



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0918NV-1 for Clark County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths: The applicant, Clark County School District (CCSD), has clearly and appropriately defined a comprehensive and coherent vision that builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas and articulates a clear and credible approach to goals as it relates to the purpose of the solicitation. For example, the applicant's vision is to have students ready for life beyond high school by being prepared for multiple exit points, such as exiting from specific tasks, exiting from requirements, exiting from programs, exiting from a grade, exiting from a grade band (elementary, middle, or high), and exiting from the school district, college- and career-ready. The applicant's selected approach will be to personalize the learning environment in every classroom for every student by: individualizing lesson structure, increasing content rigor, increasing vocabulary, and creating a classroom environment where a sense of urgency drives high quality learning, teaching, and leading. The applicant provides a solid vision for ensuring students are prepared to exit school and enter colleges and careers with a number of tools needed to meet the demands necessary for the 21st century workforce and will address the needs of their diverse and rapidly growing student population. The applicant also cites a community survey/study of the area conducted by WestEd which reinforces the urgency for the proposed reforms.</p> <p>Weaknesses: None noted.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>(a) The applicant clearly describes a comprehensive and sustainable approach to implementing its reform proposal. For example, the applicant indicates a cluster of 63 schools projected to need significant support based on preliminary results of the Nevada School Performance Framework (SPF) for the 2012-2013 school year that continue to demonstrate low rates of student proficiency (especially within the limited English proficiency subgroup) have been chosen (out of 217 elementary schools district wide) to receive support with RTT-D funds. The applicant also indicates 78 percent of participating students across all participating schools are from low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act.</p> <p>(b) The applicant clearly illustrates a list of the schools that will participate in grant activities. For example, the applicant provides a list of targeted schools for the implementation of these proposed approaches as well as a map pinpointing the specific target areas in Appendix 1. The Applicant provides a table noting the Race to the Top-District (RTT-D) implementation plan by year. The table demonstrates the exact name/location of each individual school, the specific schools they are proposing to expand Pre-K, One-to-One Technology rollouts, and Communities in Schools.</p> <p>(c) The applicant clearly indicates 78% of participating students across all participating schools will come from 41,089 low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced priced lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act. The applicant also clearly indicates that RTT-D will provide reform funding at 63 CCSD schools, serve total of 41,089 students. 41,089 of targeted students are high-need students. The proposed project approach will impact 2,496 participating educators.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>(a) None noted.</p> <p>(b) None noted.</p> <p>(c) None noted.</p>		

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant clearly demonstrates a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools and that helps the applicant reach its outcome goals. For example, the provides a comprehensive model description indicating the proposed reforms to be implemented district-wide to all of its schools to improve student learning outcomes for all students in Appendix 2. The applicant notes preliminary reforms that are currently under way to include: Raising the Bar (Ready by Exit) - will focus on preparing students so they are “ready by exit of secondary school education”, Empowerment Schools- convening a Blue Ribbon Task Force on Empowerment to identify how to broaden the empowerment model so more schools benefit and offer relief from unnecessary cumbersome oversight, Performance Zones- reorganizing the area service center structure into a dozen or more performance zones that are each comprised of feeder-aligned schools, Autonomous Zones- a single autonomous zone to provide a refuge for schools that are academically successful, and the New Schools Division- designing a New Schools Division to expand innovative school models. The applicant provides a comprehensive model in the Appendices describing their full plan to improve outcomes for all students they propose to serve. The model includes plans to create environments that are accessible to all members of the student population, tailoring those learning environments to take into account the varied and sometimes complex needs for each student. The applicant notes a systematic process is currently in place to determine how many students as well as each English Language Learners have language related learning needs.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None noted.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths: The applicant provides a strong vision which is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA(s), overall and by student subgroup. For example, the applicant’s goal district wide is focusing on student achievement and entails developing a district wide instructional system which includes the implementation of the CCSS, aligning curriculum with effective instruction, differentiated professional development, and community partnerships. The applicant’s comprehensive vision provided in the Appendices spells out measurable objectives for assessing proficiency and growth, decreasing achievement gaps, increasing high school graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment rates. The applicant’s vision is based on a number of national and statewide educational assessments that ranked Nevada at the bottom in the nation for having a chance for success, which prompted many of the proposed innovative initiatives and changes of focus. The applicant’s vision illustrates modest annual improvements, with the largest achievement gap decreases noted in every minority subgroup. The applicant provides a benchmark for each subgroup starting in the 2010-11 school year, and showing the modest increase for each school year through the 2016-17 school year. Proficiency rates will be assessed for Math, ELA, high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates, and college enrollment rates and covers all grades.</p> <p>Weaknesses: None noted.</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	15
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p>		

(a) The applicant clearly illustrates record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement. For example the applicant provides a table illustrating school district proficiency rates for academic years 2009-2012. The proficiency rates during this period for Reading in Grades 5 grew from 51.0% to 65.60%. In Grade 8, proficiency rates grew from 58.3% in 2009 to 72.7% in 2011. The Reading for this time period remained stagnant for Grades 3. The applicant also provides school district Advanced Placement Exam Pass data for academic years 2007-08 thru 2010-11 which indicates a slight increase from 23.3% to 24.3% for 11th and 12th grade AP Enrollment during the 4-year period. The applicant also indicates there have been significant strides in students graduating in the school district reporting a graduation rate ranging between 65%-69% which is slightly higher than the present state rate.

(b) The applicant has clearly illustrated other evidence that demonstrates the applicant's ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools. For example, the applicant indicates that two of its schools, Rancho High School and Carson Elementary School were identified as lowest-achieving schools. Both have improved academic achievement significantly and are no longer be labeled Turnaround Schools. Currently, Carson is a 4-Star school and Rancho is a 3-Star school (one and two star schools are in need of improvement and 5 star schools are considered "exemplary"). The applicant states most recently the Superintendent has placed all of the school district's Turnaround schools under one umbrella, aligning and prioritizing them to ensure these schools receive the more intensive assistance that is needed.

(c) The applicant has clearly illustrated that they have made student performance data available to students, parents, and educators in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. For example, the applicant has provided several samples of performance data communications that are distributed throughout the academic year. The Nevada Student Growth Summary illustrates student growth over a three-year period. The data provides information for all students that have been enrolled within the school district for at least two years. The applicant also note ParentLink, which is a tool that communicates information to parents by phone call, email, text messages, web postings, and news announcements

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strength:

The applicant clearly demonstrates a high level of transparency in the school district's processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. For example, the applicant indicates the CCSD provides reports and data regarding its finances after the approval of the District's budget at a minimum of 3 times per year through public meetings of the Board of School Trustees; conduct community presentations of the district's audited year-end financial records through a public meeting of the Board of School Trustees and post them for public viewing online through posting of the District's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report; by posting online individual school accountability reports; and by posting salaries of public employees online. The public must go to a specific website and search for a specific employees name in order to fully-conduct this search.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strength:

The applicant successfully describes the extent to which the LEA has demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments as it relates to the purpose of the solicitation. For example, the applicant indicates there is a solid relationship between the Nevada Legislature, the Governor, the Nevada Department of Education, and the CCSD. The entities are all committed to education reform in Nevada as a means to improve student achievement. In June 2010, the Nevada State Board of Education, with the support of local school districts, adopted the Common Core Standards (CCSS) in an effort to improve the rigor of the state's academic standards. The standards were revised in 2011 to include science standards that incorporated enhanced technology and engineering principles. The applicant also states Nevada began major reform efforts in

1997 with the enactment of the Nevada Education Reform Act (NERA). NERA reformed the State accountability program which linked achievement data with school improvement; provided critical data to policymakers to inform decision-making; and, provided implementation of technology for public schools.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

(a) (i) The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan regarding how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal and, how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback. For example, the applicant indicates CCSD key staff attended two work sessions with the Board of School Trustees on July 11, 2012, and September 5, 2012, to discuss the RTT-D opportunity. Meetings were held on September 26, 2012, and September 27, 2012, to discuss the program components with the principals of the 63 targeted elementary schools. A PowerPoint presentation was provided to outline the funding opportunity, requirements, and ideas for programs to be implemented at their sites to address the academic needs of their students. The applicant also states that each principal agreed to hold a local stakeholder meeting with their school community, including teachers, support staff, parents, students, and community partners. A PowerPoint presentation and the survey were sent out in both English and Spanish to each principal. An electronic survey was sent out to each stakeholder to provide feedback. Feedback was provided by a majority of the principals. 2,072 parents participated in the stakeholder meetings.

(ii) None noted.

(b) The applicant clearly demonstrates support from key stakeholders. For example, the applicant provides letters of support in the Appendices from Senator Harry Reid, the Hispanic Educators Association, the Henderson Libraries, the Las Vegas Urban League, Greenspun College of Urban Affairs, the University of Las Vegas Nevada, and the International Association of Online Learning.

(a) Weakness:

(i) Feedback was provided by only 56 of the 63 principals to LEA leadership after their meeting via the on-line survey tool which demonstrates a possible lack of commitment, time for, and/or support of the project.

(ii) The applicant indicates that only 1,616 teachers attended the stakeholder meetings from 63 participating schools. The applicant indicates that there will be 2,496 educators participating in this project, which is not at least 70% of support by teachers required in the criteria.

(b) None noted.

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

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates a high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform. For example the applicant indicates the school district hired WestEd in the school year 2011-2012 to review the educational opportunities offered to ELL in CCSD schools as well as to identify needs and gaps that would hinder the implementation of personalized learning environments. WestEd's report concluded that low expectations and perceptions of students by principals and teachers are pervasive throughout schools visited, and classrooms observed indicated little evidence that teachers design instruction to challenge and support ELL (English Language Learners), which is the districts most challenging subgroup. The study assessed the current status of instruction by reviewing demographic changes, educational needs for students, and job- and college-readiness skills necessary for success, the level of rigor, engagement, support and the ability to autonomously develop knowledge of the practices observed in a selection of classes and schools in the District. WestEd conducted three sets of two-day visits to a total of ten district schools and 70 different classrooms. The final summative evaluation report was the logic behind many of the proposed reforms.

The applicant also notes other serious gaps in academic achievement such as: 75% of Grade 4 and Grade 8 students were reading below grade level in 2009, compared to 69% nationally, as evidenced by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), and sadly, while 44% of Caucasian students were proficient or advanced in reading for 2011 NAEP assessment, only 16% and 19% of African-American and Latino students demonstrated proficiency, respectively. All of the aforementioned gaps and needs is CCSD's logic for the proposed reform proposal.

Weaknesses: None noted.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

(a) The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready with the support of parents, educators, and all students. For example, (i) the applicant states CCSD's PreK program is modeled after a 4-day instructional week. On the fifth day, teachers and teaching assistants are required to provide parent/family engagement activities to increase parental involvement in the school, community and accelerate the learning and personalized educational strategies for their children's education. Parents attend activities every Friday in the classroom where they learn about the education process, learn how to implement teaching strategies during day-to-day activities in the home to further enrich the student outside of school hours, and learn reading strategies to perform with their children to enhance literacy. (ii) Proposed activities will focus on learning and growing, math, language and literacy, playing, nutrition, and behavior. Technology in the classroom including SmartBoards, computers, and iPads will be used to motivate, engage, and enrich the learning of the Pre-K students with 21st century skills. The applicant plans to utilize Response to Instruction (RTI) with the goal of increasing academic achievement and behavioral outcomes for all students. Response to Instruction: A Multi-Tiered System of Support is an operational manual developed by CCSD's Curriculum and Professional Development Division staff and is aligned with current research and CCSD initiatives. CCSD implements the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards in all PreK programs. Within the last year, CCSD sent 35 Early Childhood Special Education programs through the NAEYC accreditation process, and all 35 programs received accreditation with an average overall score of 98.99. (iii) Activities to used to assist students with experiences of diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that will be motivate and deepen learning are achieved through: multicultural and books highlighting diversity, dramatic play time, as well as exposure to clothing, food groups, musical instruments, and dolls from different cultures. (iv and v) Children will master critical academic content and traits, such as goal setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, and creativity, through learning foundational skills that prepare them for Kindergarten. Classroom practices are included in the Pre-K curriculum. The applicant as provided a comprehensive timeline which details all major activities related to the implementation and on-going activities as the relate to the project, specific timeframes for when those activities will take place, milestones, and key project staff, district staff, and educators who will be responsible for carrying those activities.

(b) (i) The The ELL program will supplement the District's reading curriculum (Trophies by Harcourt) with the Imagine Learning English Language Development and Acquisition program for ELL, K-7th grade (funded through Title III), and uses programs such as Rosetta Stone to provide additional support to ELL students. (ii) The applicant indicates high quality instructional approaches and environments for all 63 schools includes: implementing the personalized classroom, differentiated learning, group cooperative learning, project-based learning, small group instruction, individualized instruction, and independent applications of skills, with 42 of the schools having a one-to-one program to enhance each learning environment. (iii) The applicant indicates all schools will have computers and computer labs to incorporate digital learning; Pre-K youth will have access to Smartboards, iPads, and computers to engage in learning; teachers will receive professional development and support in using the technology, and finally 11 schools will receive iPads for all students in grades 3,4, and 5, and 100 across each grade level at each school. Content noted (Imagine Learning English Language Development and Acquisition) will be supplemented the school district's reading curriculum, Trophies, by Harcourt for ELL in grades K-7th. These strategies ensures that all students will have some access and exposure to high-quality digital learning at some point throughout the project period. Thirty students at each site will be trained to use the technology and allowed to provide peer support to students as well as teachers. (iv) (A) Daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly classroom assessments will identify the needs of each student. Student achievement data is shared at Parent-Student-Teacher Academic Planning Time conferences. The Nevada Growth Model will be used to measure student growth in grades 4-12 to be shared with students and parents. ParentLink will be used by students and parents to track, academic growth, grades, and attendance. (B) The applicant indicates Early Childhood Education teaching staff are able to generate reports and progress reports three times per year, and online portfolios are

provided for daily progress monitoring which teachers use to make personalized learning recommendations and implement instructional interventions based upon student progress.

(c) The applicant clearly describes the mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. For example, the applicant states the District's Discovery Education Assessment System: Launch into Teaching online program can be accessed at home by students and parents, and provides students and parents with individual student assessment information, and online instructional content to improve student understanding of key concepts in literacy that directly connects instructional content with individual student needs and provides feedback on progress. Students have been trained by their classroom teachers on how to access the tool in the classroom and at home. Parents have been given information on how to access the program at home so that students can work on academic skills outside of the school learning environment.

Weaknesses:

(a) (ii,iii,iv,v)The applicant discusses intense parental engagement and involvement in Pre-K, but it appears to taper during the middle of elementary school enrollment. (iii) The applicant fails to address include exposure to diverse cultures throughout the project. It appears there is just a focus during the Pre-K learning activities which is a concern.

(b) (iii)The applicant does not discuss how parents will assist the school district in digital learning and digital learning content. It appears there are no plans to provide assistance to parents who will use technology monitor academic progress, and to facilitate the growth and development process in the home. Content and learning is limited to the school environment. There is no explanation why only 100 students will receive technology in grades K-2, and no discussion about how those students will be selected. There is very limited discussion regarding the specific content to be used for learning. (iv) (A) The applicant does not discuss the frequency of the feedback. There is no accomodation/engagement for parents with poor literacy skills, technology skills, or for those who are unable to access this technology using internet services within their own homes. There is no mention of specific hands-on tutorials teaching parents on how to best access and utilize the information regarding their child's progress. Parents will only receive brochures and newsletters how to access and use ParentLink, which is does not ensure each parent will actually understand and/or utilize the service. It would seem that if such a large investment is in purchasing the technolgy, the applicant would include some technical supports and tutorials for parents during the deployment phase, and throughout the year for new parents and students attending selected schools. (B) The applicant only provides personal learning recommendations information for Pre-K students. There is no information in the narrative explaining how they will address college-and career-ready standards, or college and career-ready graduation requirements. (v) The applicant states supplemental opportunities for language acquisition to support high need students and improve outcomes will include before and after school, and Saturday tutoring to be funded through the proposed project at all 63 sites.

(c) None noted.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. For example, (a)(i) the applicant indicates it has ample supports for the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies for all participating educators, in June 2013, all educators will attend a five-day institute to help all participants "build the base" of understanding for successfully carrying out academically and linguistically rigorous work with students who are learning English as a second language. In August 2013 of year 2, seventy-five apprentices will participate in phase 2 of ELL institute for a four-day Building the Base participant observation institute. The 75 apprentices will observe the unique professional development delivered to 450 teachers. They will place 7 observers at each school. During the Fall/Winter of Year 2, apprentices who have completed phase 1 and 2 benchmarks successfully will co-present the ELL professional development to 1,120 teachers from the selected elementary schools. The training will occur outside of the teacher contracted day. In the Fall/Winter 2013 and Spring 2014, apprentices will continue their training through a 4-day institute in the whereby apprentices co-present to 1,120 teachers with vendor coaches. During the summer of 2014 in year 3 of the grant, seventy-five apprentices will begin phase 4, instructional leadership development. The apprentices will develop, design and conduct professional development tailored to the needs at their site location. In January of 2015 year 3 of the grant, 25 teachers who attended and completed Building the Base Institute in Phase 3 will be coached by vendor coaches, and observed by the seventy apprentices, during classroom observations. Finally, in Fall of 2015 year 4 of the grant, the seventy-five apprentices will independently continue to conduct two coaching cycles per teacher and remote learning activities. The various phases of the proposed reform initiative will provide the needed training and development in district educators to sustain the project, making a lasting impact on student achievement.

(ii) The applicant indicates the CCSD will select a vendor who has a proven track record of success with providing high-quality professional development to schools and LEAs across the nation and has been working diligently with ELL training. CCSD has already hired a full time instructional coach at each of the 63 schools to support the trainings, provide follow-up, and to ensure the project's sustainability once grant funds have been depleted. The applicant states 53.4% of all teachers from the 63 schools targeted to participate in the professional development have an advanced degree which exceeds the far recommended threshold of 43.5%.

(iii) The applicant indicates daily tracking of student progress in literacy will be monitored closely by teachers through daily classroom interaction and assessments. If a student requires additional support, teachers will provide before, after school, and Saturday tutoring, and will refer students to the Communities in Schools Wraparound Services program, when appropriate. Instructional coaches will support and model teaching strategies to maximize learning for all students in the classroom and ensure that students meet the CCSS in literacy, mathematics, and science. Teachers will be trained to utilize World Class Instructional Design and Assessment English Proficiency Standards and the criteria for performance to frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and use the information to inform educators of both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual.

(iv) The applicant indicates data from systems such as the SPF, CRT results, the Growth Model, and English Language Proficiency Assessment will be studied by principals and school improvement teams to identify where student learning and teaching is lacking, and will be used to make informed decisions regarding coaching and training needs for individual teacher. Principal evaluations and the SPF will be used as well to identify additional supports and training needed by administrative staff to improve overall academic achievement at school sites. The data sources will provide opportunities for teachers and principals to reflect on their practices, participate in structured grade level and/or department data-focused discussions and planning sessions, and provide opportunities for all educators to share feedback across grade levels and across content areas on what is working and what needs to be revisited and revised in their teaching practices.

(b)(i, iii) The applicant effectively demonstrates actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests. For example, the applicant states the Discovery Education Assessment System: Launch into Teaching, was launched in September of 2012 to provide teachers with benchmark assessments, instructional resources, and timely formative data enabling teachers to frequently monitor student progress and success in meeting college and career readiness standards.

(ii) None noted.

(c)(i) The applicant clearly indicates there are available resources that helps school leaders and school leadership teams assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness for the purpose of continuous school improvement. For example, the RTT-D office will provide oversight and ensure that site principals have the support they need to implement a successful RTT-D program. Data from systems such as the SPF, CRT results, the Growth Model, and English Language Proficiency Assessment will be studied by principals and school improvement teams to identify where student learning and teaching is lacking, and will be used to make informed decisions regarding coaching and training needs for individual teachers as identified through annual evaluations and observations. The applicant will conduct annual stakeholder meetings with may have the potential to address school climate.

(ii) The applicant has clearly indicated that training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps are currently in place and are ongoing. For example, the District has currently identified and trained all school and central office district staff on a district-wide assessment system called the Discovery Education Assessment System. Pre-K Project Facilitator will provide specialized support and trainings to the Pre-K teachers teaching in the 19 targeted schools. A highly qualified vendor will provide the training and will be selected through the appropriate purchasing and bid process to begin in January 2013. Finally, CCSD has already hired a full time instructional coach at each of the 63 schools to support the trainings, provide follow-up, and to ensure the project's sustainability once grant funds have been depleted

(d) The applicant effectively illustrates a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals which includes 63 of the district's hard-to-staff schools. For example, the applicant believes with high quality professional development, modeling of effective teaching practices, and intensive instructional coaching included with all of its programs, CCSD will be creating more effective and highly effective teachers at each site. Principals and teachers at the 63 sites will visit other 5-Star schools in similar communities to observe how to successfully structure and manage the blended learning classroom, with particular attention to ELL and literacy skills taught to the CCSS.

Weaknesses:

(a) (i, ii, iii, iv) (i) None noted.

(b) (i) None noted. (ii) None noted. (iii) None noted.

(c) (i) The applicant does not provide enough information to describe how it will address school climate and culture issues, and provide support for principals that have identified the need for such resources as it relates to the project. If there are school climate and culture issues presently before the implementation of the project, those issues could delay implementation, and diminish possible gains in student growth if there is push back or resentment within the climate of the school. (ii) None noted.

(d) None noted.

The applicant provides a comprehensive timeline illustrating the proposed activities for teaching and leading, the timerame for each proposed activity that will take place during the grant period, the deliverables, the proposed goals and the preson(s) responsible for carrying out the proposed activities. The goal of the initiative The goal for the proposed initiative is to increase student achievement and growth on the Nevada Criterion Reference Test (CRT's) for grades 3rd-8th, to decrease achievement gaps by ethnicity, and to improve the graduation rate over the project period.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. For example, (a) the applicant clearly demonstrates they have practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning with an organized consortium governance structure to provide support and services to all participating schools. For example, the applicant indicates a highly qualified, experienced governance structure is presently in place consisting of the Deputy Superintendent of CCSD and Project Director of the RTT-D program; the Chief Technology Officer (responsible for executive oversight of the One-to-One program), and the Chief Student Services Officer (responsible for executive oversight of the Pre- Kindergarten program). These individuals meet monthly to ensure all components are implemented according to the plan. CCSD will provide direct support and services to all participating schools through a central office RTT-D department. The RTT-D management team will consist of a Project Director, a Coordinator III, two project facilitators and a full time clerical support staff. This team appears to provide ample support for project implementation and infrastructure development.

(b) The applicant effectively demonstrates the provision of school leadership teams in participating schools the sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets. For example, the applicant indicates principals at each of the 63 schools are given sufficient flexibility and autonomy over procedural and curriculum based factors such as personnel decisions, staffing models, roles, school calendars, and budgeting must be understood in the context of reform to allow principals to have flexibility to meet the needs of the student population.

(c) The applicant has clearly demonstrated it will given students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. For example the applicant states schools and educators will provide will provide opportunities for elementary students to master grade level appropriate curriculum based on implementation of the CCSS and integration of Depth of Knowledge (DOK). Students have the ability to advance once mastery has been achieved as evidenced based on meaningful assessments which entails demonstrating mastery through strategic thinking and extended thinking.

(d) The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan to students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. For example, the applicant states multiple demonstration processes hold teachers and students accountable for meeting individualized instructional goals. Diagnostic screeners provides teachers with information on what a student has mastered and what areas may require additional assistance in order to achieve mastery and advance.

(e) The applicant clearly illustrates a plan to provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including English learners. For example, the applicant states students with disabilities are provided the same learning resources and opportunities as their non-disabled peers. English learners are provided with support through ELL practices in the classroom, Pre-K programs, and support from CCSD's ELLP and supplemental Title III funding provides tutoring support, materials, and software for English acquisition. Students with disabilities participate in services in the least restrictive environment and in the general education curriculum with modifications and accommodations as specified by their IEPs.

Weaknesses:

(a) The applicant does not include at least one teacher and one principal on the team. These individuals may be able to assist their peers during the rollout process, and provide much needed feedback regarding what works and what doesn't in the early stages. Having at least one educator and one principal on the team could assist with some district and school climate and cultures issues that may arise during this rollout process.

(b) None noted.

(c) None noted.

(d) None noted.

(e) The applicant provides very little discussion regarding the learning resources, modifications, and accommodations for students with learning disabilities. It is impossible for the reviewer to determine whether or not the applicant has made appropriate accommodations (based on the individual needs per student, per school) that are suitable for student with disabilities. Many supports were described for English Language Learners, but none specifically described for students with and and all types of disabilities.

Overall, the applicant's plan to provide services and supports is strong, but does not appear to ensure the agents of change have a seat at the table which may assist the school district in understanding potential obstacles or resistance, and could possibly assist in helping to develop meaningful policies, practices, and rules for all participating schools. Having a few educators could also be a great way to get buy-in from all participating educators and make the proposal stronger. Also, the applicant's limited information regarding students with Individual Education Plans (IEP) and students with disabilities is extremely limited. Much more is needed in the plan regarding reform for this population to determine who the applicant will ensure these students have the same opportunities as students without disabilities and IEP's. The applicant notes significant advances in academic achievement for students with disabilities and IEP's but it's unclear as to how this will be done.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

(a) The applicant has clearly demonstrates a plan for ensuring that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning), regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal. For example, the applicant indicates the Vegas Public Broadcasting System (PBS) televises a live Homework Hotline tutoring help Monday thru Thursday, from 3:30pm – 5:30pm, the One-to-One program will be a web site with resources and materials associated with the successful use of the iPad and other mobile devices, limited assistance for ParentLink is available or parents when schools are unable to help. Technical support is also available for students of CCSD's Virtual High School. Instructional tutoring is available to Virtual High School students five days a week online, as well as face-to-face through the University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV) college interns, and a pilot program is in place to determine the value of separating the instructional and education support function from the technical support functions.

(b) None noted.

(c) The applicant provide substantial evidence that they currently use information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format (as defined in this notice) and to use the data in other electronic learning systems. For example, the applicant indicates in the 2011-2012 school year, 15,924 credits were earned by students participating in personalized learning via CCSD's Virtual High School. CCSD School Board of Trustees recently approved the use of a new student information system (SIS) with the enrollment and registration functions live in the winter of 2013 which will help to implement systems that meet RTT-D requirements with or without funding. The system is presently up and running. Data from this system will flow into the parent portal where parents and students will be able to access and export data at their leisure.

(d) The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan to ensure that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems. For example, the applicant indicates the school district will have a three-tiered system that will extract utilities will be used to automate data exchange with external databases and systems for both instructional and operational purposes.

Weaknesses:

(a) None noted.

(b) The applicant fails to provide convincing evidence they are able to ensure that students, parents, educators, and other

stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies noted in the criteria. For example, the applicant indicates most CCSD school staff are supported by an ECS, which is also responsible for areas including: educational technology integration support, including professional development, planning, and working with teachers in classrooms, and often includes other school duties such as test proctoring or maintaining the school's website. The applicant also indicates they offer limited assistance for ParentLink when schools are unable to help which is the gateway for parental involvement in their child's growth. Although the applicant cites a survey results published in the 2010 State Technology Needs Assessment, a report to the Nevada Commission on Educational Technology, and the Nevada Department of Education illustrated that "overall, Clark County teachers felt they could get assistance when needed, it does not provide evidence that parents have the same luxury. The current system is very unfriendly and not helpful to parents, a key collaborator in this innovative process.

(c) None noted.

(d) None noted.

Overall, some aspects of the applicant's plan needs to be developed more to ensure all parents have the tools they need to access the resources the district plans to make available to them 24 hours 7 days a week. The applicant does not provide strong evidence that it will be able to address future technical issues that may arise from the development of present infrastructures.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strength:</p> <p>(1) The applicant demonstrates a strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. For example, the applicant provides an already partially implemented plan which is addressed in the Superintendent's vision for school improvement and clearly outlined in "A Look Ahead: Phase I. The measurements for continuous improvement will include: student achievement, growth, graduation rates, college enrollment, the reduction of achievement gaps, and the annual performance of the Superintendent. All metrics will be made available to the public. Assessments for continuous improvement have been comprehensively noted within the applicant's timeline of key project activities.</p> <p>Weakness:</p> <p>(1) The applicant fails to provide to describe how this information will be publicly shared or disseminated. Meeting with key stakeholders is addressed in the timely, but when and how sharing of information will take place is in question. A written report will be produced, but what happens to it is unknown.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>(2) The applicant clearly demonstrates a strong, high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. For example, the applicant indicates they plan to host public open meetings with partners such as: Communities in Schools, the Urban League, the Latin Chamber of Commerce Community Foundation, the Family Leadership Institute, and the Mexican Consulate, which will assist the school district in decreasing the achievement gaps in the ELL and LEP subgroups. By working with groups who are at least somewhat familiar with the cultural group affected by the WestEd evaluation, the district will be able to better understand some of the basic characteristics of the cultural group, and create and implement successful reforms to address the ELL and LEP subgroups. The applicant will also purchase a new benchmark assessment system to assess students in grades K-10 four times annually and provide immediate feedback to the student. The system will also provide extra academic activities customized to each student's demonstrated areas of greatest need, and gives parents the opportunity to view their child's progress and find other activities to engage in. The applicant also proposes wraparound services through a Communities in Schools partnership which will allow the schools to address and support student needs that may or may not be academically related. These reforms illustrates the applicant's commitment to on-going</p>		

communications with all stakeholders.

Weaknesses:

(2) None noted.

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides twelve ambitious, yet achievable performance measures based on the applicant's target population (Pre-K-5) which will allow the project to assess subgroups, weekly, quarterly, annually, and at any other period. For example, for performance measures 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10, the applicant states their rationale for selecting this measure because it will enable them to measure annual growth metric while helping to predict success on state mandated assessments. Measures 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 will also allow teachers and school leaders to identify students' deficiencies years ahead of state mandated testing which usually does not commence until grade 3. For Performance Measure 3, the applicant will be able to assess multiple data points which will enable the district to determine growth. This assessment will be individually administered to students with a high degree of implementation fidelity. The applicant's rationale for performance measure four was selected because attendance serves as a strong indicator to student achievement and allows school leaders to identify students who may be in need of additional outreach efforts. The rationale for Performance Measure 5 and 6 was selected because it's currently the primary indicator of success for determining each school's AYP status in previous years and now drives 88% of the Nevada School Performance Framework. The school district has added additional academic measures to monitor student growth while ensuring that their students are on track to college and career-readiness. The applicant proposes overall and subgroup measures for each proposed performance measure. Overall, the applicant's performance measures will allow the applicant to monitor current and future performance to judge how well we are doing, help them to determine if they are meeting their goals and if students and stakeholders are satisfied, take action to affect performance or improve efficiency if improvements are necessary, and most importantly, justify the proposed project.

Weaknesses: None noted.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has clearly outlined a plan discussed inside of the Superintendent's vision that describes how they will evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top-District. For example, the applicant indicates the program evaluation for this grant will be conducted by a District Program Evaluator within the Grants Development and Administration (GDA) Department. The Program Evaluator's general duties will consist of developing the evaluation plan, assisting with data collection, data analysis, and writing formative and summative evaluation reports. The applicant will conduct formative and summative evaluations to assess the effectiveness of the project. The evaluator will provide summative evaluation information to all appropriate stakeholders involved with the project annually. Currently staff members from the school district's Finance and Operations, Accountability, Assessment, Research, and School Improvement are collaborating to develop a financial dashboard that will merge school and district financial data with growth data from the School Performance Framework Model. This accomplishment will allow the district to see where they are getting the best return on their investment. The applicant plans to use the The applicant will use annual results from the five star rating system now used within the Nevada SPF will serve as the primary indicator of success and will be able to be analyzed across programs, schools, grades, and subgroups.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly illustrates a budget that identifies all funds that will support the project, is for the most part reasonable to support the development and implementation of staff, is in most areas rational, and appropriately describes how all funds will be used. The applicant provides an extremely comprehensive budget with narrative attachment detailing each area of focus to include the Early Childhood Education Focus, the Communities in Schools Wraparound budget, The Content Curator Coordinator II who will be responsible for vetting content for all 63 schools, includes contractual expenditures for a Computer Technician responsible for the wide-scale technology deployments, and personnel costs that are adequate to support the needs of the project. All one-time expenditures are noted with the budget narratives and reflected in all of the table budgets. The applicant's total budget for the grant periods 1-4 total \$59,075,070.88. The total for federal grant funds requested totals \$39,780,362.88. The total amount of funds that will come from non-federal sources will total \$19,294,708.00 for grant years 1-4. The applicant clearly notes one-time investments includes: iPads, iPad carts, Macbooks and associated supplies for students and teachers. Finally, Communities in Schools Nevada (CISN) will provide in-kind contributions to include: CISN oversight consisting of human resource support, payroll services, general executive management, data management, and management support.

Weaknesses:

The reviewer questions the need to purchase new furniture, fixtures, desks, and chairs for the Communities in Schools Wraparound project because the programs will be implemented in already existing schools. Also, it is unclear where some of the "Other" grant funds contributed to the project will come from. These funds are not clearly identified.

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

10

7

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. For example, the applicant indicates once staff has been trained on specific professional development opportunities, the school district's personnel will continue to provide professional development opportunities after funding is depleted during regularly scheduled professional development days. The Las Vegas business community is highly supportive of District programs and will be approached for assistance in continuing PreK-5th programs after RTT-D funding ends. The applicant indicates the training investment in CCSD school personnel provides the ability to continue and duplicate the ELL training techniques and classroom strategies throughout the District after the grant program ends. The tutoring component will be sustained by utilizing licensed teachers that focus on English acquisition. This component can be sustained through resources within the Title III ELL grant.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not have a strong plan to sustain the CISN Wraparound component of the grant which provides valuable after-school academic enrichment in a safe environment. Also, the applicant does not have a solid, high-quality plan to sustain all or at least some of the 19 Pre-K Instruction Assistants which is a major component of the project. The applicant indicates they will need \$2,221,975 for personnel costs.

Overall, the applicant's lack of planning for maintaining the Pre-K instruction could result in the applicant decreasing academic growth immediately. A better sustainability plan for this important component of the initiative would assist CCSD's reforms and services, ensure better policies, practices, and will ensure the reforms implemented will be able to continue to function over time.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates a strong plan to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students, giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students. For example, (1) the applicant indicates Communities In Schools of Nevada (CISN) has agreed to partner with CCSD on the RTT-D grant. The two groups have been partners since 2004. Communities in Schools is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization with a mission to surround students with a community of support, empowering them to stay in school and achieve

in life. The applicant's logic for selecting CISN was that CISN is the leading champion of connecting critical community resources to help meet students' basic needs and provide them with the necessary tools for succeeding in school and preparing for their future. (2) The applicant clearly notes eight population-level desired results for students in the LEA, with results that include both educational results and other education outcomes. (3) The program currently serves 12 district schools and will expand into 32 schools if the applicant is funded via RTT-D. CIS Coordinators are responsible for tracking school-wide activity as well as case-managed student progress in the CIS Data Management System (CISDMS). The applicant states CIS currently monitoring the students' attendance, grades and family situations and coordinates intensive services as needed with a goal to improve the GPA of students by at least 85% and assure that 95% successfully move on to the next grade or graduation and will continue to do so should the RTT-D grant be awarded. CIS will include use the CISDMS to track selected indicators to include: school-level and individual case management provision of services, GPA, absences, suspensions, detentions, and promotion to the next grade. Because the applicant is a nationally known organization and already uses the proposed model nationally, it is determined that the partnership will compliment the RTT-D project perfectly. CISN will provide mid-year and end-of-year reports illustrating student progress to the school's principal and leadership, will regularly meet with the inter-agency team to review progress towards goals and make recommendations to adapt the site plan to keep pace with each school's progress. (4) CISN's approach to integrating education and other services is to provide whatever it takes to address students social-emotional, behavioral, and basic needs so that they are able to fully participate in learning. The applicant currently receives funding to support the needs of immigrant and refugee students. The school district's ELL Department currently coordinates services for eligible students directly with Catholic Charities, the primary agency assigned and responsible for providing acculturation services and will continue to do so if RTT-D funding is awarded. (5) The applicant will assess the needs and assets of participating students that are aligned with the partnerships goals for improving the education, family, and community supports by having Site Coordinators to work in collaboration with school staff and administration to identify students within the proposed program requiring supportive services. CISN will place Site Coordinators directly on the campus of identified Elementary Schools. Each Site Coordinator will receive referrals for individual case management from any member of the school staff or administration. The applicant indicates they will identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community using its Coordinators to develop a site plan for each school campus that identifies the school's needs for school-wide and individual case management services. The applicant states CISN Site Coordinators provide individual case management and supportive services to all students referred to CISN at each campus. CISN also offers supportive services to engage families in the school community and support students in meeting their individual needs.

Weaknesses: (3)(b)The applicant fails to adequately address Use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students, with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty (as defined in the RTT-D) notice, family instability, or other child welfare issues. Although the applicant notes they partners with agencies such as Catholic Charities, they fail to specifically state how they will use results from the data tracking to target any particular subgroup.

Overall, the applicant provides ample evidence that it currently has met this priority demonstrated via the long-standing relationship between CISN and the school district. The applicant's plan comprehensively illustrates their past and future efforts to integrate public and private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly demonstrated an approach which coherently and comprehensively addressed how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. With the implementation of the proposed reforms, the previous adoption of the Common Core State Standards by the State Board of Education in 2010, and the implementation of Summer Professional Development Programs clearly demonstrates the applicant is committed to improving the effectiveness of its educators and is dedicated to deepen student learning by meeting the needs of each student. The applicant proposed plans and initiatives that will enable them to address all of the achievement gaps noted in their current baseline data rates. Throughout the application, the applicant appropriately demonstrates the approaches, and the rationale used for selecting any and all remedies noted.

Total	210	179
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0918NV-2 for Clark County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Clark County School District plans to use these grant funds to build on its current reform efforts that have focused on middle and high schools in the district. The proposed grant activities are to be directed and targeted to elementary schools in the district. This is a logical approach to expand and strengthen student learning in the early grades as a foundation to support the reform efforts that are occurring now in the middle and high schools. The elementary school students will be better prepared as they advance to the higher grades and thus can benefit from district's reform strategies.

The district has conducted significant work building on the four core educational assurance areas such as:

- Adopted the standards and is implementing them by aligning its curriculum and guiding instructional practice
- Implemented a series of formative, interim and summative assessments such as Discovery Education Assessment, the Growth model and uses a School Performance Framework
- Revamped its Human Resources Division to focus on recruiting, selecting, developing, rewarding and retaining teachers; implemented a new teacher evaluation system
- Established a Turnaround Zone to focus on its low performing schools

The evidence of these concrete actions is identified in the district's Progress Report issued in September 2012. This work has poised the district to continue and deepen its goals of improving student achievement by proposing significant strategies and interventions at the classroom and student level.

The proposal consists of the following elementary level initiatives:

1. Pre-School
2. Second language program
3. Blended learning
4. Wrap-around support services

For the second language program, the district plans to incorporate the recommendations of an independent evaluation of the needs of its limited English proficient students. Building on the evaluation makes the success of the program more assured.

The plan demonstrates a clear and credible approach by targeting resources to the early grade span. The proposal is supported and complimented by the district's reform vision. The overall plan is comprehensive and coherent placing its score for this section as high.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district provides evidence in the application of its accomplishments thus far in its current reform efforts. This evidence is outlined in the Phase I and Phase II Reports issued by the district. Concerted efforts have been directed at middles and high schools.

The district has a solid theory of action that reviews schools to determine their level of functioning and success. The primary tool used is the School Performance Framework (SPF) to analyze school performance and hold them accountable. The SPF has a 100-point index to measure its schools using assessment results and non-test score indicators. A strength to the application is the district's use of data for actionable decisions.

The applicant has identified 63 of its 217 elementary schools to be targeted for the grant services. The SPF was used to identify the most needy elementary schools to participate in this grant. The schools selected demonstrated low rates of student proficiency and meet the definition of persistently low achieving.

The applicant's approach is justified and strong in that the proposed program activities and resources will be directed to the most needy schools whose students are in need of support, resources, and interventions. A list of the participating schools is included in the application. The proposed plan serves a significant number of students in the district with extensive educational strategies.

The applicant's sound approach to implementing its reform proposal to the most needy elementary schools will support high-quality district and school-level implementation. Based upon the high quality of the process used to select participating schools, the focus on elementary grade levels and on a significant student subgroup (ELL), the score for this section is high.

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

10

8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of its current reform efforts and defines its processes and structure using a currently operating logic model as a framework of its reform strategies. For this grant, the district intends on using the same process and structure. This adds coherence to the plan.

The applicant's plan (RTT-D High-Quality Plan and Timeline) is included in the application. The plan includes goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and identifies responsible parties. The deliverables are measurable and detailed and the timelines are clearly identified and are detailed. This plan will appropriately guide the district to achieve the outcome goals of the grant.

Based upon the reform plan, the district is likely to see overall district-wide positive outcomes for student performance since the served elementary students will be provided with early supports and interventions to succeed in middle and high school.

For the scale-up of the initiatives, the district lists its strategies however details are not included for scalability such as timelines and specific activities.

The overall plan to implement the grant initiatives is of high quality and is credible to reach its grant outcome goals although the plans to scale up beyond the participating schools are not provided specifically. Therefore, the score for this section is in the bottom of the high range.

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

10

7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The vision of the applicant is aligned and consistent with its current reform goals in its middle and high schools. For these efforts, the district has set measurable objectives and goals. The district issued progress reports, as evidenced in the application, on its current outcomes and accomplishments. The grant activities are intended to deepen and accelerate student learning in preparation for high school graduation.

For the purposes of this grant, the district intends on aligning the measures, outcomes and expectations/goals used for its current reform efforts. The goals are to decrease the percentages of students who are non-proficient or failing to meet annual growth expectations. This is aligned with the state's federal targets.

The application includes annual outcome tables for summative proficiency (status) and growth, achievement gaps, graduation rates and college enrollment. The outcome goals are projected to gradually increase. In most instances, the tables include student subgroups. The identified goals are equal to the state's ESEA targets.

For the proficiency (status) data, specific grades are not included. The data is for all grades combined in the LEA. For the growth tables evidence is provided for each grade however subgroups are not identified. For achievement gaps, the individual grade outcomes are not included rather combined for all grades. The gap table identifies student subgroups and the comparison group.

Overall, the data is unclearly presented due to missing subgroups and grade level data. Therefore it is difficult to clearly identify the goals for the proposed elementary grades to be served by the grant.

The extent to which the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity is well presented based on its vision and approach. Because grade level and subgroup data is not provided in all applicable tables, the goals of the proposed initiatives are incomplete. The score for this section is in the top of the medium range.

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	8

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

According to the application narrative and supporting evidence, the district's reform efforts and outcome goals thus far have been improving although modest in some instances and declining in 8th grade reading. Although the evidence provided shows success, the narrative and data are incomplete not showing all subgroups, grades over the past 4 years.

For its lowest achieving schools, the district has an established Turnaround Zone designed to give them added support. The district shows evidence that two of its once identified struggling schools have shown enough growth to be removed from the list of turnaround schools. The applicant states that other turnaround schools have shown growth. However, the data details

are not provided about the outcomes of these schools.

The district lists some of its reform efforts and strategies such as recruiting highly effective principals to lead these turnaround schools. This effort of placing highly effective leaders in its needy schools demonstrates promise in its approach. However, the applicant does not provide specific outcome data.

The district uses multiple methods to make student performance data available to its stakeholders. Notably for parents, it has a robust system of communication.

Educators now have full access to student assessment data and will be using individual student growth reports this year. Additionally, the new formative assessment system is being launched this school year which will inform educators, students and parents at multiple times during the school year.

A clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching is not fully demonstrated since the all the data outcomes of its low performing schools and district grade level proficiencies are not provided. The district currently makes student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Additional initiatives are being launched this school year. Due to inadequate data, the score for this section is in the middle of the medium range.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

School level expenditure information is only available on the state's web site. The district is taking further action to post this information on its own web site.

Some of the school budget information is included in the district's annual budget report, which is posted on the district's web site.

Because not all 4 categories of information are readily available, expenditure transparency is not at a high level. Therefore, the score for this section is in the low medium range.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district's reform efforts are consistent with the state's efforts, which are aligned with the federal education requirements. Therefore the conditions are such that the district's proposed initiatives can be implemented without legal, statutory or regulatory constraints.

The state has enacted reform efforts such as linking achievement data to school improvement, adoption of academic standards, linking criterion-referenced assessments to the standards, established a process of individual student remediation, set up a unique student identifier system, expanded professional development supports, established the School Performance Framework, requires personalized academic plans for middle and high school students, and established a teacher and administrator evaluation system.

Because the conditions at the state do not interfere with and support the successful implementation of the proposed Pre-K,

ELL, blended learning, and wraparound initiatives, this section results in a high score.

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

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant consulted and engaged its stakeholders in the development of the grant proposal. Multiple methods were used for this engagement such as meetings and surveys.

Union participation, district Board of Trustees, and principals, teachers and parents of the participating schools were engaged.

Feedback after various stakeholder meetings was obtained from the principals using an on-line survey. Additionally, revisions to the grant were made based upon stakeholder feedback.

Feedback was specifically elicited for each of the proposed project initiatives. Notably, over 6,000 stakeholders, including 1616 teachers attended informational meetings.

Letters of support from key stakeholders are included in the application. Notably absent is a letter of support from the collective bargaining organization.

Due to the narrative and evidence provided, meaningful stakeholder engagement occurred in the development and revision of the grant proposal, however evidence of direct engagement and support of collective bargaining is absent. Therefore, this section score is in the medium range.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The district conducted a needs assessment analyzing its current status in implementing the grant initiatives. The analysis shows data and evidence that supports the Pre-K, ELL and Blended learning proposed initiatives.

The district's analysis showed the following needs:

- Open Pre-K programs in its 19 highest need schools
- Implement the recommendations of an external evaluation of its English language learners program
- Address third grade reading proficiency levels based on research
- Provide educator professional development and coaching based on administrator surveys

The district does not provide evidence that the needs analysis plan and process was of high quality. Some of the missing information includes the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and parties responsible.

The district provides evidence of its logic, research based studies, reports, and its needs and gaps to support the need for implementation of the initiatives.

Based upon the district's level of a comprehensive needs analysis and supporting evidence, the score for this section is in the medium range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The implementation plan is of high quality and addresses the strategies to serve the students in the 63 participating schools. The proposal describes how it will improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment to provide the participating students the necessary support. The grant initiatives will be implemented as follows in the 63 participating schools:

1. Pre-K: 19 schools
2. ELL: 63 schools
3. One-to-One: 42 schools
4. Wraparound: 20 schools

Notably, some schools will receive the services of all four initiatives, which are determined by greatest need. The populations served are in the district's 63 neediest schools serving high-need students.

Professional development for educators is embedded in each of the initiatives. This is supported by the district's needs assessment findings.

The proposal has a feasible approach to implementing instructional strategies through the three initiatives for the participating students. The programs enable the students in these schools to pursue a rigorous course of study - pre-school, ELL support and blended learning.

The programs provide a variety of instructional approaches that are also foundational (Pre-K), targeted (ELL), innovative (blended learning), and supportive (wraparound). These programs offer students a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments.

The proposed programs have components for students and parents to understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals by providing frequent access to student performance data, assessment outcomes, and progress reports. These strategies and activities help students and parents to adequately identify and pursue learning and development goals and understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals.

Student performance outcomes through the formative assessments and a daily on-line portfolio for the Pre-K program provide frequent information to all stakeholders to determine progress toward meeting the educational goals of each student. These strategies serve to meet the goal of informing student, parents and teachers that the student is on track toward meeting targets.

Personalized recommendations are made using the district's RTI program, which has been implemented across the district. The RTI Manual, included as evidence, is a comprehensive guide for the work to provide students with needed supports and

interventions. The RTI program ensures that each student has access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development. It also addresses accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students who need additional supports to achieve their learning goals.

Through a quality curriculum and content in all three initiatives, as demonstrated by evidence in the application, students are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest and have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. For the blended learning program, details are not included about the one-to-one program and the use of iPads.

Notably, in most instances, the projects are coordinated with current federally funded strategies.

As part of the implementation, training and support will be provided to students to successfully utilize the services provided by these initiatives. Although details about the one-to-one program is sparse.

Students and parents have access to several on-line tools and programs to access assessment information, content and practice lessons. Teachers also serve to communicate with parents about individual student progress and support strategies.

Overall, the initiatives adequately engage students, parents and educators.

Engagement and empowerment is accomplished and evidenced by using a variety of methods such as parental involvement, robust curriculum, professional development, coaching, high quality content, differentiated learning, group and cooperative learning, project-based, small group instruction, digital learning, RTI interventions and support, supplemental opportunities, extra tutoring, technology tools, iPads, classroom assessments, formative assessments, progress reports, and summative assessments. The learning strategies as specified in the grant application are comprehensive and thorough except for the one-to-one program. Therefore, the score for this section is at the top of the medium range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The teaching and leading strategies are outlined in the district's high quality grant implementation plan and in the ELL Professional Development Plan. The instructional strategies are clearly specified for the initiatives of the proposal to improve learning and teaching in the 63 schools. High-quality learning resources such as a curriculum based on standards and a formative assessment system are being utilized for these initiatives.

Significant professional development is embedded in the plan to ensure successful implementation and to improve the effectiveness of the educators and implementation of the initiatives. This will be achieved by the district's use of its new teacher evaluation system that is aligned to federal requirements as well as through professional development activities.

All participating educators (1,120) in the 63 schools will engage in training, and in professional communities. The professional development is to focus on implementation of best practices and the use of standards to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies. Instructional coaches, classroom observers, structured feedback, structured staff discussions, and instructional planning sessions will be used. These strategies are designed to improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback and learning communities. All educators in the 63 schools have access to training, tools, data systems, and resources to assist in implementing the learning strategies of the grant proposal although specific information about the one-to-one program is minimal.

As a result of using student performance outcome data, content and instruction will be adapted by the teacher, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches. Further, targeted professional development and additional coaching will be identified using

student outcome results.

The training and on-going support for the 19 Pre-K programs is clearly described. The Pre-K students will receive individualized and small group instruction depending on their needs as determined by on-going evaluations of student performance by teachers who make these decisions using student performance data.

Equally strong is the professional development and implementation for the ELL program. In this program all teachers in the 63 schools will be provided with training and supports. Additionally, the plan includes a viable approach to deepen the effectiveness of this initiative with the coaching and apprenticeship elements. This comprehensive approach serves to sustain the capacity of these educators after the end of the grant period.

The district intends to continue and refine its on-line assessment programs to ensure that students stay on track and instruction is adapted accordingly. All teachers have already been trained in the use of these tools, as it is being implemented district wide this year. In the Pre-K program, some of the assessments are conducted on a daily basis and teachers use the results to adapt instruction. The student outcome results are used for actionable decisions on classroom instruction and strategies for learning.

Processes and tools to match student needs with resources and approaches to provide continuous feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs is achieved through the use of student outcomes and performance. Teachers have accessible data from the district's online assessment program.

The district intends to increase the quality of the teachers in these 63 targeted schools to ensure that more students are being taught by effective teachers. Teacher and principal effectiveness will be determined via the educator evaluation system and individualized professional development will be provided accordingly. This is the only strategy to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective teachers, specifically in the 63 participating schools.

The district's educator evaluation system also includes a performance pay and rewards component. The system will serve to inform the district of the school's collective educator effectiveness and culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement.

The application does not specifically address increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

Overall, the plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment is appropriate to reach the goals of the proposed initiatives. This plan sufficiently includes quality approaches to implement the instructional strategies. The score for this section is in the bottom of the high range given the comprehensive supports to the educators in the participating 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:

The district's high quality implementation plan is supported by a central office structure that is designed to support implementation of the grant components with fidelity. Sufficient leadership support is identified for the grant. Monthly leadership

meetings are planned to ensure that the proposal components are on track for implementation.

The district has made adjustments to its operational policies to assure that the participating schools have a measure of flexibility and autonomy to successfully implement the grant components. Notably, the staffing decisions and school budgets for these schools have been given more autonomy.

Students have an opportunity to advance once mastery has been achieved using meaningful assessments. These students have opportunities to participate in accelerated learning. Equally important is a system to provide supplemental interventions for struggling students.

The plan calls for the use of formative assessments and technology enhancements to differentiate instruction thereby providing students with opportunities to determine mastery of the standards. The district also utilizes the RTI model for evaluation of student progress.

The learning resources at the district are applicable to all its students including the special education and ELL students. The use of resources for these students is adaptable depending on the individual needs of each student.

The district's application is strong in this section resulting in a high score.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district has a variety of resources available to all its stakeholders to access information. These include on-line teacher developed content, lessons and units, demonstration videos and standards information. All stakeholders can access this information through the district media center, online video, district public broadcast system and social media. The district also operates an on-line parent system. Other methods are used to communicate to parents such as telephone calls, e-mail, web postings, news announcements, and the homework hotline. The district has also developed a partnership with a community agency to assist needy parents in accessing the on-line systems by use of free computers at their site.

For in-school computer assistance, there are district and school-based technical supports, which includes both hardware and software services.

The district's current data systems allows for exporting of data in an open format and is usable in other electronic systems as demonstrated by its on-line/blended learning opportunities and its learning management system. The district is planning to develop a parent portal for access to more student information. The district has laid the groundwork for connections to its data systems as well as for personalized learning plans for each student. The application however does not clearly describe access and interoperability of its human resource and budget data. Additionally, the district's implementation plan does not include the elements addressing the district and school infrastructure needs.

Because these systems are not fully operational and the plan does not address the infrastructure needs, the score for this section is in the top of the medium range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	6

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district's implementation plan identifies performance measures that are consistent with the superintendent's vision for the district. Further, there is a viable strategy to utilize each school's individual School Improvement Plan to track progress in implementation. The district uses its strategies, data points, plans and staff to ensure progress.

The proposal also describes the strategies to monitor and measure the results of the grant however It is unclear how the district intends to publically share them.

The implementation plan does not include the continuous improvement strategies. Even though the applicant has identified a strategy for implementing a continuous improvement process, it does describe timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. Therefore the score for this section is in the medium range.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district strategy to maintain on-going communication with its internal and external stakeholders to continuously improve its plan is through public meetings, Board meetings, and meetings with community agencies. The proposal does not address strategies to review the goals and outcomes of the grant itself.

The strategies for on-going communication regarding individual student engagement are excellent. However, it is unclear how stakeholders will be informed about the results of the grant. Therefore, the score for this section is medium.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides performance measures that include the rationale, are formative and result in improvement and accountability. These measures are varied and include academic, non-cognitive, readiness, social-emotional and attendance. There is evidence of a system to review and improve the outcomes of the grant initiatives. The performance measures are reasonable however it is unclear why the goal for use of its quarterly formative assessments is not higher. Also, the performance measures for the district as a whole are flat which is not realistic and no data is provided in one of the tables for the participating students.

The score for this section is in the bottom of the medium range.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The application identifies an evaluation of the grant by the district. The school's outcomes will be analyzed annually using the state rating system. Additionally, the district intends to analyze the served schools compared to the non-served schools. Notably, the district intends to hold the served schools to a higher standard of achievement anticipating that the schools with additional support and services will accelerate at higher levels.

The evaluation will include both quarterly formative and summative elements. The results of the outcomes will be communicated to stakeholders involved with the project annually. The outcomes of the evaluation will also be used for the schools to make adjustments to their implementation accordingly.

The score for this section is high.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has identified both the requested funds (\$39.7 million) and those from the district for a total budget of \$59 million. The district intends on using federal grant funds (Titles I and III) to help support the initiatives. There is sufficient itemization in the budget to understand the costs for the proposed projects.</p> <p>The applicant provides clearly described rationales for each of the initiatives in the grant application and also identifies the funds that will be for one-time investments.</p> <p>The budget overall is clear and understandable resulting is a high score.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district plans to sustain the initiatives after the end of the project period, which will require the influx of funds and on-going federal funds to support further implementation. The applicant anticipates other support from the legislature, business community, public education foundation, and other public and private funds. The ELL and One-to One programs are expected to be sustained beyond the grant using the grant investments of professional development and technology.</p> <p>The applicant does not specifically have a high quality plan to address sustainability efforts. Specific activities, timelines and responsible parties are not identified therefore the sustainability plan is not sufficient. The score for this section is in the medium range.</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 applicant plans on providing wraparound services with an existing community partner. The partner has a history of providing such services across the nation and specifically provides such services to 12 schools in the district. The applicant provides positive outcome data for these schools and references positive national outcomes.</p> <p>The grant proposes to provide the services to 20 of the 63 schools - 10 in year 1 and another 10 in year 2. The services will consist of schoolwide and intensive supports to individual students. The wraparound program is comprehensive and presents strong services to address social, emotional and behavioral supports to students and their families. The model speaks to</p>		

parent engagement, but the plan is short on these details.

The proposal is for each school site to develop an implementation plan that includes goals, timelines, benchmarks and outcomes. This process will be used to inventory the needs and assets of the school.

Overall outcomes are identified including both academic and absentee rates by student subgroups. The rate of the proposed outcomes is reasonable and are aligned with the grant targets.

The applicant intends on tracking the outcome data as well as other student data using its established data system. It is unclear if the frequency (twice per year) of the analysis is sufficient. The applicant indicates that meetings will be held regularly with the partner to review progress and make recommendations to adapt the site plans. It is unclear how frequent the site plans will be reviewed and how progress and challenges will be addressed.

The application states that the wraparound services will be expanded to 31 schools in the district. The evidence of this plan is not included in the application.

The partner provider has a history of improving the identified results and thus expects to continue with this trend. The focus is to provide services to students who have the greatest need. This is a reasonable assumption.

It is clear that the wraparound services are to be directed to a subset of 20 of the 63 schools. The intention is to provide the wraparound services with the goal of increasing academic performance. Schoolwide services are provided to all students geared to improve the culture of the school thereby integrating the focus.

The applicant describes building capacity at the schools using an on-site coordinator. It is unclear in the application about what types of services will be provided to the school staff and how the decision-making process will be designed and used.

Despite some ambiguity, the score for this section is in the high range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The proposed plan is well designed to provide needed services to a large number of schools, students, educators and families. Alignment with the district's vision and reform goals are coherent.

Further, the application builds on the core educational assurance areas by using state content standards, implementing and using multiple assessment systems, measuring student growth, having robust data systems, embedding professional development, using the teacher evaluation system and focusing resources and services to its low performing schools.

The grant initiatives are concentrated on strategies at the classroom level designed to provide direct support to students. Notably, all of the initiatives are directed to the elementary school level where the need is the greatest given the district's past

investments in middle and high schools.

The district is well poised to apply these instructional services as it has a strong infrastructure such as data, technology, and teacher evaluation systems to support implementation with fidelity.

All four programs (Pre-K, ELL, One-to-One and Wraparound) expand services to student groups, while building district capacity with teacher professional engagement, growth opportunities, support and use of learning tools.

Total	210	154
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0918NV-3 for Clark County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, Clark County School District (hereafter CCSD), articulates a comprehensive reform vision begun in 2010 - Ready By Exit - to ensure that all students are prepared at key points in their education life with the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful. CCSD's reform is aligned with the four key RTT-D assurance areas and the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity. The applicant cites its work to date in the areas of professional development, assessment systems, high quality teachers, and high school reform to support its reform vision.

The proposed RTT-D program is part of its Ready By Exit vision to improve literacy skills from pre-K to 5 with a specific focus on LEP students. The applicant's rationale for this targeting includes "preparation and prevention" for pre-K students as well as for elementary students as part of the Ready By Exit strategy. The applicant further contends that this targeted reform approach will prevent the need for turn-around efforts. The applicant intends to focus on personalized student support.

It is unclear if this focused approach, as needed as it might be, is actually aligned with the District's larger vision of Ready By Exit or an opportunity to serve a very needy population with substantial extra funding. The applicant confirms that personalization at the elementary level and increased equity, i.e. improved instruction in ELL classrooms, have been part of its larger plan but that funding was a barrier. Given the on-going initiatives within the district, it is not clear why they decided to put-off this needed area which would have added cohesion across all the reform efforts.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD articulates the process it used to identify the target schools which are the 63 schools based on Nevada's current school performance framework that demonstrate low rates of proficiency especially with the LEP subgroup. This is approximately 30% of CCSD's elementary schools. While the process meets the competition's eligibility requirements, the applicant does not provide additional information on whether or not these are the lowest performing schools in the district or if the schools have the largest population of LEP students. A clearer description of the selection process is necessary to ensure that high need schools and students are targeted.

The demographics of the schools and students to be served meet the guidelines for the RTT-D competition.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The application lacks a clear description, as well as evidence, of its plans to scale-up this project and support district-wide change. The applicant does provide the Superintendent's reports on the progress to date within the district of various reform areas which indicate spread across the district. The specific RTT-D projects, however, are discussed as prospective projects that are lacking in the current plan but could be addressed with possible federal funding. It is unclear in the application if there is a specific plan to support district-wide scale-up beyond the participating schools.

CCSD does provide its guiding principles which include data transparency, educator effectiveness, and focus on literacy among others to improve student achievement that it intends to use as a guide to possible scale-up of the project but the principles do not provide a credible plan to implement the action necessary to achieve the goals of this project.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides student performance and growth rates on the Nevada CRT for English language arts and math by student subgroup and grade levels that are achievable and ambitious. It is unclear in the charts, however, if the "Overall" goals meet or exceed state targets or are only for the LEA. Across all the subgroups the growth rate varies by approximately 10 to 20% based on the current baseline and remains only slightly diminished at the end of the grant period.

Since CCSD intends to focus on LEP students, the performance gap is expected to lessen but will remain at the end of the four year grant period in both math and English language arts. The applicant fails to describe why these students will continue to experience this large gap in performance after an intense intervention. Without a more detailed description of why the applicant did not focus on a more ambitious performance and growth rate for the target students the vision for this project is incomplete.

The high school graduation rates follow a similar pattern of steady increases over the four years with a decreasing gap but still an almost 20% remaining at the end of the grant period.

College enrollment rates are presented for approximately half of the subgroups but is to-be-determined for LEP students.

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	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Based on the limited data presented in the application, CCSD has a mixed record of success in advancing student learning and decreasing achievement gaps. Taken as a whole, the elementary level shows a constant, albeit slight, up-tick in proficiency levels for both reading and math. At the middle school level, the math results show a similar pattern of improvement while the reading proficiency levels vary from year to year and grade to grade but indicate few increases in achievement. Minimal data are presented for high school graduation rates. The narrative states that is has remained relatively constant at 65% to 69%.

The three to four years of data presented in the application narrative and the Superintendent's report in the appendices indicate:

- 3rd grade reading proficiency levels have remained constant from 2009 to 2012 with a slight dip in 2011. Math proficiency levels demonstrate slight (2 to 3%) growth from 2010 to 2012.
- 4th grade reading proficiency levels are constant in 2010 and 2011 with a 6% increase in 2012. Math proficiency levels show steady (4% per year) increases from 2010 to 2012.
- 5th grade reading proficiency levels show steady increases from 2010 to 2012. Math proficiency levels show a similar pattern of increases but not as dramatic as the reading scores.
- 6th, 7th, and 8th grade proficiency levels in reading decrease over this same period while math proficiency levels increase. (Note: reading proficiency levels were re-set in 2011 accounting for some of these changes.)

The applicant presents incomplete data on the achievement of subgroups over time except for one chart that compares American Indian, African American, White, and Pacific Islander growth percentiles for math and reading from 2011 to 2012. Given the current Federal reporting requirements as well as the applicant's focus on LEP students this lack of data fails to demonstrate a track record of any kind.

CCSD provides a brief overview of the progress of a few turnaround schools but does not provide sufficient details on the changes instituted in those schools or the actual annual improvement scores. The lack of a complete description of the specific approaches utilized in CCSD to turnaround these schools makes it difficult to evaluate whether or not ambitious or significant reforms were achieved.

CCSD makes limited student performance data available to students, educators, and parents but outlines two initiatives it intends to implement in 2012-13 to share more information on the growth model as well as the results of planned formative assessments. The applicant does not discuss the information provided to educators.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD includes a copy of a district wide and school report that include financial information on salaries for different staffing groups, materials, support services, and leadership. The reports provide both actual amounts as well as percentages of total school spending that would be useful to parents and others interested in how the District and its schools use their funds. These reports are online. It is not clear how easy it might be to find them online but they are available.

As for the salaries of individual personnel, CCSD provides a screen shot of a state level website that provides the salaries of all public employees which they indicate is searchable by name only. This would make it difficult for a member of the public or a parent to have easy access to the information thus making transparency questionable.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD provides a thorough discussion of the legislative and statewide initiatives that support the implementation of the personalized learning environments. It should be noted the state has passed legislation requiring personalized learning plans which may support the efforts of this project. However, those plans are required at the middle and high school level and this project targets elementary students. The state has also provided for rules and regulations for teacher and administrator evaluations. The applicant states that districts are allowed flexibility in the rubric used to evaluate teachers and the professional development provided to support teacher improvements.

The applicant does provides limited evidence indicating that it has the autonomy to improve on the statewide initiatives or vary its approach from statewide rules and regulations. It includes a description of "loose/tight" paradigm for school improvement that is used to differentiate the monitoring and oversight under the state's performance framework. It is not clear if this system actually provides a level of autonomy for the district to implement its RTT-D plan.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD provides an overview of the steps it undertook to inform and engage stakeholders in the development of the RTT-D proposal. In addition, to the two meetings held with the Board of School Trustees, meetings were held in late September at each of the 63 targeted schools with a commitment to include teachers, support staff, administrators, students, parents, community members, and others. The applicant provides overview data to document the number of representatives from each of these groups who attended the briefings. The numbers indicate that approximately 6000 stakeholders participated: 1616 teachers, 1884 students, 2072 parents and 80 community members. This is out of a possible pool of approximately 2,500 educators, 41,000 students and their parents. As a group more educators attended the briefing, approximately half of the possible total than students and their parents, about 4% of the total assuming one parent per child. The description of the briefings appear to be more informational rather than a meaningful engagement in the development of the proposal.

CCSD indicates that the response at these meetings was positive and provides some limited data from approximately 90% of the meetings indicating a positive response to the three main interventions of 84% for the expansion of pre-K, 89% for LEP professional development, and 90% for the personalized learning program, i.e. One-to-One. The comments from the meeting included in the appendices indicate a more cautious response to the initiatives with appropriate concerns over the quality of

the professional development to be provided, the impact on the school day, i.e. substitutes as well as indications that some of the proposed services were very needed. As a result of these meetings, the applicant did reduce the number of schools that were to implement the One to One program given concerns over the use and care of iPads. It is difficult to determine the degree of support for the proposal given the range and type of feedback presented in the application, however, it does seem to range from an endorsement of the need to concerns over the quality of the implementation which may indicate a level of reform fatigue.

CCSD applicant included 24 letters of support in the application from a diverse audience of community groups, institutions of higher education and administrators association. The letters have a similar level of endorsement and content.

The applicant indicates that it has had ongoing communication with the teachers union but no details of that extent or substance of the communication are provided. There is no letter of support from the teacher's union but the Union Representative signed the application.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD does not include a plan in the application to analyze its current status in implementing personalized learning environments. It does however present the analysis it has already undertaken to identify the needs and current gaps for ELL students as well as the logic supporting its initiative for pre-K and K-12 literacy in general.

Included in the application is an independent on-site review of the current teaching and learning conditions for ELL students in seven elementary schools, four of which are included in the RTT-D proposal. The review documents a lack of quality instruction, poor student engagement, low expectations, and many other indicators of few educational opportunities for these students. This is clear evidence to support CCSD's plan to provide professional development as well as personalize the learning environment for ELL students.

The applicant provides the rationale for providing additional Pre-K programs in the District by citing availability statistics. For example, pre-K programs are not available in 19 of the highest need schools due to funding limitations. CCSD argues that the lack of pre-K programs contributes to the achievement gaps for ELL students.

The K-12 literacy needs are presented as both the state and district level with reference to NAEP sub-group results. These data support the applicant's proposal to address K-5 literacy achievement.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a plan to implement the following components in 63 high need elementary schools using a "Response to Instruction" model to provide the interventions and closely track student progress:

- 19 schools will establish pre-K programs,
- 63 will implement ELL professional development and coaching, and
- 36 will implement the One to One program in grades 3-5.

Pre-K Component

The applicant presents a highly credible plan for the pre-K program which has a high likelihood of success. The specific goals and activities for the pre-K program include a complete start-up from hiring teachers to buying furniture. The content of the program will be based on a model in use throughout the state for which the applicant provides longitudinal data of its effectiveness from the first cohort through Grade 6 and the second cohort through Grade 4. The results at Grade 4 are significant and provide a guiding model for the RTT-D program in Clark County. As could be expected from previous research into the long-term effects of pre-K programs, the gains seem to diminish over time. However, the gains for students at Grade 4 are significant.

The instructional content of the program is sound based both on the data and the description provided in the application. It includes appropriate personalized learning, i.e. differentiated instruction; daily assessments; total immersion with supports for ELL students.

The timeline for the pre-K program has a start date of August 2013 which is reasonable to set-up, staff, and organize the program. The one area not addressed in the application is the recruitment process for students and whether or not there is sufficient interest to fill one classroom or if students will need to be turned away.

ELL Professional Development and Coaching

The applicant presents a reasonable plan for implementing the learning component of the ELL Professional Development and Coaching Program. The specific goal of the ELL program is to raise the achievement of students in grades 3-5 thus impacting achievement through grade 8. The activity to support this goal is an intensive professional development the need for which is well-documented both in the current achievement of these students and the analysis of current teaching strategies. The professional development and coaching program will be discussed in Criterion (C)(2).

The student learning component of this aspect of the RTT-D project focuses on a comprehensive approach to student learning, including high expectations, increased rigor, engage students, and focus on language. The strategies articulated by the applicant include appropriate personalized learning opportunities which will be implemented through the One to One program in approximately two-thirds of the schools.

The applicant provides an overview of the strategies it intends to implement in each classroom that reflect current knowledge of effective instruction and follow the outline of the Response to Instruction approach. The applicant will also integrate these approaches into the established programs within the district. The applicant does not explicitly address the content and its alignment with college- and career-ready standards. While it does state that parent-student conferences will address this issue, the lack of clear and specific descriptions of the content that will be part of this approach is a serious omission. In addition, the applicant fails to describe the content and approaches to be utilized in the remaining 10 schools beyond broad generalizations which is an inadequate response.

One to One

The applicant presents a reasonable plan for implementing the learning component of the One to One program. The goal of this strategy is to implement personalized learning approaches using blended learning. The major activity is to assign each student an iPad.

The applicant intends to replicate the One to One program in 42 of the target schools. According to CCSD, this approach is currently in use in approximately 5 high-achieving elementary schools in the district but later states that One-to-One is only in middle schools and the RTT-D project will extend it into elementary schools for the first time. The applicant provides data on the growth model results of one of those elementary schools which indicate students are improving. It is unclear how well LEP students are doing; there appears to be some gains but they may not be consistent. Given the discrepancy in the application concerning current implementation sites, the claims of improved results are questionable.

The applicant does not provide specific information on the instructional content of that will be accessed in the individual classrooms. It does provide information on a district wide program that can be used at home by parents and students to access assessment information and additional learning activities. The plan lacks sufficient details on the alignment of these activities with college- and career-ready standards.

CCSD has proposed a reasonable scale-up in at the elementary level starting first with schools that feed into the already implementing middle schools. The expansion will follow a logical progression to other schools in the district. The timeline included in the application provides logical intermediate steps for the purchase and wiring requirements for this type of technology dependent project.

The plan includes appropriate support for students and parents to use these devices to advance learning. Of particular note is its plan to develop a cadre of student leaders to support both other students and teachers. Given the knowledge base in technology, this is a creative response.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 Improved Teaching and Leading is a major focus of CCSD's RTT-D application and is key to the improvements it expects to gain in ELL student achievement. The plan lacks depth in that it relies heavily on contract support but it does provide for the development of ELL trainers and coaches within the district over the life of the grant. The applicant's plan focuses on two specific areas:
 Pre-K Programs
 The applicant provides a minimal plan for training the 19 new teachers and 19 new instructional aides that will implement the

pre-K program. It proposes a standard approach to inducting new teachers and instructional aides into a district. The plan provides for an introduction to the state and district policies and procedures in August before the school year begins followed by quarterly professional development on research-based pre-K model standards. This is limited professional development and will not provide the high level of teaching and leading expected in the intervention. The description of the program these pre-K teachers are expected to implement, including the assessment, parent support, and personalized learning, will require a more robust support system as well as possible mentoring within the district and individual building to be successful.

It is not clear in the description if the pre-K teachers will also participate in the on-going professional development in their home schools.

ELL Professional Development

The applicant's plan to provide professional development to improve ELL performance is based on "hiring a highly-qualified vendor" to train approximately 2,500 teachers in the 63 buildings as well as the Apprentice Professional Developers and Coaches. The applicant intends to use the District's contracting process to issue the RFP in January 2013 but does not indicate an award date. While it is not appropriate to include any possible vendors in the application, an assurance that highly qualified vendors exist at the level of quality and capacity to carry the weight of this all important project would have increased the feasibility of this strategy.

The aspects of the plan included in the application are of high quality and covers the areas of content, process, and resources. The applicant does provide for the training of the Apprentice Professional Developers and Coaches in such a way that they will eventually take over the role of the vendor thus building an in-house capacity after the grant ends. The applicant provides a flow chart and timeline show the development of this personnel over the grant.

The content of the professional development, which will form the RFP, includes appropriate attention to teaching strategies aligned with differentiated instruction and personalization. In addition, the applicant includes in its plan the use of a district wide assessment system which will provide further support to teachers, students, and parents. Teachers and administrators will also have access to state level CRT and growth model data to further optimize student learning.

In regard to teacher performance and pay, the applicant describes the state system which will be implemented in 2014-15 as a means to improve student achievement. CCSD describes how the teachers in these 63 targeted sites will add to the highly effective pool of teachers available in the system.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a focused organizational structure which sets RTT-D within the Deputy Superintendent's office with four staff including a specific K-5 coordinator and Facilitators for ELL and Project One to One. Other RTT-D offices will be established in the Student Service Office for Pre-K with five staff and the Technology Office with 3 staff. This is a minimal addition of staff for oversight of the project but sufficient to manage the project at the district level. There is, however, a potential weakness in the evaluation of the project at the site level. Given the extensive nature of the intervention and the number of schools and teachers, the lack of an external evaluator limits the credibility to the evaluation plan and the objectivity of the results.

The applicant provides an appropriate level of detail on the duties of each of these positions that indicate a high level of support for the implementing schools and staff.

CCSD provides assurances that the participating schools will have the authority and autonomy necessary to make key decisions at the site level. The applicant indicates that the increased autonomy is balanced by increased accountability for results. It was not clear if this autonomy was conditional.

It is not clear in the application if students will have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. Given the pre-K and K-5 nature of the program it is not feasible to provide formal opportunities for mastery and credit. However, the teaching and learning approaches which are to be implemented provide for individual growth within a personalized learning classroom.

CCSD provides appropriate assurances that learning resources and instructional practices are fully accessible. Since this project is focused primarily on ELL the district will meet those assurances.

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

10

2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant articulates a wide range of district wide strategies to connect schools, teachers, students and parents. The applicant does not describe any special resources or activities it intends to make available as part of this specific project. Given the focus of this project, the most relevant access tools to support this project are the Wiki-Teacher site to share content and the Parent link project but the applicant does not indicate that it will take advantage of either of these sites to improve communication or share teaching strategies.

The applicant describes the technical support available to District personnel but does not indicate that any support is available to parents or stakeholders beyond minimal support to the Parent link project. It does mention the One to One project which is a major part of the RTT-D program is to create a web site for parents, teachers, and students. Little detail is provided and a timeline is not included.

The applicant describes the development and proposed implementation of a student information system which would provide the range of information and services described in this Criterion. CCSD will complete this project without RTT-D funding and expects it to be fully functional by the 2014-15 school year.

The applicant is developing an interoperable data system that will be completed by 2014-15.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant provides minimal information on its strategy to provide for a rigorous continuous improvement process. It intends to have two individuals monitor implementation progress and budget outlays but does not provide any detail on how the various reports listed in the application will be integrated to monitor, measure, or report on RTT-D. The two Superintendent Reports in the appendices indicate a commitment to continuous improvement and demonstrate the District's current monitoring of key initiatives but do not provide a framework for a high quality approach to continuously improve its RTT-D plan and make mid-course corrections over the four year life of the grant.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide for a formal process to review progress and make corrections over the life of the grant. It is not sufficient to make the RTT-D project part of the regular reporting requirements undertaken by the district. The degree of change anticipated by the RTT-D project requires a specific, on-going, and rigorous continuous improvement plan with intermediate targets and formal review. This is an inadequate approach to monitor, measure, and publically share information on this major investment.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant presents a limited its plan to use technology to improve communication with parents and students through its new benchmark assessment system which will provide better information to students and parents. CCSD outlines a technical assistance plan, including mandatory parent-teacher conferences, to introduce the web-based system and provide training in its use. In addition, the applicant does mention cooperating with the Latin Chamber of Commerce and the Mexican Consulate to communicate with families from the Hispanic community. It will also include RTT-D into on-going initiatives to share the status of the project.</p> <p>CCSD states that it will keep open effective lines of communication but the proposed plan does not provide for in-depth two-way communication and engagement strategies with internal and external stakeholders. The plan provides little evidence that specific RTT-D strategies beyond the one way communication it discusses in the application will be implemented.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides 12 performance measures which are clearly focused on the expected outcomes of the for the RTT-D program. A rationale is provided for the measures that focus on non-academic areas such as absenteeism and student engagement. The other measures are clearly linked to the expected outcomes of increasing achievement.

A new formative assessment system will be used to track the measures that are related to the state's summative assessment. It is difficult to determine, however, how the applicant developed the 10% annual increases other than predicting higher levels than the district as a whole based on the additional support. A more precise explanation is needed.

The applicant does not provide a process for adjusting the measures over time.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant intends to use the current rating and reporting system in place within the District as the primary indicators of success. The District evaluation team will be tasked with gathering and presenting these results.

The plan in the application did not present a complete picture of a high quality evaluation particularly in the area of formative evaluation. The applicant did not provide a thorough list of the areas it intended to examine as part of its implementation review. An additional concern was that an annual summative report was to be used for program improvement. This may not be frequent enough to make necessary changes.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a thorough, reasonable and sufficient budget to support the RTT-D project over 4 years. CCSD includes a narrative with supporting tables which document how RTT-D funds as well as other sources will be allocated to support the program purposes. As a total, approximately half of the funds for the RTT-D project will come for other sources. The other sources vary by project. For example the ELL program budget includes significant in-kind resources from Titles I and III.

The largest one-time investment of RTT-D funds will be for the One to One technology and personalization program to build the in-school infrastructure and purchase computers with supporting hardware. It is slightly half of the total federal funds. The largest program in terms of schools and children impacted is the ELL programs which is budgeted at less than a quarter of the federal RTT-D funds but has the largest in-kind contribution by the District. The difference proportion and source of investments are credible given the nature of the individual programs.

It is a concern that such a high proportion of funds will be used for consumable technologies (iPads) since it raises questions of the CCSD's capacity to replace, repair, or continue the program over time. The technology based program is the personalization component of the project and it is unclear of the district will build a sustainable project.

The final concern is the amount budgeted for the contractor to provide ELL training and coaching. It seems unreasonable to expect a contractor to provide the level of services necessary for approximately \$1.7M over four years.

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

10

7

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's sustainability plan varies by project:

- The pre-K program will require approximately \$2M per year for personnel to continue and CCSD is working to secure state legislative funding to continue the project.
- ELL literacy initiative is designed to be self-sufficient after funding ends.
- One to One Program is described as a one-time investment. CCSD does not describe any long term costs.

The applicant describes a number of local foundations and organizations that it has worked with over time that contribute to specific district budgets. CCSD contends that the success of the RTT-D project will encourage organizations to continue it. The applicant does not provide any evidence of the possible future interest in this work on the part of community organizations or foundations.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant intends to continue and expand its partnership with Communities in Schools (CISN) to an additional 20 elementary schools. CISN is currently working in 12 school campuses providing a range of services including assemblies, guest speakers, field trips, anti-bullying campaigns, and community resources fairs. It is not clear how the project will support Absolute Priority 1. The activities listed in the current project, including case management support, are very valuable to each student and the school community but are loosely linked to the Priority.

The actual services for the CISN partnership for 75% of the students at the school are not clearly delineated within the application. The intense services for 5% of the students include monitoring attendance, family situations and other areas with a goal of improving student GPA and promotion. The applicant mentions Level 2 that appear more closely aligned with direct student outcomes such as tutoring services. The percent of students served is not included in the application.

The applicant provides evidence of results for elementary, middle, and secondary schools and students served by the project. Three results are related to the elementary level to be served by this project and include improvement s in attendance and academics and decreases in suspensions. The application is silent on other population level desired or actual results. The CISN program intends to improve results over time based ultimately on dropout rates. Since this is an elementary based program, the applicant needed to provide additional links between the eventual program results, especially for 75% of the students, and ultimate improvement goals.

The applicant provides a very general plan to work with CISN to track relevant data, such as attendance, and use it to better target the program. CISN has a strategic plan to add more schools based on the level of need. It is not clear in the application if the plan is strategic or simply opportunistic. The applicant does not describe how it will identify high need or which services will be provided in the additional schools.

CISN has a formal process for working with the schools utilizing a site coordinator to evaluate the needs at the general and specific level. It was unclear in the application if the site coordinator actually provides the needed services or if he/she arranges for services from other community groups. The applicant did state that the site coordinator did provide the 5% case management services. Specific descriptions of the roles and responsibilities between CISN and the CCSD were vague.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a comprehensive and cohesive plan to extend its current reform efforts to adopt standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed, data systems that measure student growth, recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals, and turn-around low-achieving schools. The applicant's plan to increase the effectiveness of its current reform efforts by adding and extending services to new grade levels, schools, and populations has the potential to impact the achievement of the participating students.

Total	210	114
--------------	------------	------------

