will not be visited until year three resulting in a loss of points.

CADERA shows funds available to sustain this project such as district, Title I and Title II funds. The lack of planning until year three of the project poses the greatest loss of points in this category.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

CADERA scores in the low category for competitive preference. CADERA identifies the public and private partnerships they will establish for this program. The specific organizations are mentioned for three of the five participating states resulting in a loss of points.

CADERA is focusing this project on the social and emotional needs of students. They will accomplish this through an online format which does not seem as if it is an ambitious plan. This plan does not identify the educational and social and emotional results. As both programs work hand in hand, there are still not measurable goals to be reached resulting in a loss of points. There should be a timeline or goals for each program to meet both the social emotional and academic needs of students. This online program has the ability to track select indicators and aggregate data. An example of this is to show where students are researching for help and involve additional community service organizations to give this help.

There is a clear social media plan to reach students outside this project. Social media is a 21st Century skill to build valuable relationships in the community. There is a commitment to evaluate this program quarterly. This will be done through a review of information procedures, open and ongoing discussions and a review and report of student behaviors in school and engagement in personal learning. There is not clear evidence of how this program will integrate education and other students. As this is a compelling program, it has a larger focus on social emotional health rather than integrating social emotional health with academics resulting in a loss of points.

CADERA provides a clear plan to assess the needs of participating students with the use of the online program WSIS. This will provide immediate information on initial needs and measure group change. There is a plan to identify and inventory needs and assets of the school and community through focus groups of parents and students to identify the needs and assets of the school and community. This will engage parents and families to have an active role in decision making and resolve challenges and problems. There is not evidence of a plan to routinely assess progress in implementing this plan. There is only mention of walk-beside coaching and peer group support which can make a difference however it will not assess progress resulting in a loss of points.

There is not evidence of annual ambitious yet achievable goals rather simple statements such as students who are successful in school stay in school. This does not meet the requirements of an ambitious plan resulting in a loss of points.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

CADERA meets absolute priority one criteria. This is evident with the project based learning as well as the Share Portal. Both approaches to learning give students the most personalized approach to learning. Students will have the opportunity to chose their own learning path instead of being assigned a path. Through this process, students will be exposed to college and career readiness and accelerate learning at their own pace. Students will work collaboratively with students from five states to meet common goals. Teachers will be trained to meet the criteria of effective and highly effective. All of this will take place while decreasing achievement gaps in student groups.

Total	210	151
-------	-----	-----