



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0896TX-1 for Arlington Independent School District

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 applicant has described a feasible vision that will clear goals in the areas of leadership, community engagement and student safety. The applicant has described a vision that will increase service learning for students. The facilities plan described by the applicant will serve to increase student learning while conserving energy. Lastly, the applicant describes a plan to more fully engage parents in the educational process, which will increase student achievement. However, the applicant did not provide a comprehensive plan to address academic achievement in low performing schools.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A. The applicant described a comprehensive description of the process that was used to select the schools to participate in the project. The applicant conducted interviews and focus groups and various off-site work sessions with various stakeholders. The leadership of the district in collaboration with the stakeholders decided that each of the 6 high schools and 12 middle schools would participate in the project.</p> <p>b. The applicant has fully documented all of the schools that will participate in the grant activities.</p> <p>c. The applicant has comprehensively included the total number of students from each school that will participate, the number of participating educators, the number of participating high need students, and the number of students from low income families.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided an ambitious plan that will create a greater focus on college and career preparedness and increasing the opportunities students have to attain their individual college and career goals. However, they have not provided a plan to scale up programming for students K-6. The applicant completely described the programs that will become a part of the project including, early college high schools, career and college academies, virtual academies, dual credit expansion programs, and a bridge center. The applicant provided a time line that shows the target population, the activities they will engage in and the plan to show scaled up programming throughout implementation.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a well thought out explanation of the vision for the proposed plan that is likely to result in increased student learning and performance. The described plan guides the district staff members to focus on 100% of students in an effort to ensure that all students will adequately develop and monitor their graduation plans.</p> <p>a. The applicant was unable to provide any growth goals for summative assessments due because the state agency has recently changed the new state assessment.</p> <p>b. The applicant has provided an achievable and ambitious goal to decrease achievement gaps within the district. The applicant will use the STAR academy curriculum to bring students to grade level and bridge achievement gaps. Teachers will be offered extensive training using this curriculum.</p>		

c. The applicant has provided ambitious and achievable goals in the form of a deliverable chart to increase the graduation rates among students. The AISD Virtual Academy course will allow students to earn additional credits. Additionally, first generation college students will be offered an Early college High School curriculum. These plans, in addition to other project objectives will allow for an increased graduation rate among students.

d. The applicant has provided a detailed chart that indicates the achievable and ambitious goals of increasing the college enrollment rates for all students in the district. Although the district doesn't currently track data on college enrollment rates desegregated by race, the applicant has indicated that they will do so moving forward as part of the project.

e. The applicant vision is very likely to result in increased post-secondary degree attainment through their increased dual credit course offerings for all students, the virtual academy which will allow students multiple options to earn high school credit.

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	12
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has demonstrated an extensive record of success for the past 4 years of increasing student learning and equity and has included several charts and graphs to demonstrate these improvements.		
a. The applicant has provided graphs that indicate that significant gains were made in almost all academic areas and high school graduation rates. The applicant did not provide evidence of improved college enrollment rates.		
b. The applicant has provided limited evidence of ambitious and significant reforms in increasing achievement in their persistently lowest achieving schools. The applicant has described the school level leadership teams that are in each of the low performing schools that identify strategies to increase achievement among the student body.		
c. The applicant has demonstrated significant evidence that they make student performance and district performance data available to students, educators, parents and the general public. For example, the applicant maintains a comprehensive website that contains all of the information regarding the district performance. Additionally, students are given progress reports with respect to their performance every 3 weeks in addition to a cumulative report card every 6 weeks.		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has provided adequate charts and information to support that they exhibit a high level of transparency in LEA processes and practices.		
The salary of instructional, professional and para professional staff are made available to the public through the district's website or by Open Record Requests. Additionally, Texas Educational State agency also measures the applicants school funding system and financial health through the TEA financial rating system. This report is available to the public.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to show that charter schools have sufficient autonomy under the Texas legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement the plan. The applicant included the Texas Education Code and Senate Bills that offer them such authority. The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate the authority that the SBISD to implement the proposal as indicated.		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:		

a1. The applicant has provided sufficient evidence of support of its teachers through letters of support from the Texas State Teachers Association.

b. The applicant has provided overwhelming evidence of support from stakeholders including the mayors of several surrounding cities, the YMCA, Big Brothers Big Sisters, and the PTA. Although there was evidence of stakeholder group support, it is unclear from the letters whether or not the stakeholders are supportive of the specific project that is presented.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a high quality plan to implement personalized learning environments that includes identification of needs and gaps that the plan will address. The applicant has described the creation of the district wide Professional Learning Communities that will offer the opportunities for campus' to create collaborative teams within the school to work to achieve common goals of the campus. The PLCs will work to successfully identify needs and gaps that will be addressed by the plan.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1ai. The applicant has submitted an adequate plan that describes that students are aware that learning is key to their success. Through the student support office, students are working with teachers, counselors and parents to develop a plan that is critical to their academic success.

1aii. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that students are learning skills critical to their college success, including through the 4 year plan that is developed for all 8th graders that includes a college career plan, and guiding students through various project learning experiences that describe real life roadblocks to college.

1aiii. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that students are deeply involved in learning experiences in areas of academic interest through the virtual academy where students can learn at their own pace, and through other activities such as academic night at the ball park where students experience different ways of learning together.

1aiv. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that students are exposed to diverse cultures and contexts through their partnerships with local businesses, various student leadership organizations, and their partnership with the University of Texas at Arlington.

1av. The applicant has provided no evidence that students are learning various skills such as goal setting, problem solving and creative thinking, however the curriculum is being realigned to include such important skills.

1bi. Through the CTE department, the applicant has successfully demonstrated that the students are encouraged to develop a program of study that organizes their elective choices and teachers are provided with high quality professional development that allows that the individualized the learning of each student

1bii. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that they utilize a variety of learning approaches including indoor classrooms, experiential experiences such as museums, city service buildings and online learning.

1biii. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that they implement high quality learning content including 90 online courses, and dual credit programs.

1biv.a The applicant has successfully demonstrated that they are frequently updating student data. The evidence offered includes a description of the teachers access to common assessments, teacher made and campus assessments.

1biv.b. The applicant has indicated that they are not implementing personalized learning throughout the district.

1bv. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that they making accommodations for high need students. Accommodations are successfully implemented through an RTI Data collection system.

ic. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students to ensure that they understand how to use tools to manage their own learning through their successfully parent talk and student talk programs. Additionally, the Bring your own technology policy ensures that students use electronic calendars to organize their work and assignments.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a1. The applicant has successfully demonstrated a strong commitment to continuous personalized learning for each student. The applicant has demonstrated a successful plan whereby teachers collaborate and support one another as they review student success and weakness data to make make curriculum changes.

a.ii. The applicant has successfully demonstrated content and instruction is altered in order to meet the academic needs of students. The project includes a successful strategy through Pathways to the Future to support teachers in evaluating student progress and increasing instructional flexibility.

a.iii. The applicant has provided a roadmap to demonstrate their effective strategy to ensure that they are frequently measuring student progress to meet college readiness goals. The roadmap includes a process for administrators and teachers to follow to ensure that all students are keeping up.

a.iv. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that teacher and administrator feedback is used to improve their practice. Formative evaluations and weekly walkthroughs are a successful strategy used to access the progress of teachers and administrators.

bi. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that the use of the Polaris system is a successful system for staff to have access to actionable information to make decisions on behalf of student learning.

b.ii. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that they use high quality resources that are aligned for college and career ready standards including the Technology Bond package, common interest networks to increase teacher-to-teacher collaboration, and educational resources through the New York Times Knowledge Network and Texas PBS.

b.iii. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that they have implemented processes to meet student needs to provide feedback including weekly RTI conferences. However, the applicant has indicated the impact of these conference have not yet been documented.

ci. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that information from the teacher evaluation systems are used for the purpose of student and school improvement. Principals meet with teachers to discuss the academic growth made their students in an effort to improve student achievement.

c.ii. The applicant has not provided evidence for specific training that successfully addresses achievement gaps.

d. The applicant has provided that there are no existing gaps with the placement of staff in hard to staff schools.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that the LEA Central office to provide support to all schools. The successful responsibilities include supervision of principals, curriculum assessment and accountability measures, and development of school evaluations.

b. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that school leadership teams have sufficient flexibility including having

biweekly review curriculum assessments, and site based decision making committees to development improvement plans and budget plans.

c. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that students have the opportunity to obtain credit and demonstrate mastery through online instruction, and not just through seat time the Texas Virtual Schools Network allows students to successfully obtain these skills.

d. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that a student may demonstrate mastery in multiple ways including before and after the regular school day.

e. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that the e2020 system successfully provides instructional practices that are accessible to all students including students with learning challenges and English language learners.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- a. The applicant has not provided any evidence of this criteria.
- b. The applicant has successfully provided evidence that parents, students and educators will have access to the Campus Technology Liaisons for technical support in addition to access to the ED2020 and PD360 online systems.
- c. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that parents and students can access student data in various formats including excel or csv format.
- d. The applicant has provided an adequate chart that ensures that LEAS and schools use interoperable data systems that include a variety of data.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has described a successful process whereby timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals will be made during and after the term of the grant. The process will include various key stakeholders including the superintendent, direct language coordinators and instructional staff for special needs learners. Various achievable timelines for review are offered for various project.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has successfully demonstrated that they will offer high quality strategies for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders including through the use of the website, facebook, public release announcements and presentations.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- a. The applicant has successfully identified the rationales for the goals that were selected.
- b. The applicant has successfully demonstrated through a chart how the performance measures will successfully provide rigorous and timely information regarding the applicant's success.
- c. The applicant has successfully demonstrated through a chart how they will review the performance measures over time depending on success of the measures.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has successfully demonstrated that they will use the a monitoring specialist to guide the monitoring the progress of all project activities. The management level position will be able to successfully monitor the project activities.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: a. The budget adequately identifies that all funds will support the project. b. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. c. The budget has provided a complete description of all funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal including total revenue from those sources. d. The budget reasonably identifies the funds that will be used for one time investments as opposed to those that will be used for ongoing operational costs.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has provided a sustainable highly plan that is based on identified measures of success, rubrics for documentation of success, periodic reporting and approval for continuance based on that success. As such it is likely that the goals will be sustained after the term of the grant. The applicant provided an adequate budget for the 3 years after the terms of the grant that includes budget assumptions and potential sources for the project continuation.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: 1. The applicant has successfully provided evidence that they have developed partnerships with organizations outside the district to assist in providing students with social and other noneducational services. They have created successful partnerships with organizations including Communities in Schools, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, Pathways to the Future. 2. The applicant has successfully identified 6 desired results for LEAs that will successfully support the broader proposal including, the creation of a student services department to guide extra curricular activities, and to provide additional support to teen parents. These identified goals will support the overall vision in the proposal. 3a. The applicant has indicated that each of the partner organizations will collect data on student participation to determine measurable educational attainment results. However, it is unclear what data will be collected by the organizations. 3b. The applicant has adequately indicated a plan whereby they will create a centralized department that will collect data from all organizations, including law enforcement to coordinate efforts to best serve students with both prevention and intervention services. 3c. The applicant did not provide a successful plan to scale up the program to additional students. 3d. The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence that shows how they will improve results.		

- 4. The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence that would show how the proposed program would provide social emotional services to students.
- 5a. The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence that demonstrates how the needs of participating students will be identified.
- 5b. The applicant has sufficiently provided evidence that demonstrates that meetings will be held with all stakeholders to provide an assessment of current programs and their effective compatibility with the new services that will be provided upon funding of the project.
- 5c. The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate the process by which decision making will be made post funding.
- 5d. The applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that the parent involvement liaisons will work with parents to ensure that they are a part of the decision making for project implementation.
- 5e. The applicant did not provide adequate evidence to demonstrate how continual feedback and assessments will be used to maximize the impact of the project.
- 6. The applicant provided a thorough timeline and organizational chart that demonstrates how the performance measures will be assessed to determine if adequate results were made.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has submitted a well thought out plan that is likely to result increased student achievement for the LEAs identified. The applicant has offered achievable and attainable goals that will result in increased professional development, parental input and support services for at risk students.

Total	210	182
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0896TX-2 for Arlington Independent School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The application provides a comprehensive and clear understanding of the District's reform vision which satisfies the elements for this criterion. The overall goals for each student as described within the five objectives and three priority areas of the District's strategic plan, *Journey 2017: Achieve Today. Excel Tomorrow*, are consistent with the elements articulated in three of the four core educational reform areas. The application presents a tailored vision based on plans for implementing a

Managed Performance Empowerment Model that will; (a) incorporate individualized assessment and standards; (b) describes plans to support the hiring, development and retention of highly effective principals and teachers; (c) includes a comprehensive plan to utilize technology to generate data to measure student growth while informing teachers where challenges exist; (d) and that focuses on an individualized path for each student to develop a plan for their career, technical and higher education needs while leveraging the considerable opportunities within the community. The narrative meets the criterion for the first, second and third core educational reform areas as well as the overall criterion. However, the application does not address the District's vision for turning around its lowest-achieving schools resulting in a reduction in points for failing to include the fourth core educational reform area.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 AISD presents a credible approach for determining an overall strategy that meets the requirements of this criterion. The use of comprehensive participation by a wide array of stakeholders, particularly in obtaining feedback from 36 high school students, to complete the District's approach to implement its reform proposal is innovative and reflects a comprehensive vision. The narrative includes a full description of the process involved, the list of schools required, and a complete set of the numbers of participating students by sub-group as required by this criterion.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The application presents a credible and high-quality plan for translating the District's Journey 2017 reform initiative into meaningful reform. The innovative offerings anticipated in this plan meet the elements within this criterion. Specifically, the Early College High School targeting 100 students to be first generation college learners is outstanding and may have a long-term impact on how the District's plan will support multi-generational reform. While the District's focus is to include a grade-band of 7th-12th grade students in its plan, therefore all of its schools in those grades are participating, the application provides only a brief mention of any plans to expand to its younger student population. The plan is silent in explaining specifically what steps are contemplated for scaling the project across the younger grades to include the entire district as required by the criterion which results in a reduction in points.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 (a) The application presents baseline summative assessment data which is largely available across all subgroups. However, the application does not meet the criterion with regard to demonstrating ambitious yet achievable annual goals for summative assessments due to the State's recent implementation of a new assessment that prevents having its goals in place until December 2012. This situation is repeated in each of the sub-categories required in the criterion.
 (b) The application describes a high quality, ambitious and specific plan for decreasing the achievement gap. This plan is comprehensive, has a proven track record, and meets the criterion for presenting a vision likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity. The Bridge program and STAR Academy curriculum appear to be an excellent, thoughtful strategy.
 (c) The goals articulated for improving graduation rates are ambitious yet achievable and fully meet the spirit of this criterion to link vision with improved student learning and performance and increased equity. The narrative presents a comprehensive strategy to improve graduation rates consistent with a credible approach indicating the likely result of improved outcomes.
 (d) The District's goals for college enrollment are reasonable though not ambitious enough to achieve the stated goal of 100% of those students who choose a college path of actually achieving enrollment. The plan does not address how the District will determine which students have determined a college path, at what point in the education continuum this might be introduced, and how this would apply to those students who have chosen a career-ready path and a set of goals for those students. This calculation would also likely influence the scalability and credibility of the goals set for college enrollment across the student population. The narrative presents an excellent and credible vision for addressing college enrollment including the establishment of measuring success in this area across sub-groups.
 (e) The application presents a compelling set of strategies that are likely to result in improved student performance toward postsecondary degree attainment. The approach described is innovative and includes a variety of strands to increase the likelihood of appealing to a large cross-section of students. The plan is unable to meet the criterion for demonstrating ambitious yet achievable annual goals.

As a general comment, though the plan is unable to provide the District's specific annual goals consistent with the

requirements of the criterion, the innovative, compelling and thoughtful strategies within each area mitigate the reduction in overall points.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative presents a reasonably coherent explanation of the District's success in advancing student learning and achievement in several areas but also vaguely highlights a number of deficiencies that are more evident in the accompanying charts. For instance, the narrative points out that student performance in Mathematics for spring 2012 was not sufficient to earn Recognized status by the State but does not provide the statistical explanation to show how far off the mark the scores were. The plan does acknowledge the need for sharpened instructional focus to address the challenges and includes a comprehensive array of aggressive innovations including a new improvement plan framework and online tool for developing, sharing and maintaining improvement plans, which combine to make for a credible plan. The narrative offers a detailed explanation of a variety of city collaborations with the District but then fails to link any of these programs to the requirements in the criterion. Therefore, it is unclear how to align that aspect of the narrative with the criterion in any meaningful way.</p> <p>(a) The criterion requires demonstrating a clear track record of success in the past four years in several areas. The charts provided indicate that there has been an inconsistent record of success across sub-groups and subject areas with regard to the achievement gap and student achievement generally. In most cases, results have been flat in the previous four years except for disturbing reductions in performance in the 2010-2011 Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) for African American, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students in Reading/Language Arts. No explanation is provided to address this issue. The chart addressing graduation rates demonstrates gradual improvement across all sub-groups but does not reflect substantial growth.</p> <p>(b) The plan fails to present a solid case for achieving ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools as required by the criterion. Beyond generalized statements, no evidence is offered to support this requirement.</p> <p>(c) While the narrative successfully describes the availability of data consistent with the requirements of the criterion, the plan indicates generally passive treatment by the District of ensuring the data are available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction and services. The data are presented on a website without any evidence that the data are organized in any impactful way to meet the elements of this criterion.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The criterion requires evidence of high level transparency in a number of elements. The application presents a chart describing the general information about District expenditures but also indicates that the information regarding median expenditures per pupil on instruction and instruction-related activities was not included as part of the published chart detailing District revenue and expenditures. In addition to indicating a lack of transparency on this point, the narrative lacks compliance with the criterion requirement for transparency regarding instructional support and school administration expenditures.</p> <p>The narrative does not delineate that actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, as required by the criterion, are provided in the data available on the website. Nor does the narrative specifically address the criterion regarding actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only, actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only, or actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level -- if applicable. The narrative provides a general overview of what the State requires in terms of reporting without addressing the high level of transparency of each of the four categories in this criterion.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application successfully meets the criterion in providing evidence through existing State law for the autonomous operations of the District which would allow for the implementation of the personalized learning environments described in the</p>		

proposal. However, the narrative fails to address any evidence of specific conditions that exist to support the extent of autonomy enjoyed by the District regarding State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The application presents a credible description with regard to the process undertaken within District Administration to prepare its proposal including a thorough description of comments and feedback from mayors, teacher's associations, elected officials, chambers of commerce, educational program providers, parent teacher associations, colleges, non-profit organizations, and senior class presidents that is reflective of meaningful feedback in developing the proposal. The application provides a conditional signature by the local educator's union. The union specifically opposes the use of student growth as a "significant factor" in a teacher's evaluation. This significantly diminishes the applications' ability to meet the spirit required by the Race to the Top competition. The letters of support are generally quite weak and indicate only a cursory knowledge of the proposal, the vision on the part of the District to implement its proposal or how any students, families, teachers, principals, members of the business community, civil rights organizations, or other stakeholders had any role in the proposal development. The plan also provides an impressive list of organizations to whom presentations were made regarding the proposal.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	0
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The criterion requires a high-quality plan for analyzing the District's status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal including identified needs and gaps. The plan does not address this criterion whatsoever. Beyond stating broad themes related to overall strategy, no discussion is presented regarding analysis, gaps or identified needs. The plan does not meet the criterion.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The application presents a high quality plan consistent with the elements required by the criterion regarding improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment and implementing instructional strategies. The plan is comprehensive, innovative and involves all of the participating students in some manner. However, the plan fails to address how the various strategies would be aligned to college- and career-ready standards, graduation requirements or how these strategies will specifically accelerate student learning as required by the criterion. As a general note, there are a number of errors in the narrative which distract from the coherence of the argument being presented.

(a)(i) The narrative paints a robust picture for implementing what are described as "leading-edge" learning experiences that promote management, creativity, critical thinking and achievement. The successful deployment of Personal Learning Community models and their impact in motivating more shared learning strategies among principals and teachers is impressive. The learning stations, individualized learning time, small group cooperative learning time and technology time that are described meet the objectives for this criteria. Further enhancing this is the Pathways to Success program through the newly proposed student support office. A particularly innovative strategy is the age appropriate course proposed for 8th grade to focus on "Who am I? Where am I going? How do I get there." This suggests a very direct response to the criteria requirement for helping students understand that what they are learning is linked to their success in accomplishing their goals.

(a)(ii) The plan indicates a build-on course for 9th grade students as a natural and important progression from the plans created by students in the 8th grade course. The plan also describes a set of collaborative activities and agreements through the College and Technical Education Department with a number of impressive institutions within the community. However, the plan fails to detail exactly what these activities consist of, how many qualified students are able to participate -- in other words, evidence that sufficient capacity exists for all participating students -- and how they result in personalized learning for each student. The criterion also requires evidence that the pursuit of the goals described are linked to college- and career-ready standards. This is not addressed in the narrative.

(a)(iii) The plan describes a rich abundance of existing and proposed programs that is of a very high quality and that meets the criterion, as well as expansion goals for each program to access more participating students.

(a)(iv) It is clear that participating students within AISD are exposed to and have access to diverse cultures, contexts and

perspectives through a number of campus-based organizations, community organizations and specific internship opportunities with minority-owned area businesses that meet the criterion.

(a)(v) The plan addresses issues in this section that are not related to the requirement of the criterion to demonstrate an approach to master critical academic content and develop skills in goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving. The narrative does, however, mention that college- and career-ready standards are imbedded in the TEKS but is silent in all sections in fully describing how the plan aligns to these standards.

(b)(i) The narrative in this section fails to address the criterion in any meaningful way. The narrative describes indirectly-related State requirements but does not link these to how they are or are not currently linked or proposed to be linked with a personalized sequence of instructional content. Finally, there is no description for how these activities will be imbedded to ensure students are able to graduate on time and college- and career-ready as required by the criterion.

(b)(ii) A variety of high-quality instructional environments are described in the plan and also several high quality instructional approaches linked to these environments.

(b)(iii) The narrative presents a variety of high-quality content consistent with what is required by the criterion including evidence of how this content is aligned with existing and developing college- and career-ready standards.

(b)(iv) The plan fails to address the frequency upon which the TEKS individual student data are updated and made available as feedback. The criterion requires evidence of ongoing and regular feedback which is not clearly stated in the plan. Further, the plan fails to meet the criterion to describe how the District receives ongoing and regular feedback that result in personalized learning recommendations.

(b)(v) The plan fails to link any of the narrative to the requirements of the criterion that accommodations and high-quality strategies are in place or proposed for high-need students.

(c) The plan speaks clearly and credibly about a number of mechanisms -- Virtual Academy courses, Career Cruising, Parent Self Serve website, and Pathways to the Future for 7th and 8th grades -- that meet the requirements of the criterion. These are visionary, well-linked to one another and provide a solid base from which students, families and educators can track and manage student learning.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a)(i) The plan provides an encouraging commitment to support educators in their move to personalized learning for all students. The plan admits that this is not being achieved by all teachers at this time but that the framework has been put in place to support this accomplishment. The plan provides clear evidence of collaboration among teachers, principals and administrators as an imbedded aspect of the class day. The narrative does not offer specific evidence aligning these laudable efforts with the requirement of the criterion, however, with regard to how this support system will help ensure that all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

(a)(ii) The narrative offers a high-quality plan and existing approach for meeting the elements of this criterion. The flexibility provided to educators to adjust teaching and learning through daily evaluations being introduced in a trial 7th and 8th grade program is impressive. The narrative also presents evidence of the responsiveness on the District's part to the needs of the educators through the "on the job" technology training.

(a)(iii) The criterion requires evidence of frequency in measuring student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and the narrative indicates that teacher informal assessments are encouraged daily, formal assessments weekly, and CA's every six weeks. The plan indicates that this is "encouraged" but does not offer evidence of how compliant educators are in the participating schools in meeting this objective. Also, the narrative does not specifically speak to alignment with college- and career-ready standards or graduation requirements.

(a)(iv) The plan presents a narrative supporting the District's current and improving evaluation system for teachers and principals which has several layers of feedback embedded within this process that meet most of the elements in this criterion. But the process does not elaborate on how educators are trained to use the system nor how the process of obtaining evaluative feedback will be used to provide recommendations for improvement, supports or interventions.

(b)(i) The important element within this criterion is evidence of actionable information that helps educators identify learning approaches. The narrative does not suggest how specific, actionable information is or will be derived nor how the participating educators would benefit from any training in this regard. The plan also consistently fails to specifically address how data, tools and resources are targeted to accelerate student progress.

(b)(ii) The plan presents evidence of high-quality technological resources including digitally-based learning tools. Further, the

plan discusses how students are able to use their own familiar technology in the classroom through the District's Bring Their Own Technology Program. But the criterion requires evidence of how these tools are aligned with college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The plan is silent on both of these elements.

(b)(iii) The plan describes the District's process for Responses to Interventions as a mechanism for identifying tools to match student needs as well as presenting a sense of how input from RTI and families is used to continuously improve feedback.

(c)(i) This section of the plan is poorly worded and contains a number of errors. Further, the narrative does not support the evidence required by the criterion in explaining how the District's teacher evaluation systems, which are described as being re-designed, will be used to strengthen educator effectiveness.

(c)(ii) The criterion requires evidence of training, systems and practices to continuously improve school progress yet the narrative does not sufficiently address this. No description is given in the narrative for how frequently training is provided or proposed to be provided for any systems nor does the plan specifically speak to how all of this will help decrease the achievement gap as required by the criterion.

(d) The criterion requires evidence of a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly-effective teachers and principals. The narrative describes work that will be undertaken to research how the District will define "effective" and "highly-effective" but does not indicate when this will be completed nor does the plan offer a commitment that this definition will ultimately be agreed upon. The narrative fails to even address any plan to increasing the number of students who will receive instruction from the to-be-defined effective and highly-effective teachers. Therefore, the application does not meet the criterion

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(1)(a) The plan simply provides a narrative to the existing organizational chart of the District and does not address in any way how the District will organize its central office to specifically support the participating schools in the implementation of this project.</p> <p>(1)(b) The narrative does not address the criterion in offering any evidence of flexibility and autonomy sufficient to support adjusted school calendars and schedules, school personnel and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and only briefly touches on school-level budgets outside of the context of the criterion.</p> <p>(1)(c) The plan describes alternative credit opportunities for students that do not require seat-time and that allows students to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. The plan does not elaborate on whether or not participating 7th and 8th grade students have these opportunities or if only high school students can take advantage of this approach. Further, it is not clear how many courses are offered through this alternative credit approach nor how many students are currently participating. The opportunity, as required in the criterion, is evidenced.</p> <p>(1)(d) Evidence is described that allows students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways through online, teacher, district, and correspondence course means with plans to expand these provisions.</p> <p>(1)(e) The District utilizes PD360 and E2020 to provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and accessible to all students including students with disabilities and English learners that meet the criterion.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(2)(a) It is clear from the application that the District takes reasonable steps to ensure access to necessary content as required by the criterion except with regard to low-income families. Access to technology is the primary means for enabling access and other options are not described that might be more helpful for families without the means to utilize technology. The plan indicates that the District's objective is to utilize project resources to expand access.</p>		

(2)(b) The application presents a reasonable plan for expanding its currently organized technical support services to internal personnel to students and parents, and other stakeholders.

(2)(c) The District's existing systems are limited to allowing parents and students to export attendance and some assessment data but the plan does not describe a high-quality approach to expand information technology systems to allow for the exporting of curriculum or learning system content.

(2)(d) The plan provides evidence that the District's Total Education Administrative Management Solution (TEAMS) interoperability system meets the elements of the criterion.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application presents a high-quality plan that thoroughly meets this criterion by describing quarterly RTTT-D Grant Implementation Team meetings and Board of Trustees Reports, bi-monthly Grant Team meetings, ongoing project email exchange and structured communication in an ongoing basis to determine strengths and weaknesses throughout the project. This is an excellent framework for continuously monitoring progress and includes a wide range of expertise in areas like professional development, human resources, finance and District staff.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application presents a high-quality, thoughtful plan for ensuring ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The plan identifies responsibility channels for each as well as a wide array of technological strategies to maximize outreach.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application presents generally ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, consistent with the requirements of this criterion. While it is difficult to make a complete judgment on those metrics where the District intends to achieve 2% or 3% annual growth absent a baseline, given the nature of what is being measured as a qualifier, the application successfully meets the criterion. In addition, the District commits to 12 performance measures which is within the range of the number required. The rationale provided for each of the performance measures is coherent, credible and includes measuring progress in all four of the core educational reform areas.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application presents a brief, coherent narrative that describes the District's plans for evaluating the effectiveness of the RTTTD funded activities. The majority of the evaluative process described will be imbedded within the District's existing grant monitoring system. The narrative fails to offer specifics as to exactly how this will be achieved and does not speak to how an integration of these evaluations will be used to provide a comprehensive picture of RTTTD's effectiveness.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget detail is comprehensive, thorough and coherent. Further, the description of staff dedicated to each of the project elements seems reasonable and not excessive. Justification is clearly provided for each expenditure as required by the</p>		

criterion and the application includes a full description and source of all funds that the District intends to dedicate to the implementation and support of this project. However, the application did not clearly identify funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those funds dedicated to ongoing operational costs.

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

10

9

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application presents a high-quality sustainability plan that contemplates by line-item how each of the goals will be sustained should the evaluative process indicate that they are, in fact, contributing to the overall success of the project. It is indicative of smart financial rationale to align future funding commitments to proven success. The sources of potential future funding are credible and combine to create a solid path for sustainable success.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The application thoroughly describes existing partnerships with very proven after-school, public health and social service programs that support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1. The plan also integrates several new programs that would be created through this grant that compliment and strengthen the existing partnerships. The application clearly defines eight population-level desired results all of which are aligned with the District's overall proposal. Though the application addresses each of the four required elements within the criterion for tracking selected indicators, effectively using this data to target resources, demonstrating a plan to scale the model and how the District intends to improve results over time, the narrative lacks vision and imagination. Specifically, the narrative for developing a scalable strategy simply commits to the objective and does not present any details for how such a strategy might be created or implemented. Similarly, the narrative states a commitment to improve results over time without meeting the criterion for describing how this would be done. The application fails to adequately describe how the partnership would integrate education and other services within participating schools. The narrative describes responsible parties for assessing the needs and assets of participating students but fails to describe how this would be accomplished while giving a more coherent, credible description of how aligned needs and assets of the community will be identified and inventoried. The narrative repeats the description just stated for creating a decision-making process and infrastructure without providing sufficient detail as required by the criterion. It is clear that a solid plan exists to engage parents and families but the narrative is quite weak in describing specifically how the District intends to routinely assess its progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact. The narrative restates the criterion and indicates who would have this responsibility but fails to describe any strategy or plan for how this would be achieved. The annual performance measures indicate that 50% of the participating students will be engaged by the newly created Student Services Department in the first year of the grant but will grow to include all 100% of participating students in the second year. This seems too aggressive for a newly created department. Further, the narrative doesn't adequately explain how the Department will interface with each of the students, how often and to what extent. The performance measures in the remaining categories are ambitious and achievable for each of the proposed population-level results. Overall, the application meets the requirements of this criterion.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The application presented by the Arlington Independent School District is clear and coherent in its alignment with the four core educational assurance areas and reflects a thoughtful approach to create meaningful personalized learning environments. The vision for this plan is broad and involves a large percentage of the District's student population. The focus of *Journey 2017* and its program elements is targeted to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements. There are elements of expansive vision and innovation within the plan but also several areas where criterion

were simply not met when the narrative seemed to re-state the criterion or, in some instances, was not relevant to the issue at hand. But consistent with the broader priority of this competition, the application does in fact meet the elements of Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	125
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0896TX-3 for Arlington Independent School District

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>AISD has laid out a solid vision including lofty student goals for graduation, mastery of college and career standards, and increasing service learning and parental involvement. The core educational assurance area related to turning around lowest achieving schools was addressed only in a general manner.</p> <p>There are many spelling and grammatical errors within the proposal narrative.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>AISD has set high expectations and lofty goals and has included all students in the district in grades 7-12. AISD has included a description of their development process which included holding focus group discussions with a variety of stakeholders to receive feedback to incorporate into the district's strategic plan, and ultimately this grant proposal. The resulting district strategic plan identified projects related to College and Career Readiness, which led the district to identify the junior high and high schools in the district to participate in this grant; however, no specific details regarding the performance of each school related to these project goals were included in the narrative, leaving some ambiguity regarding the process of choosing schools.</p> <p>A list of participating schools, including details about the student population and total numbers of students, was included.</p> <p>Portions of the application narrative referred to "high-need" and "at-risk" students, with different percentages for each. The application did not include clear definitions for either of these terms.</p> <p>Consideration of the balance of information that was provided led to the score point awarded.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>AISD proposed including all students in the district in specific grade spans, including all junior high and high school students. While the narrative mentions using this plan as a guide for implementation of other programs in PK-6th grades, and does briefly address components to be included at the 5th and 6th grade levels, it does not include a comprehensive, specific, high-quality plan to address the inclusion of all district schools and students in the reform in the future. This high quality plan should have addressed specific goals, activities, deliverables, timelines and responsible personnel for implementation.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Data provided by AISD was inadequate in that the data charts addressed only mathematics achievement for students in grades 7-11. Without a narrative to support the charts, explanations about subgroup performance and/or why only mathematics was included were lacking. The charts also state that, "The Texas Education Agency moved to a new state assessment test during the 2011-2012 school year. Because of this change, proficiency standards will not be determined until December 2012. Therefore Specific growth goals cannot be estimated until those standards are determined." While this explanation supports why there are not growth targets to be met and judged as ambitious or attainable, percentages of students who met standards are listed for the 2011-2012 school year, which seems to contradict the statement. While not required in this section, AISD has included a high-quality plan for tracking the data needed here, listing the activities of collecting data, identifying goals, reviewing annually, and submitting reports, along with deliverables, timelines and persons responsible.

(b) AISD included subgroups in the data charts, but did not address the need or the process for decreasing the achievement gaps between these subgroups in the narrative. The narrative includes an explanation of addressing accelerated learning for individuals that are a year or more below grade level in mathematics, but details are lacking on how this will impact the subgroup performance. Data provided in this section is inconsistent with data provided in section (a) as it now includes reading in addition to mathematics, fewer subgroups than were listed in section (a), and here there is no achievement data listed for 2011-2012, supporting their statement that proficiency standards will not be determined until later this year (conflicting information here lists it as November and December 2012).

(c) AISD has included a detailed explanation of current graduate rates and the goals for increasing these rates, as well as an explanation of the programs put in place to assist students in reaching this goal. A high quality plan is included that outlines the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties in the district for implementing the reforms. The annual goals for increasing the graduation rates appear to be attainable, increasing in reasonable steps each year, and ambitious in aiming for 100% of all subgroups graduating high school.

(d) AISD has included proposals to begin to involve students in 5th and 6th grade in envisioning their future including post-high school education. AISD has also included plans to assist high school students involved with degree completion and dual enrollment started on their path to post-secondary education. AISD has also supported their proposal with a plan for developing a data system to keep track of post-secondary education by subgroup in the future.

(e) AISD has included the outline of a high quality plan to put into place a system for tracking postsecondary degree attainment in the future, including activities for tracking and analyzing the data, timelines for annual review, deliverables and persons responsible. AISD has also outlined some important steps that the AISD is taking to help ensure that your graduates will be prepared to tackle postsecondary education challenges.

This information was considered together to come to the point score indicated in the mid-range for this component.

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:

AISD provided charts documenting district results in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics from the 2008-2009 school year through the 2011-2012 school year. During this time the summative assessment changed from TAKS to STAAR, which is represented with TAKS equivalent scoring. The detail in the charts is vague and does not provide enough information to support AISD's record of success. The information provided in the charts is insufficient to build the case for AISD's track record. The introductory narrative discusses the AISD's rating from the State of Texas, but provides inadequate information regarding specific grade levels and subgroups.

The information provided to support the reforms that the AISD has already put in place was vague and inadequate to demonstrate a history of ambitious and significant reforms. While partnerships within the cities whose children are served by the AISD were included in the narrative, no evidence was included to provide detail of the number of students served or the impact that these programs have had on student achievement. These partnerships seem helpful for some of the students, but not comprehensive enough to serve large numbers of students. Title I programs are described to support the history of reform in the district, but the description included insufficient detail regarding the number and identification of the campuses served and no evidence was provided to demonstrate the effect of the Title I program at each school site served.

The narrative described efforts by the AISD to communicate Title I site plans, which are posted online, student progress and

grades, available through progress reports, report cards, and an online system for attendance and grades, and school and district achievement information, available online, to parents and stakeholders.

The lack of clarity and detail in the evidence provided led to the point score indicated.

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

5

2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The AISD presented a narrative stating that their transparency meets their state requirements and that they provide required information regarding salary schedules via the district website to communicate with its stakeholders and the public. The information provided does not address the specificity of the information requested in sections a-d of this section.

FAQ responses indicated that the district should be able to provide up to date expenditure information, yet the data provided in this section is several years old.

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

10

9

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The AISD outlined their independent operation as an accredited educational provider under the Texas Education Code, making the superintendent and principals eligible to make decisions and implement policies to operate the district by managing resources, hiring personnel and oversee district and site improvement plans, as cited in the sections of the Texas Education Code included in the narrative. The state regulations allow for autonomy on the district and campus level. While no examples of the AISD implementing this autonomy in the past were cited, the authority is in place for the AISD to implement programs as seen fit to benefit their students.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district strategic plan development was discussed earlier in the application and included focus groups to get feedback from patrons, students and community members. The strategic plan was referenced while developing this grant application.

Letters from three teacher professional organizations were included in the appendices. The Association of Texas Professional Educators expressed support for the district's application. The Arlington Texas State Teachers Association expressed concern for the process of selecting candidates for teaching and administrative positions within the grant proposal, as well as proposed merit pay, but agreed to work with the district and the other teacher organizations in implementing these portions of the grant. The United Educators Association offered conditional support of the district's application. They offered support on the college and career readiness portions of the grant, but expressed that they oppose development of a new teacher evaluation system under the grant which would incorporate student growth as a "significant factor" in the evaluation. These mixed reactions are the only responses documented representing teachers in the district.

The AISD submitted a number of letters of support from a variety of stakeholders with the application. The letters document that the district has communicated with a range of stakeholders regarding the grant application, including mayors of the towns whose children come to school in the AISD, local universities, Chambers of Commerce, non-profit organizations, PTA, State Senators, and high school students from the participating high schools. All of the letters included expressed support for the proposal, and in some cases outlined support back to the district, such the Chamber of Commerce who outlined their partnership for education in the letter, offering support including a scholarship to help students enrolled in dual credit classes to obtain textbooks if they could not afford the books.

Appendix 10 outlined the feedback from the stakeholders, as well as the responses from the district, in response to questions and comments from the stakeholders. This section outlined questions that different stakeholders had and the manner in which the district responded to them. For example, the Mayor of Arlington asked if the district would be competing against a local charter school for funding, but AISD personnel explained that the charter school would be in a different grant level due to their size, and the City Manager of the Town of Pantego offered to partner with AISD to help provide an internship program for students. This section provided evidence of the working relationship between the AISD and a variety of stakeholders in the community.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The AISD identified two main shifts that need to be addressed: PLCs and differentiated instruction. The narrative provides support for these two big ideas, and they are included in the high quality plan in the proposal to assure implementation, which includes goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and persons responsible for implementation. The district provided a graphic being used to illustrate the growth of PLCs within the AISD, but detail regarding the analysis of the gaps between the current status of implementation and the necessary growth were lacking.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The AISD has included a high quality plan outlining the timelines, deliverables and responsible parties for their plans under section C1.</p> <p>The AISD has included plans for a Virtual Academy for students, as well as other digital learning resources. It is not made clear whether courses available in the Virtual Academy are offered for credit recovery, for student flexibility, or student interest, or available for any reason the student chooses.</p> <p>The district is making plans for career awareness and leadership courses aimed at helping students learn to plan for future goals and maximize their learning while in the AISD.</p> <p>This section focuses on personalization and options available to students who may not be college bound, but are looking for career path options through certifications and technological career preparation. This demonstrates the AISD's commitment to improving personalization and relevance for those students who have not been completing high school due to feeling that the college readiness path may not be for them. This section of the proposal demonstrated that the AISD is committed to enhancing these opportunities for these students.</p> <p>There is an inadequate explanation of how personalization of learning will be undertaken and implemented for those students who are choosing to continue on to college. Detail is lacking in the discussion of the general curriculum standards and how these standards are being implemented and met for all students.</p> <p>The proposal discusses the professional development taking place among administrators through book discussion groups, helping the administrators implement Professional Learning Communities. The explanation of how teachers are being brought into the learning and implementation process is lacking in the narrative.</p> <p>Balancing the positives of the career readiness opportunities with the lack of emphasis on the college readiness curriculum led to the point score indicated.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14

<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application outlines and supports that the leadership and decision making in the district is changing, and discusses how teachers are getting involved in their learning to support the personalization of the curriculum to support student learning. Teachers' involvement in the PLC process should involve them in the continual improvement that AISD is looking for. The implementation and assessment of this process appears to be mostly centered around the principals at this point, with a rubric to guide their implementation the PLC process. Discussion of how teachers will develop ownership of this process is not included in the proposal.</p> <p>The AISD included a community partners survey to provide feedback to the district. This is discussed as bringing information to the formative evaluation sessions. While this information seems useful, the discussion is confusing as its place in the evaluation of teachers and principals is not clearly explained.</p> <p>District and state level resources were highlighted to provide continual learning resources for the AISD teachers. While these</p>		
--	--	--

resources are available, the use of each seems to be based on an individual teacher's engagement and desire to interact with the system and resources. Strategies to increase the teachers' engagement and expectation for continual improvement so that use of these resources would be more than on an optional level were not discussed.

The emphasis on Response to Intervention (RtI) is relevant as this seems an appropriate way to focus on the learning needs and personalization of the curriculum for individual students. Comments were included about the need to help teachers with large case loads under this system, but the comments only established that resource support is being developed at this time.

The Arlington Growth index (AGI) was discussed as part of the teacher evaluation system and as an important tool for discussions between the principal and the teacher. The description of this index was inadequate to create a vision for the data that will be included and how it will be computed. The high quality plan includes the purchase of norm referenced testing materials. The explanation of need for these materials was inadequate to explain how these assessments fit into the evaluation cycle and discussion at each site and at the district level.

The AISD has outlined a plan to develop a teacher effectiveness evaluation in the future, in collaboration with the teachers' professional organizations. Two of these organizations expressed concern about portions of the evaluation process outlined and required in this application in their letters included in the proposal, making this process appear more challenging than it is referred to in this section.

Balancing the positive aspects of this section with the concerns noted led to the point score indicated.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The AISD presented what seems to be a feasible plan to break their large district into manageable networks of school campuses to focus school support services within the district.

Flexibility and autonomy appear to be increasing at the site level through a new managed empowerment model, which is not yet in place. While extra resources are available to help guide campuses identified as struggling (the definition for this was not provided in the narrative), increased flexibility for these campuses is not yet much different than for other campuses in the district.

The AISD has provided the opportunity for some students to earn credits through mastery and/or testing, but this has been mostly limited thus far to students who are experiencing credit recovery or alternative education environments based on previous failed school experiences. These opportunities are expanding for these students, but no indication was given for expanding education for students who have mastered standards in regular learning environments and need to be moved ahead or provided with enrichment. E2020 is briefly mentioned as providing access to AP coursework. Details about the implementation of individualization opportunities for all students are vague.

E2020 and PD 360 were both discussed as methods to provide individualization for students. Descriptions of how E2020 works were lacking and as such led to confusion as to whether it is an outside vendor or an AISD initiative using AISD teachers.

PD360 sounded like a valuable resource, but it is described more as a professional development tool for teachers, rather than a tool for students to access for course coverage. Explanations and how these resources would be made available in appropriate ways to support student learning for all students, and especially ELLs, were lacking.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The AISD has indicated plans to implement two programs to increase technology use for students. The Bring your own Device program would allow and encourage students to utilize their own technology for organization and curriculum support. Expanding the technology lending program would allow students without their own devices to be able to utilize technological support for curriculum. Details of this plan were lacking in the proposal..

Online access to student information is available for both parents and students, and the systems allow data to be exported in

two formats. No mention was made about accessibility issues for families to this information.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The AISD has outlined a team of personnel to monitor and oversee the implementation of the grant. The Grant Implementation Team is lacking any members who are content area instructional coordinators. A meeting schedule was outlined and an email system of communication was suggested. Details of measurement and monitoring are vague, and post-grant review was not addressed.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A basic framework was provided for semi-annual public hearings, as well as communication options for parents and stakeholders. The AISD plans to share information through out the grant period with civic, workforce and social organizations. Timelines and details were lacking for implementation.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The AISD included performance measures for students across the grade spans included in the proposal. The ambitiousness of the goals is varied. Some of the goals had current baselines already determined, including graduation rates for all subgroups at 80% for 2012-2013 school year. According to other information submitted in this proposal, several subgroups are already above the 80% rate for graduation.</p> <p>While it is clearly challenging to create goals for growth in some areas where baseline data is not yet available, setting the growth expectation at 2% or 3% a year cannot be seen as ambitious without further explanation.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The AISD has identified a team to monitor the implementation of the grant, including teacher professional development and increased use of technology. The discussion of the ongoing evaluation is brief, but includes important components of monitoring and evaluating the progress.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Other funds are identified as being used to support the grant application, but detail regarding these funds in not identified in all cases.</p> <p>Budget pages outline funding purposes and timelines and in most cases identify costs as start up or ongoing/operational as required for the application.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A general outline of the district decision making process for the continuation or discontinuation of projects based on ongoing value to the AISD strategic plan was provided. A chart with possible future funding sources was listed, although no specific</p>		

three year plan or support from any other entities is included. The information provided about sustainability does not meet the criteria of a high quality plan as it is lacking detail of goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible for the implementation.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The AISD has identified a partnership that will offer support to all participating students through courses to support their academic development (study skills, etc) as well as support to students who find themselves needing extra support due to outside issues. These programs have been integrated throughout the proposal. Specific population-level desired results are included for students in the junior high schools and high schools.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

While AISD has not identified its lowest performing schools directly in this proposal, their commitment to ongoing data analysis and attention to closing the achievement gaps should suffice for their intent to address decreasing achievement gaps. The AISD addressed their plan comprehensively throughout their proposal.

Total	210	147
--------------	------------	------------