



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0496NJ-2 for East Orange School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has articulated an ambitious vision that has some very unique characteristics. The four distinct programs (the Achieve Program, Career Technical Education, Extended Counseling Program and STEM Academy) are innovative and address issues that should lead to reaching the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity. These programs are designed to address the "whole problem" instead of easy to see and Band-Aid issues. They include career counseling, upgraded technology infrastructure and professional development. These portion of the vision are comprehensive in the intention to provides opportunities to address issues such as drop out, career paths, and STEM opportunities are appropriate. The Extended Counseling Program in one that really demonstrates a vision that goes beyond what is happening in the schools and what can be easily addressed. The plans for socio-emotional support services are indicative of true reform vision. There is only one proposed reform that addresses students at the Pre-K - 5 level (the extended counseling program. Schools at this level are included in the plan but the vision includes them only in one of the proposed reforms. While this will be valuable in reaching the goals of the program, there is no mention of other programs that would affect students at these levels. The STEM opportunities do not include this population of students.</p> <p>Score 8/10 based on the extensive and unique vision for reform in the school that addresses many of the underlying issues that affect student success. The vision lacks a comprehensive plan to address issues in the Pre-K to 5th grade levels.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) The description of the process used to select schools is unclear. It is impossible to ascertain whether all schools in the district were included so long as the met the criteria of 40% from low-income families or if there were other criteria involved in the selection.</p> <p>b) The list of schools that will participate in tech grant activities is clear and complete.</p> <p>c) The list of schools included the total number of participating students (9721), students from low income families (7469), high-need students (3041) and participating educators (910). This data is available for each participating school as well as the LEA as a whole.</p> <p>Score 8/10 based on complete data provided but a lack of a clear description of how the schools were selected.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan presented does not provide a description of how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform beyond the participating schools. The descriptions provided state a given number of students served by each of the planned areas of the reform (Achieve, Career Academies) it is unclear how this will translate into scaling up and translating the model. The narrative does indicate the theory or program on which reforms will be based. For example, it is stated that the Achieve program will be based on the John's Hopkins curriculum for alternative education and that the Career Academies will be based in the academic pre-requisites for success at the secondary level. In addition, they provide a clear theory of action based in the recent calls for change (No Child Left Behind and President Obama's challenge for the nation).</p> <p>Score 5/10 due to the lack of a high quality plan. Score based on the clear description of theory and logic behind the plan but lack of a plan for scaling up the reforms or explanation why this is not addressed.</p>		

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a) The lack of a comprehensive vision that includes programs designed for pre-K to 5 students would make it unlikely that the applicant could attain the goals set for students in the areas of ELA and Math on summative assessments. While the extended counseling program for Pre-K through 5 might help to improve performance in these areas, there is no evidence to suggest that these ambitious goals could be met with this reform action alone. The goals for improved learning in math and language arts as indicated in the table for students grades 6-12 seem ambitious yet achievable.

b) The lack of a comprehensive vision that includes programs designed for pre-K to 5 students would make it unlikely that the applicant could attain the goals set for students in the areas of ELA and Math for decreasing achievement gaps. The goals set for each of the subgroups in relation to decreased achievement gaps are extremely ambitious. For example the projected increases in this area for special education students in grade 6 increases over the life of the grant from 2.5% to 51.3. There is no indication in the narrative as to how these proposed reforms will assure this vast improvement. There is no description as to how these projections were reached.

c) The programs proposed should serve to increase the graduation rate and the goals for increases in this area are ambitious yet achievable. The Achieve program, career technical education, and extended counseling program will all contribute to the attainment of these goals.

d) The applicants vision is extremely likely to result in increased numbers of students enrolled in college. Each of the programs (Achieve, career technical education, STEM Academy and extended counseling) will help students to move toward these goals. The goals set by the applicants are ambitious but should be achievable. An overall increase from 67.2% in SY 2011-12 to 83.7% could be achieved with successful implementation of the programs described.

Score 8/10 based on goals that are too ambitious for pre-K - 5 students (when considering reform efforts in these schools but achievable and appropriately ambitious for students at the middle, secondary and college levels.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) There is some indication of a record of success in improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps in the data presented. The high school language arts literacy and high school mathematics programs are in place to assure increased performance in these areas. However, no data is presented to show a record of success or even participation in these programs.

There is a record positive gains in all categories except 7th and 8th grade LA on state standardized assessments for the district as a whole. However, there are no other indicators of success in closing achievement gaps - data presented is for the district as a whole and do not provide necessary indicators of success.

The data for increasing high school graduation rates shows a consistent increase over the past four years when rates of passing the High School Proficiency Assessments are include in the calculation. There is no indication of how this is reflected in individual subgroups and thus no indication of how this reflects a close in the achievement gap.

Drop out rates as reported for the past four years do not indicate a clear record of success. Data shows inconsistencies from year to year and does not indicate a clear record of decreasing the achievement gap.

b) With the exception of the Campus High School language arts literacy, mathematics, and graduation rates, there does not seem to be a clear record of success in achieving reforms in the lowest-achieving schools. There is a clear indication of how these schools are identified, but no real record of success in implementing significant reforms to address the needs.

c) The district does have several sound measures in place to assure that parents and students are informed. For example, syllabi or learning goals are distributed for every course. Also, there is a system in place to provide warning notices to parents. These in addition to the improved assessment management tool and FOCUS database do offer opportunities to improve the information flow with parents. However, there is no indication of ways in which this information is used to improve

participation, instruction or services.

Score 6/15 based on the presence of a record of success but lacking specifics for individual subgroups and a lack of evidence to show a record of success in low performing schools. Also, the presence of a system to inform parents of student progress is in place but lacks provision that lead to improving instruction and services.

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

5

1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

While the information required (actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional and support staff, instructional staff and teachers only) is presented here, there is no indication of non-personnel expenditures at the school level nor indication that it is not available. Further, the presence of this data in the proposal does not indicate the existence of any level for transparency in the LEA processes. There is no description of how this data is made available to any stakeholders.

Score 1/5 based on the fact that the data is available but there is no indication of how the data is made available to stakeholders.

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

10

6

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented a clear representation of how the state affords LEAs with the autonomy to implement the proposed personalized learning environment in respect to the four areas of RTT-D reform. There is a clear agenda of reform that is evident from the information provided. As a recipient of state RTT funds, New Jersey has addressed the four reform areas. Since one of these areas is to build a data system to measure student growth and success, this ensures that the state will support the proposal in that aspect. Further, the state has ongoing measures and plans in place to address the other four areas of the RTT-D proposal and the proposal is presented within the framework that has been developed in each of these areas. The applicant has done a good job describing the conditions that the state has developed, but does not adequately address how the proposed reforms fit within this state plan with the exception of the data system.

Score 6/10 based on the description of conditions that exist and indication of sufficient autonomy as related to the data system but lack of information concerning how the proposed reforms will fit within the conditions set by the state.

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

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a) The applicant provides sufficient evidence that there was some stakeholder involvement in development and support for the proposal. They describe an advisory council made up of "representatives of all stakeholders involved ..." but fail to give a complete list of these stakeholders. It is impossible to tell from the list provided ("community organizations, community colleges, youth groups, families, etc.), the extent to which students and parents were included in the process. There is strong evidence that teachers, principals and participating schools had input and provided support for the proposal. The local education association was and is a close partner and participated in the process to develop teacher and principal evaluation system. The association president attended planning meetings and thus had sufficient input into the process. Further, the communication with all school representatives provided opportunities for teacher input. The applicants provided ample opportunities for schools to be engaged and involved as well through status reports to principals. Support at the district was evident through the permission to submit through the district Board of Education.

b) Letters of support are presented from a large variety of stakeholders including institutions of higher education, local civic organizations, the business community but are not available from any parents or parent organizations nor students or student organizations.

Score 7/10 based on strong engagement from educational stakeholders but lack of evidence of engagement from parents and students.

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

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

There is clear evidence that the applicant has a plan in place to analyze the status in implementing the personalized learning environments. This includes a timeline for addressing the needs and gaps that are identified to address the core educational assurance areas. They have identified gaps and needs in each of these four areas as well a list of activities necessary to address each of the gaps and needs and indicators of successful outcomes. Further, there is a clear indication of the responsible parties for each of the activities. These components provide a picture of the applicants plan to analyze the status of the plan.

Score 5/5 based on a clear plan with gaps and needs addressed as well as a plan to implement the aspects of that plan.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a)The plan for learning is not sufficiently detailed to indicate that the approach to learning will engage and empower all learners. The ideas for the 10 projects seem unique and innovative, but there is no description of the programs as far as the curriculum or format for the projects. While the chart provides information concerning goals, activities, outcome, responsible parties and a timeline, the information concerning activities is the only indication of the makeup of the programs. There is no detailed description of the programs provided. The narrative does not sufficiently addresses how these programs will assist parents, educators and students to understand that what they are learning is key to their success. There is no description of the input or involvement that parents and students will have in determining the make-up of the personalized learning environments nor if the programs will actually be personalized to match the needs and goals of individual students. There is no indication as to how students and parents will be involved in planning and pursuing learning and development goals. The NJ-SMART and FOCUS parent additions would provide adequate additional access to information but there is no indication of any opportunity for parents to be involved in any aspect of the students' education beyond just being informed. Further, "allowing parents to be proactive in in helping or getting help for their children before failure" is not possible based on the plan written. Parents have no training or assistance in identifying concerns or in being proactive in their children's education.

The ideas presented for the 10 programs would provide students to be involved in areas of academic interest. However, there is not sufficient information to determine if the learning experiences would be deep or provide the opportunities that would lead to college- or career-readiness. In addition, there is no indication that the 10 programs would provide access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives or allow students to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits that advance students chances for success.

b) As stated before, the lack of detailed descriptions of the 10 programs precludes any determination of the quality of the plan in regards to the instructional content, approaches or environments. The 10 programs, as presented, do not indicate any personalization of instruction. The topics for the programs are valuable in ensuring college and career readiness, but a lack of detail makes it impossible to determine if they will meet the individual needs of students nor provide the necessary content and approaches. There is no indication of the approaches that will be used in the different programs. The use of the eBackpack will provide a good mechanism for storing and sharing content but there is no mention of the type of content that will be included in the programs. Again, the NJ-SMART and FOCUS additions will provide for more regular feedback, but there is no indication that it will provide data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery nor if there will be any assistance in determining this. There is no mention of accommodations of strategies for high-need students in the plan for learning.

c) There is no indication in the plan as to how students will be trained or supported to use the tools and resources provided.

Score 6/20 based on the presence of the 10 innovative programs but the lack of detail to be able to ensure that the programs provide the high quality leaning experiences that would assure college- and career- readiness or support to ensure personalized learning environments.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a) The plan has a broad range and comprehensive set of professional learning opportunities in which educators can engage. These include instructional coaches, peer coaching, and study groups. The instructional and peer coach would not be putative and thus should support the implementation of innovative teaching strategies. The small groups that make up the

study group will provide opportunities to adapt content and instruction and provide valuable collaboration experiences for participants. The professional development, as described does not offer training in measuring student progress toward meeting career- and college ready standards. The applicants have a feasible plan in place for evaluating teachers and principals in response to effectiveness. The visual representation of the evaluation system that is proposed shows a clear vision for evaluation and there is a sufficient plan in place to train evaluators. However, there is not an indication of the amount, frequency, or nature of any feedback provided by this system.

b) The provision for laptops for teachers does increase the opportunities for teacher access to tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress. This is important for insuring equity for all teachers and thus all students. However, one computer per teacher does not assure that teaching for 21st century skills will occur. (Just because a teacher has a computer or even knows how to make a simple slide show does not guarantee that students are given the opportunities they need to work with the technology no that the delivery of instruction will differ from the traditional format.) Further, there is no indication of how teachers will be trained to use the computers to enhance learning nor to use data or other available tools. The plan does not go beyond giving computers to the teachers. While this can be valuable, there is no indication that teachers will be provided with high-quality resources (with the exception of the new evaluation system) that are aligned to the college- and career-ready standards. There is also no indication of processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches. It does appear that the need to upgrade the district's network infrastructure is vital for the success of the proposed reforms.

c) The plan for the evaluation system would provide information to help school leaders asses and take steps to improve educator effectiveness. The system would provide information on teacher practice and student achievement which could be used to improve effectiveness. Beyond training to ensure inter-rater reliability, there does not appear to be a plan to train leaders on the use of information from the sources for improvements that would increase student performance and decrease achievement gaps.

d) The professional development plan would be an effective way to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teacher and principals. These opportunities (instructional coaches, peer coaching, and study groups) would increase the number of effective teachers and thus the number of student who receive instruction from them. The addition of the new behavioral specialists would support the goals of the grant and would provide some valuable information and support for students. However, the role that they would play would not be one of providing instruction in subject areas or specialty areas.

Score 12/20 base on a strong plan for professional development and a plan to develop and evaluation system for educators and principals but lack of a plan for training educators to use tools and data.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) There is no indication of a plan to organize the LEA central office to provide support and services to all participating schools. The plan indicated in the proposal is one that addresses needs assessment and not support for project implementation.

b) There is a clear and reasonable system in place for providing school leadership teams at participating schools with flexibility ad autonomy over certain funds (both grant and non-grant). For example, the schools have flexibility to select staff and determine the use of non-salary stipend funds. However, there is no indication of flexibility as it relates to other aspects including schedules, calendars,staffing models and roles and responsibilities.

c) The plan presented offers no indication that students will be given the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. The programs mentioned (Freshman Academy, extended school year) are not described in such a way as to indicate how credit will be awarded nor how students will demonstrate that they have accomplished the goals.

d) Response to Intervention does not assure that students are given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times in multiple ways. The plan does not indicate how students in the individualized educational settings will have opportunities to demonstrate mastery based on their needs and goals. Further, there is no indication that classroom practices will address when students are assessed nor how.

e) There is a viable system in place for assessing data to determine the needs of all students including those with disabilities and English learners. However, the plan does not go beyond this assessment. While the applicant states that the data can be used to differentiate instructions, there is no mention of learning resources or instructional practices that are adaptable or accessible.

Score 4/15 based on the presence of a system in place for assessing data to determine needs for all students and providing school leadership with some autonomy. Credit was deducted based on the lack of indication of a plan to offer students opportunity to demonstrate mastery in multiple ways or at multiple times.

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

10

2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a) Providing parent meeting and workshops does not ensure that all stakeholders have access to content, tools and other learning resources. There is no mention of how these things will be made available to stakeholders. No plan for changes in the infrastructure are presented that would indicate that stakeholders have increased access.

b) The list of things that the district will do does not show any evidence of technical support. There is no mention of changes or existing components within the infrastructure that would ensure that all stakeholders have technical support. There is no mention of online, face-to-face or other types of support which might provide the needed technical support.

c) The Parent Portal in the already existing FOCUS program is a viable way to provide students with access to student's grades, assignments and attendance. There is, however, no indication that this data will be used in other electronic learning systems.

d) There is no indication that the Edusoft system described by the applicant provides for the use of interoperable data systems. There is no mention of human resources data or budget data in the proposal described.

Score 2/10 based on the existence of parent portal and edusoft systems but lack of other plans to provide technical support, or using information systems that provide valuable information to parents.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that the evaluation will be appropriate, both quantitative and qualitative and will measure success in making progress toward achieving proposed outcomes. However, there are no specifics provided that would indicate that there is a plan in place for evaluating the process that is used to achieve these goals. All evaluations provided assess the products. The table included (E4) does provide a comprehensive plan for evaluating the project that addresses the four priority areas. Thus there is a plan in place to assess progress from the review of summative data. However, all of the data suggested in this plan is reflective of student progress (through formative assessment). Without formative assessments in addition to the summative assessments there is no way to know which of the proposed reforms are impacting the outcomes and which would be benefited through adjustments. Further, there is no plan for dissemination of the data and thus there is no provision in the plan to have the data available to facilitate and ensure ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant.

Score 6/15 based on the fact that the plan is summative in nature and thus not optimal for that addressing continuous improvement. All evaluation strategies included address only student progress and products and do not address the process for achieving the stated goals.

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

5

0

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

While there is a plan for evaluation in place, the strategies indicated do not reflect a plan to communicate nor to engage the stakeholders. The preparation of required reports does not address how findings and plans will be communicated with stakeholders (especially external stakeholders). There is no indication that parents, students or community members will be informed of any adjustments or revisions that occur based on ongoing assessments.

Score 0/5 based on the lack of any indication of strategies to communicate assessment findings and associated adjustments to stakeholders.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has selected the appropriate number of performance measures. In no case is a rationale for choosing a specific measure presented. Nor does the narrative provide information as to the way the measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative information nor how the applicant will review and improve the measures. (The description of calculations and data sources do not address how the data will be used.) The targets set for the chosen measures are recorded for the overall population and by subgroup. In the area of highly effective teacher/principal (all a) it appears that the projected rates are not at all ambitious. Based on the data presented, the projected number of students with effective teachers/principals would only be 5.0% by the end of the grant term. There is no relational nor explanation of this presented and thus it is not possible to determine if this number (as presented) is accurate or reflects the true goals for the project. In other cases (all b - effective teacher and effective principal) there is a projected decrease in the %. There is no explanation as to why this might be the projection nor how this represents achievement of the stated goals of the project. The performance measure proposed by the applicant that can be directly tied to improving student outcomes (all - c) reflects only the overall population and does not address the targets for subgroups. Further, this measure only addressed math and language arts and does not address the actual goals of the proposal (STEM, college- and career-readiness etc.). Targets for grades Pre-K-3 are reasonable as far as the the measures chosen. Increasing student motivation is a valid measure at all levels. There is no description of the criteria that will be used when developing the instrument mentioned in the test. The use of self-assessment checklists, surveys and interviews is acceptable for students in grades 4-12. However, this type of data collection may not be effective with children at the primary or pre-school levels. There is no indication of how these will be administered to assure that the data generated is valid. The proposed measure to reflect college- and career-readiness for students grade 4-8 (a) do not address all of the standards that are considered to determine this. A projection based on one measure that relies on Lexile score along is not sufficient to determine the to provide necessary data to drive adjustments. Further, the projected rates (as low as 15% by the end of the grant) are not ambitious considering the overall goals and expected outcomes of the grant. It is unclear what performance measure is addressed in the chart for grades 9-12 c. No description is available. Other measures for grades 9-12 are sufficiently ambitious and attainable. However, the lack of rationale and a clear plan for how the measures listed will provide information and how these measures will be reviewed and findings will be reviewed and improved over the course of the grant and beyond.

Score 1/5 based on the presence of feasible measures but the lack of rationale and description of how the measures will provide information and improved over time.

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

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The plan presented does not address the effectiveness of the activities that would be implemented to bring about the intended outcomes. The plan presented here addresses student outcomes. In essence it evaluates product but does not take into account the process used to achieve the product. There is no plan in place for monitoring and measuring the quality of measures intended to facilitate the student progress. (For example, there is no provision for providing feedback on professional development, technology and staff in such a way that the information is available and usable for improvements to the project.) The plan does not provide any method of determining which, if any, of the activities caused the expected improvements in student performance.

Score 0/5 based on the fact that the plan presented does not measure the effectiveness of the funded activities.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The budget presented does not identify any other funds that will support the project. This does not seem realistic based on the fact that many of the schools that are part of the LEA have Title I and Title II funds (as mentioned in the narrative) and thus

would have some funds that would be support parts of the project.

There is not a clear description of the 10 projects (either in the teaching and learning plans nor as a budget narrative) to allow for determination if the requests are reasonable or sufficient. Based on what is available, the requests for funding for personnel do seem adequate and reasonable. However, it is not possible to draw conclusions about materials, equipment or other aspects.

Since no other sources of funding are provided, the applicant does give a comprehensive description of how funds associated with the RTT-D grant will be used to support the implementation of the proposal. There is no indication that any revenues from the sources will be realized. There are no indications as far as which funds will be used for ongoing operational costs.

The applicant lacks a complete and comprehensive narrative that provides in-depth information about the funds and their use or the rational for requesting funds.

Score 5/10 based on the presence of a thorough budget but the lack of a sufficient narrative to support the requested funds.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It is apparent that the applicant has a desire to sustain the projects proposed beyond the term of the grant. The formation of a fundraising subcommittee could be a valuable asset in assuring sustainability. However, the applicant does not present any detail as to the exact function of the subcommittee. The applicant does not indicate what is meant by finding "ways to maintain and continue the program. It is unclear if this subcommittee will suggest activities that could generate additional funds or will actually be charged with obtaining funds.

The intent to use the process based on the work of Dennis, Young and Gardner could be effective. However there is no indication of how the steps will be implemented in relation to the project described here.

While the applicant sates that the Board of Education will strive to maintain the additional teaching staff, there is no concrete evidence that this is the case. No other indication of support from State and local government leaders and financial support is presented.

Score 2/10 based on the presence of a plan for sustainability that does not provide sufficient detail to determine if the plan is feasible or will produce the desired outcomes. Further, there is no evidence of support for sustainability form stakeholders outside of school personnel.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- 1) There is no indication that partnerships have been formed. The plan to form an Advisory Council that includes representatives from the community does not represent solid nor formal partnerships.
- 2) The applicant has identified 10 population-level desired results for students align with the proposal. These results go beyond educational results and include social and emotional outcomes. Most of the desired results align with the proposal. However, the desired result for full-day kindergarten does not seem to align. In addition, there is no indication of how partnerships would contribute to achieving these results.
- 3) Since no partnerships are indicated, there is no description of how the partnership could track selected indicators or use data to target its resources. Further, if no partnership is formed, no strategy to scale the model beyond the participating schools could be formed.
- 4 and 5) Again, the lack of a partnership precludes a description of how education and other services would be integrated nor how the capacity for staff would be built.
- 6) Since no partnership is in place there is no grounds on which to base performance measures.

Score 0/10 based on the lack of partnerships and no clear indication of how such partnerships would be formed nor how they

would contribute to achieving the desired results.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has addressed all of the core educational assurance areas. However, the applicant fails to give a comprehensive picture of what these methods for addressing the areas would entail. The proposed 10 programs, as presented do seem to offer suggestions as to how the projected outcomes would be attained. Further, these programs would provide career exposure and guidance for students. However, there is not sufficient detail to assure that the programs would bring about the desired outcomes. Further, there is no clear description of how these programs would create individualized learning environments. There is no clear picture given as to how students would select or be selected for different programs nor how they would be tailored to individual needs and goals of students. The plan for professional development is solid and plans for peer teaching and coaching along with small groups would be beneficial in helping teachers improve teaching and thus the learning opportunities for students. There is little provision to include parents in the educational success of their children. The proposed program does improve reporting to students and parents as far as progress, but does not provide opportunities for input from these stakeholders. The plan to provide tools to support students and educators does not seem to be comprehensive. The only concrete tool described is laptop computers for teachers. This does not improve student access nor assure an increase or improvement in personalized learning environments.

The applicant has not met the absolute priority because there is a lack of detail in the plan presented to assure that all of the core educational assurance areas are met.

Total	210	92
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0496NJ-3 for East Orange School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	4

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This was not a strong area. East Orange School District (EOSD) articulated a vision for the success of its students that encompasses four distinct programs to create personalized learning environments. It provides clarity as to the nature of these programs and how they will result in the in the vision; increased academic, and socio-emotional and overall well being of its students. This is a strength of the vision area. It also describes the nature and intent of the four programs but provides no explanation as to why of these four core programs only one (Extended Counseling Program) targets Pre-K through six students. EOSD also asserts that its approach is closely aligned with the four core assurance educational assurance areas. But it did not build on work done in the four core assurance areas because many of the New Jersey and EOSD reform levers were not aligned with the core assurance areas. For example, EOSD asserts that it will provide career academies in

grades 6-12 to strengthen the work done in adopting standards and assessments. But the addition of academies is not a valid way to enhance standards and assessment in the district. It also aligns provision of emotional support services across the district to remove barriers for student growth as the key strategy for turning around lowest performing schools. While emotional support services have merit they are not the key to turning around lowest performing schools. This area was scored in the low middle range.

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

10

3

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

EOSD provided very little narrative for this area. It simply indicated that selection of participating schools was based on RTTD requirements. No description of the process was provided. A list of participating students was presented in a subsequent page that provided the numbers of participating students by types as requested in the notice but did not provide information about participating educators. Nothing was provided to provide evidence that EOSD has valid strategies for implementing its proposal. Thus, it was scored in the low middle of quality.

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

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Because EOSD proposes that all schools be included in the project it was not necessary for it to describe how the program would be scaled up. It did provide useful information as to how the project will build on the strengths of the state model while addressing the unique needs of its students and community. It also described linkages between project initiatives such as marrying the district student data base to the state SMART system, and using the Danielson teacher evaluation framework in one school in 2103, and the program thrusts of the Career Technical Education Career Academies. Included in this area, further strengthening the area, was EOSD's Theory of Action: Integrating elementary, secondary, and postsecondary curricula and extra curricular educational activities into a comprehensive approach that encourages more students to succeed in school, complete high school and earn two-year and/or four-year degrees that will prepare them to enter the workforce. The theory of action also includes the belief that this will be achieved by rigorous professional development and its commitment to sustain the project beyond the grant period. Because of the lack of necessity to describe the scale up effort and the strong coverage of program thrust and its theory of action it was scored at the very high level.

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

10

9

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Goals for improved student achievement were strong. EOSD identified ambitious but achievable goals for each of the areas identified in the notice. For example, the table for summative assessment goals for all grades (3-12) included a breakdown by race, economic sub-groups, and special education. From a baseline around the 50th percentile, 4 to 5 percentile point gains were targeted overall in grade 3, and 2 to 3 percentile gains targeted for most other grades. Tables for achievement gaps, raising graduation rates, and college enrollment were similarly clear and showed patterns that reflected ambitious but doable goals. For example high school graduation rates were targeted for about a three per cent increase annually as were college enrollment rates.. EOSD earned a very high level of quality in this area.

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	7

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

EOSD does not have a strong track record of student success. EOSD provided tables to illustrate their record of success in advancing student learning and achievement but in some cases provided no narrative to clarify the results. There is evidence of success achievement; 17 percent more students reached proficiency in high school language arts and 28 percent in mathematics. But scores have not increased significantly in grades 6-8 across the district. In fact, they declined by 8 and 3 percentile points in language arts in grades 7 and 8 and rose modestly in grades 6 and 7 (mathematics; (1.3) and 8 (4.7). Their high school graduation rates trail the state average by 14 percentage points and have steadily declined at a rate similar

to that at the state level. Drop out rates are also relatively stable although they did experience a spike (7 percent) in 2010-1011. There is evidence that they have achieved modest success in Tyson Middle School, one of their two schools designated as a lowest performing school. But Tyson had two grades that experienced decline in test scores. EOSD has taken steps to make student performance data available to stakeholders. These include warning notices, use of an assessment management tool, online data base, and online testing. In general, EOSD, while holding its own, has not demonstrated a strong track record of success in raising student achievement. EOSD has made strides in making performance data available to stakeholders. For example, plain - paper scanning at the school level and instant on- line results in literacy and mathematics are utilized by coaches. The FOCUS data base provides a portal that is now used by education staff and it will soon be used by parents. While these elements strengthen the area, because the student achievement data were not strong, this area was scored in the middle level of quality.

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

5

0

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There was no description of the extent to which EOSD operates at a high level of transparency in processes, practices, and investments. EOSD provided a table that provided school level expenditures for each school across the groups requested in the notice. But there is no evidence that it makes available the four levels of school-level expenditures identified in the notice from State and local funds. Because this area focused on transparency and the notice explicitly called for a description of how those funds were made available no points were awarded in this area.

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

10

9

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This was a strong area. EOSD's approach to demonstrating evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy by the State to implement personalized learning environments was to identify and describe legislation and state initiatives that support EOSD in implementing the proposal lawfully and by providing infrastructure and technical support. A list and description of the legislation elements that form an umbrella under which the EOSD proposal and its initiatives are addressed was provided as evidence that EOSD has sufficient autonomy for implementation. These legislative elements were used to support the extent to which the districts have autonomy to implement reform in the four core assurance areas. This was an excellent connection to make and strengthened the quality of their proposal in the area. It was further strengthened by the legislative elements identified and described. These included PARCC and a model curriculum that focuses on the standards and assessments,, In addition, NJ SMART, supports the data system effort, an Effective Teacher and Principal program is in its third year, and a description of seven new field-based Regional Achievement Centers are charged with driving academic achievement, particularly in the lowest achieving schools. The district earned a high level of quality in this area.

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

10

4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Stakeholder engagement and support was not a strong area. While EOSD provided opportunities for staff and others to comment on the application and proposes an advisory council consisting of all involved stakeholders, as well as a high school charged with seeking collaborative partnerships, there was little evidence of real involvement in development of the proposal. Nor was any evidence provided that indicated that their input or feedback played any role in revising the application. The involvement and support of the teachers' association was also not strong. The applicant describes ways in which the local teacher union president was involved in proposal development and how she sought information from her union membership to buttress teacher input. But it also provides a statement that the union and EOSD have agreed on: "Nothing contained herein shall violate the terms and conditions of the collective bargaining agreement between the East Orange Education Association and the East Orange Board of Education." This does not connote support of any kind. In the absence of a letter of support from the teachers association there is nothing to signify that this important aspect exists, thereby weakening the area. Some letters of support from potential stakeholders were included in the appendix. Not included were letters from key stakeholders such as parent groups, non profits, and community groups. When viewed collectively the area earned a rating in the low middle level for quality.

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

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

This area had both strengths and weaknesses. Its strengths are its framework that includes needs and gaps, activities, outcomes, timelines, and responsible persons including partners for each core educational assurances. Its weaknesses significantly diminish value in this area. For example, the elements in the framework (needs and gaps, activities,

outcomes, timelines, and responsible persons) are not aligned. In addition, activities under standards and assessment included extended day school and kindergarten readiness. Extended day school via twilight and Saturday programs were identified as activities aligned to standards and assessments. Similar examples of misalignment exist in outcomes identified; community consensus around a set of educational goals that will ensure that students acquire skills required in the 21st century world of work was aligned with recruiting developing and retaining effective teachers. The inclusion of key goals and deliverables would have strengthened this area and the misalignment of activities to match needs and gaps significantly diminished quality. This area earned a low middle level of quality.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>EOSD proposed that personalized learning experiences be achieved through alignment with 10 projects. Each of these projects has key goals, activities, deliverables, responsible parties, and timelines. It also proposes a 6th grade STEM Academy for 2013 and describes in detail its program elements. Neither of these approaches specifically address the sub-criteria specified in the notice. Thus the information needed to determine the efficacy of the plan was absent., thereby reducing the quality of the plan. There are a number of projects that will enable students to understand what they are learning, pursue learning goals linked to learning, be involved in deep learning in their areas of expertise, have access to deep cultures and master critical academic content. Projects such as Allied Health, East Orange STEM Academy High School, Graphic Arts Design, Sound Engineering Academy, Engineering Academy, and Culinary Arts Academy appear to be designed to address the aforementioned sub-criteria as well as the criterion aimed at personalized sequencing of content and skill development. While there are no details about how many students will be served by these projects it seems as though most students would participate. Thus, the projects strengthen this area; more information may have strengthened it even more. High quality instructional approaches and environments and high quality content can be addressed through Project Curriculum and Project East Orange and STEM Academy High School. As with the other sub-criteria the lack of specific information make it difficult to determine the extent to which these Projects will reach all students. No specific information was provided to address how the project will ensure ongoing and regular feedback to students to determine mastery and prescribe personal learning recommendations. But throughout the proposal there are a number of sections that describe EOSD approaches to do this. For example in B(1)(c) the steps to make important student performance data available to all stakeholders was described. A clear summary of these would have further strengthened the proposal. EOSD provided a plan that appears to have potential for empowering all learners. The mix of promising projects with strengths and the weaknesses inherent in the lack of specific information related to project sub-criteria resulted in a rating of middle level quality.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>EOSD proposes to improve the effectiveness of all educators through achievement of six goals fundamentally critical in improving instruction and increasing teacher and administrator capacity to support the personalized learning environments and ensure that students meet college- and career-ready standards. For example, the first goal is "establishing a universal vision of effective teaching practice that yields accurate and differentiated practice based on common language and clear expectations." These goals add strength in the area. It also has adopted the Charlotte Danielson Evaluation Model which contains the essential elements of a sound system. EOSD asserts that it will be participating in the PARCC assessment program whose pathways support effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies to meet students academic needs, adopt content and instruction, measure student progress, and improve teacher and principal practice by using feedback. While this strengthens the proposal the lack of further explanation about PARCC and/or additional information about the number of participants and how it will be implemented limits its contribution to area strength. EOSD provides some explanation about how it will provide its educators access to use tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress. For example, the district will move from thumb drives to a centralized data system. Technology labs will be upgraded and a variety of other upgrades and additions will strengthen the infrastructure that makes technology work in a personalized learning environment. Each of these and other upgrades are positive enhancements and strengthen the project in this area. But no plan has been articulated that delineates how this will happen. For example, in addition to a lack of goals, activities, timelines and responsible parties there is no information how training policies, tools, data, and resources will include information from the teachers evaluation system and how the training, systems, and practices, to continuously improve school progress and close achievement gaps. Nor is there a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals including hard-to staff schools, subjects and specialty areas. In sum, while EOSD has articulated a number of sound ideas to promote teaching and leading it has not</p>		

demonstrated that it has organized these ideas into a coherent and comprehensive approach that will ensure that it has the effective teachers and leaders needed to ensure its effectiveness in accelerating student achievement. It earned the middle level of quality in this area.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>EOSD has provided evidence that it has a number of sound practices but lacks sufficient structure or rules to ensure a deep level of implementation in the district. For example, it employs a School Improvement Team consisting of principals, curriculum and testing supervisor, mathematics and language arts supervisors, director of special education, director of support services, and the superintendent of schools. They meet to discuss and delineate a process to involve school based staff in a needs assessment process. The Office of Staff development provides support by ensuring that staff development is aligned with the school's instructional program. While these activities strengthen the effort they are not enough to provide the level of support needed for the proposed project. EOSD asserts that it will provide school leadership teams by assigning district supervisors to assist school administrators with clinical supervision practices and monitoring of instruction. While this will be helpful to the principal more is needed to ensure that the team has sufficient autonomy and whatever else is needed to manage the complexity and challenge of school reform. The district clarified its support for providing students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery but did not identify the specific ways in which that would be carried out. This weakens the approach. It did identify implementation of a 3-Tier model (RtL) that provides students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery multiple times. EOSD's approach for provision of learning resources and to make instructional practices adaptable and fully accessible revolves around implementation of a monitoring system to ensure alignment and differentiation. It includes monthly meeting between district and school administration to discuss next steps in student achievement results in data evaluation and modification to meet the needs of students with disabilities and English Language learners. That design makes sense but implementation and execution are unclear. An explanation of who conducts those meetings, the processes used, and how this process becomes systematically productive would have greatly strengthened this section. It scored in the middle level of quality.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths and weaknesses were revealed in the LEA and school infrastructure proposal. EOSD addressed the importance of LEA and school infrastructure and the need to engage parents and support their students and the district in the reform project. But it provided very little explanation as to how students and other stakeholders would have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources. The district proposes that the web-based FOCUS Student Information System will be used as a primary <u>role</u> to provide technical support to all stakeholders. While FOCUS appears to be an excellent data system and has great promise for providing important data no strategies for providing technical support were provided. Given the complexity of what is being proposed and the relative newness of resources, tools, projects, and the system more strategies would have strengthened this area. EOSD has a sound approach for using technology. It includes a comprehensive data warehouse, FOCUS, and a easy-to use Parent Portal that allows parents of students at all grade levels to access their student's data, student assignments, and attendance. This is a strong element. Adaptable and accessible learning resources and instructional practices will be provided through Edusoft, a data management system used by many districts. It enables schools and teachers to monitor student proficiency improvement and the district to retrieve students' data records for future access. No information was provided to clarify if the software program is also interoperable; able to provide human resource and budget information. EOSD has a number of LEA elements and school structures that will promote progress in student achievement. These include FOCUS, Parent Portal, and Edusoft and are very viable elements. But it is not clear that it has put together strategies and a plan to make sure that this infrastructure is used in a way that maximizes benefits to students. This part of the proposal earned middle level of quality.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

EOSD's proposal for ensuring that a continuous improvement process strengthen its project was not strong. It did not include a description of how the district would monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments as required in the notice. It simply stated that "evaluation would be appropriate to the project and use quantitative and qualitative methods and examine the success of the project in making progress toward making progress toward achievement." While EOSD provided a general picture of how the evaluation will function it did not provide strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. This weakened the proposal in this section. EOSD provided performance measures overall and by subgroups that were ambitious and achievable. For example, targets for achievement are typically in the 3 to 5 percentile range, and increases of high need schools targets are typically about 5 per cent. The assessment system is rigorous, timely and formative. ESOD adequately described how the assessment system is tailored to its proposed plan and theory of change and provided activities and a process for assessing and improving the performance measures. For example, it provided activities, information to be collected, evaluation measurement timelines, and key person responsible. This is an important facet and a strong narrative with tables was provided by EOSD. How it will provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information was not addressed. This area of the proposal had one strong section (performance assessments) and two weak areas (continuous improvement and communication and engagement). It was scored in the middle level of quality.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	0
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 No strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders were provided in this section. EOSD provided a very clear summary of how the evaluation process will be carried out. It discussed what will be evaluated, how it will be evaluated, stored, maintained, and monitored. It also provided information about when these activities would occur. But no strategies for communication were mentioned in this section. The section was scored in the low level of quality.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The district asserted that "the performance goals are clearly stated with the objectives." It also asserted the progress would be determined by comparing actual objectives with stated objectives. But it did not provide 12 to 14 measures to target performance and identify data to be collected or explain how whatever is used for measurement will be improved over time as required in the notice. No rationale for selecting measures, or in its case, objectives was provided. No discussion about how the data will be used to improve performance measures was provided. Given these shortcomings the area was rated in the very low range.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 Evaluating the effectiveness of investments was omitted from the proposal. No evidence of such an evaluation or narrative was in the proposal. No points were awarded.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 EOSD provided a detailed budget and narrative. The budget appeared to be reasonable and sufficient to support the

development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. Included in the budget were project level budgets. Because there were no external funds none were included. Nor were matching funds and dollar amounts for those fund. There was no narrative for this section and it did not differentiate funds that will be used for one-time investments from those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period. There were no strategies to ensure long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments. In sum, the budget fund allocations and detail were sound; it clearly showed how monies would be spent for each project and area. The lack of a narrative and categories to provide budget information in areas required in the notice detracted from its quality. It earned a high middle level rating.

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

10

7

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

EOSD provided evidence of state and local government support and addressed program sustainability in a very direct, strategic manner. While it asserts that it will do things such as involve stakeholders on the advisory committee early so they are motivated to maintain the program through fundraising and other activities they go beyond that. They will employ a 7-point process based on a proven model for sustaining child welfare programs. It includes, for example, such points as document the effectiveness of the innovation to prospective funders, identify potential funders, select priorities for future funding and redirect funding. The last point is institutionalization of the program. It also asserts that the Board of Education will strive to maintain the additional staff members through attrition. More detail fleshing out the 7-point plan would have strengthened this area as would some evidence of state and government support as requested in the notice. It earned a rating of high middle level of quality.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

EOSD effectively described the value of proposed partnerships with various agencies in the East Orange area. It also identified population targets and described how the partnerships would add value. These potential partnerships were well chosen and have great potential for enhancing the mission and goals of the project. However, the notice requirement stipulated that partnerships within the competitive priority area must "have been formed." Thus, a low middle level of points were awarded Competitive Preference Priority.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

EOSD has a strong approach to district wide reform and a sound theory of change. Its goals for student achievement were strong; they were ambitious, achievable and comprehensive. The state context for implementation is strong; it provides strong support to Abbott schools and EOSD is one of those schools. EOSD has important infrastructure components in place that have strong potential for utilizing data to improve student achievement. EOSD earned middle to high middle level quality in most of the notice criteria. EOSD's proposal has sufficient strength to accelerate student achievement progress and prepare all students to become college-and career-ready. The budget is sound. The district has met the requirements of the absolute priority.

Total	210	118
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0496NJ-4 for East Orange 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 East Orange School District (EOSD) provided background information and a descriptive vision of the approach that will align with the State's RTTT reform plans to build the goals based on the four core educational assurance areas.

The EOSD is a comprehensive community public school district serving PreK – 12th grade students. The NJ Department of Education has designated EOSD as an "Abbott District" in the district factor group (DFG) categorizing lowest socioeconomic status and "A" representing the lowest group.

The EOSD RTTT-D vision reform will align with the NJ Department of Education's RTTT reforms that address the four RTTT Core Educational Assurance Areas.

The EOSD RTTT-D reform goals and the alignment to the NJDOE RTTT reform goals:

1. EOSD -- Career Academies (grades 6th-12th) – decrease dropout rate, increase student engagement and motivation; partnership with higher educational institutions to provide GED and dual enrollment college courses.

This will align and support the NJDOE – enhanced standards and high-quality assessments through model curriculum and formative assessment platform aligned with CCSS.

2. EOSD – Upgraded technology and infrastructure aligned with state stands for online testing and equity with equipment.

This will align and support the NJDOE – implementing an instructional improvement system and instructional support tools – comprehensive instructional improvement system (IIS) and NJ SMART.

3. Educator professional development – student support services, career academics, common core stands, differentiating instruction, and instructional practices.

This will align and support the NJDOE – implementing a consistent, transparent evaluation system for school leaders and teachers – Excellent Educators for New Jersey (EE4NJ) evaluation program.

4. Socio-emotional support services to identify barriers for student growth and provide programs to ensure that students are successful.

This will align and support the NJDOE – improving standards, assessments, and instruction materials to provide extra attention to most troubled schools and improve academic achievement for all students.

The EOSD RTTT-D vision reform will encompass four programs for Pre-K to 12th students to provide the personalized learning experiences.

The EOSD proposed plans include:

- Achieve Program (Twilight Program) – dropout prevention, truancy, behavior management for MS and HS students;
- Career technical education – CTE, Career Academies Pathways, pre-academy course for MS and HS students;
- Extended Counseling Program – socio-emotional support services during an extended day counseling programing aimed to decrease incidents of violence, vandalism, harassment, intimidation, bullying as well as career and college placement assistance for students and parents;
- STEM Academy Summer Institute – on and off campus providing expanded opportunities for incoming 6th-12th grade students in science, technology, engineering, math, and language arts.

Overall, the East Orange School District (EOSD) has provided evidence of a clear and credible approach to reform by aligning and supporting the goals and programs with those of the NJ Department of Education RTTT reform goals which address the four RTTT Core Educational Assurance Areas.

EOSD provided explanations for programs that address three of the four RTTT Core Educational Assurance Areas:

#1) Adopting standards and assessments that prepared students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy.

The presented EOSD programs that address #1 RTTT Core Educational Assurance Areas are: Achieve Program/Twilight Program; Career technical education; STEM Academy Summer Institute.

#3) Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most.

The presented EOSD programs that address #3 RTTT Core Educational Assurance Areas are: EE4NJ evaluation system for teachers and school leaders currently being implemented SY 2012-13 in SIG school and training for teachers and administrators.

#4) Turning around the Nation's lowest-achieving schools.

The presented EOSD program that address #4 RTTT Core Educational Assurance Area is: Extended Counseling Program.

However, the EOSD proposed plans are unclear as to which presented programs will address or implement reforms aligned with the either NJDOE RTTT reforms or the RTTT Core Educational Assurance Area of: #2) Building data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction.

It is inconclusive from the evidence presented of the plans and action that EOSD will take to address when "... currenting developing the infrastructure to meet the conditions of PARCC..." and beyond being tied to the NJ SMART system and providing parent training.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the low of the high range.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a statement that the selection of the participating schools, students, and teachers was conducted according to the RTTT-D eligibility requirements and "...at a minimum... that 40 percent of participating students in participating schools will be from low-income families..."

Overall, EOSD provided a statement of selection of the participating schools, students, and teachers based on the RTTT-D eligibility requirements. EOSD provided a chart of demographics displaying the; identified participating schools, grades included, actual numbers and percentages for the participating educators, students, high-need students, and low-income students.

However, the EOSD statement of selection process and the School Demographic chart is ambiguous without providing the supporting explanation to demonstrate the evidence for the selection of participants in implementing the proposed reform.

It is inconclusive from the evidence provided in the proposal of the EOSD which process was used or will be used to select schools to participate.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the high the middle range.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided an explanation of the proposed plan to help build capacity to effectively implement the State RTTT reform plan. EOSD proposes to build on the strengths of the state model while addressing the unique needs of the East Orange students and community.

EOSD is currently in the process of:

- Developing the infrastructure to meet the PARCC- Partnership of Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers by

- ensuring the EOSD student database system is tied to the NJ SMART system;
- providing parents information about student progress as well as access training to obtain current student information including assessments, gradebook, credits, on track for graduation;
- upgrading technology for the move to on-line testing;
- and using funds awarded through the State's RTTT grant, EOSD selected to use the Danielson teacher evaluation framework, conducting training for administrators and teachers on the new teacher evaluation, implementing it in the SIG school, and will identify a principal evaluation framework.

Overall, the EOSD provided a description of building capacity to implement the State's RTTT reform by ensuring the district student data system is tied to the State SMART system; provide parents with necessary training and information of student progress; upgrade technology; and train and implement teacher evaluation framework.

However, it is inconclusive from the evidence provided in the proposed EOSD plan as to how it will be scaled up to translate into a meaningful reform in order to support district-wide change beyond the identified participating schools.

Unclear, if the proposed plan is a “scale – down” from the NJDOE RTTT plan to EOSD or if EOSD plan is to be implemented with MS and HS grade levels then scaled-up to all grade levels or if EOSD plan is to be implemented to all grade levels.

The EOSD proposed plan is a quality plan yet with the unclear of factors to determine if the proposed plan will be scaled up and translate into a meaningful reform to support a district-wide change, it is inconclusive to determine that the EOSD proposal is a high-quality plan.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the high of the middle range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided explanations and detailed charts displaying data and statistics of the EOSD student outcomes in the areas of performance on summative assessments, decreasing the achievement gaps, graduation rates, and college enrollment.

The EOSD proposal provides student data outcomes using a 2010-11 and 2011-12 as baselines and projecting 4 years of growth goals through 2015-16 and one year of growth goals beyond the RTTT-D grant for 2016-17.

The targeted areas utilize the NJASK – NJ Assessment of Skills and Knowledge for grades 3rd-8th in English Language Arts and Mathematics and the HSPA – NJ High School Proficiency Assessment for grade 11 in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Each targeted area and grade level provided data and growth goals for the overall student population, general education, special education, ELL, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and economically disadvantaged.

High School graduation rates of East Orange Campus High School and Tyson M/H School provided data and growth goals for the overall student population, gender, Black, Hispanic, Special Ed, not Special Ed, LEP, not LEP.

College Enrollment of East Orange Campus High School and Tyson M/H School describes the number graduates enrolled in a higher-educational institute during the 16 months after graduation and the growth goals for the overall student population, gender, Black, Hispanic, Special Ed, not Special Ed, LEP, not LEP.

Overall, the EOSD proposal provides statistics and supporting student data, projects 5 years of goals for increasing performance on summative assessments, decreasing achievement gaps, increasing graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment. The plan demonstrates ambitious goals that most likely are achievable.

The EOSD proposal states that the administrative team and staff “have implemented a variety of strategies in increase the graduation rate and decrease the dropout rate.” A chart comparing 2010-11 graduation rates and dropout rates to 2011-12 demonstrated a positive gain for Tyson High School and a negative gain in graduation rates/positive gain in dropout rates for Campus High School.

However, It is unclear of the “...variety of strategies...” that were implemented to increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates in three of the four areas for the students of two high schools.

It is unclear of the proposal's justification for the rather high goals projected gains for subgroups such as special education, ELL, and economically disadvantaged with gains projected to increase over 50 percentile in 4 years.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the high of the middle 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	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided an explanation and charts to demonstrate records of student success. The charts clearly outlined student gains and some loss over the past four academic years.

EOSD provided the following evidence to demonstrate student gains:

- Charts of SY 2007-08 to 2010-11 of the NJASK – NJ Assessment of Skills and Knowledge results for grades 6th-8th in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics. Each displays the results in the categories of partial, proficient, and advanced as well as a summary of the 4-year loss and/or gains.
- Charts of SY 2007-08 to 2010-11 of the HSPA – NJ High School Proficiency Assessment for grade 11 in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics. Each displays the results in the categories of partial, proficient, and advanced as well as a summary of the 4-year loss and/or gains.
- Chart comparing the EOSD and State performance on high school graduation rates over SY 2008-09 to 2011-12.
- Chart comparing the EOSD and State performance on graduation by passing both HSPA rates over SY 2008-09 to 2011-12.
- Chart of college enrollment rates for pursuing 4-year, 2-year, other, and total college enrollment rates over SY 2007-08 to 2009-10.
- Chart comparing the EOSD and State performance on performance on school dropout rates for the categories of gender, black, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged.

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided an explanation of approaches and the implementation of strategies to improve student learning outcomes at the high school level.

Analytical reading and writing skills – increasing the use of data, grade-level team meetings, double periods of English for all 11th graders, Saturday tutoring program, interdisciplinary writing project in conjunction with the Social Studies Department.

Mathematics – implementing a second math class “math test preparation” for 11th grader in the instructional day; “lunch bites” tutorials; Saturday tutorials.

EOSD described the “drastic measures” taken to assist with the turning around of the low performing middle schools categorized as Priority schools – Tyson Middle/High and Healy Middle School and Focus schools – Campus High School and Costley Middle School.

Reorganization as a single grade school in which students loop with that grade level until graduate from 8th grade. Results of program will be completed at end of 2012-13.

East Orange STEM Academy – addressing issue of over 200 students leaving district after grade 8. Results, EOSD has decreased number of students leaving the district.

EOSD provided an explanation of how student performance data is made available to students, educators, and parents in order to monitor progress in obtaining and achieving goals.

Students – receive a syllabus or list of learning goals for each course; feedback from teacher; formative assessment results.

Parents – warning notices of falling behind in classwork, consistently late, absents; quarterly reports; plans for Parent Portal (Feb. 2013) to include warning notices, access to assignments, grades and other pertinent student information.

Teachers – assessment management tool; plans for 2013-14 begin online testing function; FOCUS database to upload assessment results and link to other key data points.

Overall, the EOSD has provided supporting data and evidence demonstrating records of success throughout the past four years to implement approaches and strategies in order to advance student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching; making progress toward the achievement of reforms in the low performing schools; making progress toward closing achievement gaps; and make available performance data to students, educators, and parents while providing tools and support.

The presented results of the EOSD “drastic measures” taken to assist with the turning around of the low performing middle schools categorized as Priority schools are:

- 1) Tyson MS/HS – 2nd math test preparation class for 11th graders and “lunch bits” over the past 4 years resulted in a -2% loss to a 32% gain to a -6% loss.
- 2) Campus HS – double periods of English for 11th graders and Saturday tutoring program over the past 4 years resulted in a 7% gain to a 8% gain to a 6% gain.

However, it is inconclusive from the EOSD the data and supporting documentation provided for Healy MS and Costley MS to determine the level of success made with this “Priority” and “Focus” schools due to the despairing gaps of data and without explanations provided to validate and/or indicate actions to address the issues.

- High school graduation rates vary – EOSD graduation rates range from 20% to 40% lower than state averages. Yet, the presented data indicates EOSD graduation rates over the past 4 years experienced a 14.5% gain to a -29.62% loss to a 5.92% gain.
- Dropout rates - EOSD dropout rates range from 4% to 11% higher than state averages and continue to experience a disparity in the amount of African American students who drop out of high school. Yet, the presented data indicates the overall EOSD dropout rates over the past 4 years experienced a -.8% loss to 7.5% gain to a -5.2% loss.

Statement indicating the establishment of East Orange STEM Academy has “...decreased number of students leaving the district...” yet a lack of evidence and data is presented to demonstrate and support the statement.

Since EOSD has presented a variety of programs and interventions that have been implemented at various MS and HS campus, it would be beneficial to have the data for graduation rates, dropout rates, graduation by passing both HSPAs, and college enrollment rates disaggregated for each MS and HS campus to support and provide evidence for the levels of success through the various strategies and interventions.

It is commendable and encouraging from the results presented by EOSD for the achievements made through the strategies and interventions of double math classes and Lunch Bites at Tyson MS/HS and double English classes and Saturday tutoring at Campus HS.

It is inconclusive if the EOSD plans are to upscale these proven interventions to all MS and HS campus in an effort to create additional support and student achievement.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the low of the high range.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a chart listing the schools (PreK – HS and alternative) in the district with the combined totals of personnel salaries for each of the categories – instructional and support staff, instructional staff only, and teachers only.

However, the EOSD proposal lacks evidence of the transparency supported by a description of the extent and methods to which the listed information is made available to stakeholders and the community in order to demonstrate the transparency of EOSD school-level expenditures from State and local funds.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the low of the middle range.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided an explanation of the education legislation in the State of New Jersey and support provided by the NJ Department of Education (NJDOE) in lawfully implementing the proposed plan.

Overall, the implementation of the EOSD proposal is supported by NJDOE through:

- Adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS);
- Adoption of PARCC- Partnership of Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers;
- “model curriculum” – to assist in the implementation of the Standards;
- NJ SMART – New Jersey Standards Measurement and Resource for Teaching a data warehouse, student level data reporting, unique statewide student identification system;
- Effective Teachers and Principals program – evaluation systems for teachers and principals;
- Regional Achievement Centers (RAC) – driving academic achievement particularly in low-performing schools;
- IIS – instructional improvement system

The support by the NJDOE demonstrates that EOSD has the sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the highest of the high range.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a description and a chart of the partners and their role and/or contribution demonstrating evidence of a stakeholder engagement, input, and support during the development of the proposal.

EOSD partnered with the East Orange Education Association (EOEA) in the development of the new teacher and principal evaluation system, planning meetings, and the professional development committee, and signature on the application; informed the principals and teachers; Board of Education approved the submission of the proposal; all stakeholders were given a 2 week opportunity to provide comments.

EOSD proposal received 9 letters of support from religious organizations, health and wellness center, therapeutic services, Job Corp, YMCA, and education consultants.

Overall, EOSD demonstrated engagement, provided inform, invited input, and received signed documentation of support from stakeholders.

However, it is unclear as to the level of participation, direct engagement, input provided and/or the consideration of the feedback by principals, teachers, parents, or students in the development of the proposal.

It is unclear from the description in the proposal about the “...formation of an Advisory Council...” whether it is in existence or will be formed in the future in order to demonstrate the evidence of the level of engagement in the development of the EOSD proposal.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the middle of the middle range.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) identified immediate needs and gaps as related to the four core education assurance areas and proposed a plan of action to implement the RTTT-D reform agenda aligned with the four core areas.

- 1) Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy – EOSD plan includes the use of Achieve/Twilight programs; Summer Institutes; increase parent involvement and provide monthly workshops; link community support to student achievement; increase post-secondary access.

- 2) Building data systems that measure student growth and success to inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction – EOSD plan includes updating technology labs in each school; laptops provided to all staff; update infrastructure and equipment for PARCC; implement FOCUS parent portal; continue use of eBackpack; coordinate with NJ SMART.
- 3) Recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals – EOSD plan includes hiring Career Specialist, behaviorists, program support staff; provide professional development through PLATO and Academic Innovations.
- 4) Turning around lowest-achieving schools – EOSD plan includes extended counseling; hiring additional counselors; create a Parent Technology Center; update technology labs in each school; laptops provided to all staff; update infrastructure and equipment for PARCC; student data available through FOCUS parent portal.

Overall, EOSD provide evidence of a high-quality plan analyzing the EOSD current status through a chart outlining a plan of action addressing the identified needs and gaps which described the four core education assurance areas, needs and gaps, activities, outcomes, timeline, responsible person(s) including partners. The proposed plan of strategies, programs, and actions implementation to support personalized learning environments should be achievable and demonstrate student achievement.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the highest of the high range.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a chart identifying 10 district projects through the Career Academies that are based on occupational training to prepare student for entry-level employment in various fields while also providing the necessary educational core for success in post-secondary education.

EOSD plans to utilize the projects to provide personalized learning experiences and intervention strategies to increase academic, socio-emotional, and overall well-being of the students. The chart described the project, goals, activities, outcomes, responsible parties, and timing.

The EOSD proposed projects proposed to provide students with students the knowledge and confidence needed to quickly gain employment while also gaining credit for a certification program/college are:

Allied Health – preparing students to succeed in college, workplace, and compete in the global economy and to decrease dropout rates and increase student engagement and motivation;

Curriculum – improve student achievement via reflective and collegial models of professional development in order to develop and retain effective teachers and principals in all schools;

East Orange STEM Academy High School – increase the grades from 9-12 to 6-12 so that targeted teachers will develop strategies vertically aligned to prepare students to succeed in college, workplace, and compete in the global economy;

Graphic Arts Design and Production – prepare students to succeed in college, workplace, and compete in the global economy to decrease dropout rates and increase student engagement and motivation;

High School Twilight Program (Achieve Program) – provide a positive non-threatening environment for non-traditional students in order to alleviate the effects of dissatisfaction and apathy by turning around lowest-achieving schools (Tyson MS/HS, Campus High, Healy, Costley);

Socio-emotional/Academic Support Services – provide socio-emotional support services to identify barriers for student growth and provide programs to ensure that students are successful by turning around lowest-achieving schools (Tyson MS/HS, Campus High, Healy, Costley);

Technology – participate in PARCC assessments SY 2014 and establish FOCUS parent portal to measure student growth and success and inform teachers, principals, parents in a timely manner how to improve instruction;

Sound Engineering Academy – prepare students to succeed in college, workplace, and compete in the global economy to decrease dropout rates and increase student engagement and motivation;

Engineering Academy – prepare students to succeed in college, workplace, and compete in the global economy to decrease dropout rates and increase student engagement and motivation;

Culinary Arts Academy – prepare students to succeed in college, workplace, and compete in the global economy to decrease dropout rates and increase student engagement and motivation.

Overall, the EOSD proposed a plan with ten district projects through the Career Academies based on occupational training to prepare student for entry-level employment in various fields while also providing the necessary educational core for success in post-secondary education.

EOSD plans to utilize the projects to provide personalized learning experiences and intervention strategies to increase academic, socio-emotional, and overall well-being of the students.

Although EOSD has presented an extensive plan with goals and key activities, it is inconclusive as to the evidence of alignment and coherency of the elements to ensure a high-quality plan of a cohesive support to all students for a personalized learning environment.

However, there are areas throughout the plans and key activities that are ambiguous.

The evidence is unclear and inconsistent as to the targeted population of students:

Whether the proposed plan is district-wide PreK – 12th as previously stated or 6th-12th as indicated in the identified planned projects;

Whether the proposed plan is for all learning levels of students – regular education, special education, high-need to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

It is unclear if the proposed if the content of the curriculum framework is high-quality and aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

It is unclear of the factors in the determination to pursue the identified majors of Allied Health, Culinary Arts, drafting/CAD, Graphic Arts Design and Production, sound Engineering, and Engineering for the Career Technical Education-Career Academies.

It is unclear if the determination was made by purely by the administration or the level of input from students and/or parents was considered in order to ensure the success of the project and achievement of goals to improve learning by personalizing learning experiences and intervention strategies to prepare students for graduation, going to and completing college, and being career ready.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the middle of the middle range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	11
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) the proposed professional development plan will reach the classroom via increasing the numbers of effective/highly effective educators through the components of:

- Structured, supportive professional development;
- Technology investments and infrastructure upgrades;
- Participation in NJ’s teacher administrator evaluation initiative Excellent Educators for New Jersey (EE4NJ).

The new evaluation initiative EE4NJ, developed and implemented by the NJDOE, will measure or assess teachers, principals, and administrators on the “highly effective” criteria by utilizing student growth data to determine the educator’s impact or quality.

The EOSD proposed RTTT-D plan will hire 3 behavioral specialists to meet the socio-emotional needs of students, create an

after school counseling program to assist students with career choice and counsel student at risk.

EOSD proposes to develop partners with local colleges and universities to provide job-embedded professional development opportunities for administrators and teachers.

The Professors in Residences will: Provide in-class coaching and lead team meetings to assist teachers with research-based instructional practices that improve student achievement;

Facilitate Administrator Academies to provide school leaders with learning that will enhance supervision and coaching responsibilities.

The EOSD proposed plan will provide laptops to be issued to teachers that can be used on site and/or off site providing equity and access across the district, while aiding educators in reaching the requirements to become highly qualified teachers.

Teachers can use the district issued laptops to view videos and class demonstrations online to increase instructional knowledge and the implementation of strategies.

The EOSD proposed plan will upgrade the district's network infrastructure with a centralized file storage system ensuring a equitable access to a safe and secure means to files, documents, projects; additional network switches allowing connection to the network at high speed; and new wireless access points providing an increase to wireless capacity.

The EOSD proposed plan will provide opportunities for quality time of professional development during the summer months and Saturdays.

Overall, the EOSD plan to provide professional development training, evaluation initiative EE4NJ, hiring behavioral specialists, and partnering with local colleges and universities to provide job-embedded professional development opportunities with support mechanisms for teachers and principals as they improve the learning and instruction through personalizing each student's learning environment supporting the journey to successfully graduate college- and career-ready has many strong and research-based components, techniques, and strategies.

However, the evidence presented in the EOSD proposed plan is unclear as to the level of success and feedback for the student growth standard that was introduced by NJDOE in SY 2011-12 and will be included in the new NJDOE Teacher and Principal Evaluation System in SY 2013-14.

It is unclear if the professional learning and growth opportunities and training offered by EOSD will be mandated for all teachers and principals or if it is simply an offering.

The evidence is unclear as to the intensity and frequency that educators, students, parents will measure the student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards as well as graduation requirements.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the middle of the middle range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	7

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a description of the EOSD practices, policies, and rules.

The EOSD believes that school improvement is a result of thoughtful evaluation and educated planning through which an evaluation of the educational programming is conducted and a written plan is developed providing direct for school improvement. EOSD provided an explanation of the evaluation the educated planning.

EOSD assessed data from various sources and developed a reliable needs assessment process including:

- DSIT-District School Improvement Team consisting of principals; supervisors of curriculum/instructional, testing, math,

language arts literacy, special education, support services and the school superintendent in order to delineate a process to involve school based staff in a needs assessment process;

- Office of Staff Development – on going job-embedded professional development aligned with school instructional program;
- Increase instructional time for math and language arts literacy from 40 to 80 minutes daily;
- Saturday Program – 4 week after school program for all students;
- Summer School Program – 4 week school program for all students.

The EOSD central administration will provide the school leadership teams with sufficient flexibility and autonomy.

Each principal is given the flexibility to select staff and determine the use of non-salary and stipend funds.

EOSD plan will provide students with the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery through establishing:

- Freshman Academy – transitioning students into high school;
- Advanced Placement and Honors – prepare students for the HSPA and SAT;
- Extended school year – provide students with additional time in math, science, language arts literacy; integrate enrichment and applied learning opportunities into school day; and provide educators with team instructional planning time for individualized student support.

The EOSD plan will increase mastery of major concepts through student work products and documentation of student assessment results by providing teachers with training in the RtI – 3-Tier Model of Response to Intervention.

EOSD plan ensures the curricula are aligned with the NJCCC – Common Core State Standards. Through an extensive process and levels of teams, students are evaluated to make necessary modifications in order to meet needs of students including those with disabilities and English learners.

Overall, East Orange School District demonstrates a plan with a wealth of supportive stakeholders from central administration to principals that provide support, services, and resources to schools. It is evident that EOSD has a plan and process to ensure the alignment of curricula with NJCCC while monitoring, pacing and implementation of the curricula to make modifications for students as needed.

However, it is inconclusive from the proposal of the sufficient flexibility and autonomy, opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery and earn credit based on that demonstration of mastery.

It is unclear as to how school level principals have the school level flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budget beyond funds for non-salary and stipends.

It is unclear from the evidence presented as to how the programs of Freshman Academy, Advanced Placement and Honors, extended school year will allow students the opportunity to earn credits based on demonstrated mastery rather than the amount of time spent on a topic.

It is unclear of the specific plans to allow students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the middle of the middle range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided the explanation that school administrators, teachers, outside organizations – governmental, art and cultural institutions, health and mental agencies, institutions of higher education and churches – will collaborate to create community-oriented schools.

EOSD proposal will provide content-specific training to parents to inform and provide opportunities of participation in order to foster a stronger collaboration of increasing student achievement.

EOSD will ensure the support of the following strategies to assist in student success:

- Communication of assessment goals and dates;
- Share results of assessment with parents;
- Use of various assessment data;
- Parental access to materials and resources;
- Collaboration of specialists and parents;
- Assist parents in setting up graphic organizers and data collection sheets.

EOSD utilizes the State systems NJSMART and SID for student data. The proposed plan will upgrade the district data system with the web-based FOCUS student information system to manage student and staff data for accountability, analysis and state submission. The FOCUS system provides a Parent Portal to view students’ grades, assignments, and attendance.

EOSD utilizes the data management system, Edusoft, to maintain local assessment data and provide assessment support for administrators, schools, and teachers.

Overall, East Orange School District has developed an infrastructure and the proposed plans to support school administrators, teachers and parents with the support and resources to assist in the increase of student achievement.

However, it is inconclusive from the EOSD proposal if the district and school infrastructure supports personalized learning on the following levels:

It is unclear as to the proposed plan ensuring the provision for all students both in and out of school with the access, training, and technical support to obtain information from the FOCUS and/or Edusoft systems in order to track their progress, create and maintain academic plans, and the necessary preparations to ensure reaching graduation and careers.

It is unclear as to the proposed plan ensuring the provision for all students and parents both on school site and off with the resources and tools to access student information from FOCUS and/or Edusoft systems.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the middle of the middle range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a brief explanation about the EOSD proposed evaluation design that is a continuous improvement process.

Overall, the EOSD brief explanation for the EOSD proposed evaluation design describes the proposed RTTT-D evaluation as “...it will be appropriate to the project and include both quantitative and qualitative evaluation measures.”

The EOSD described the proposed RTTT-D evaluation as “...it will examine in specific and measurable ways the success of the project in making progress toward achieving its process and outcome objectives.”

Upon reviewing Section E (4), the provided table does indicate instruments proposed to measure activities for each goal - performance on summative assessments, decreasing the achievement gaps, graduation rates, and college enrollment.

However, it is inconclusive from the provided description as to the EOSD strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process.

It is unclear how the EOSD proposed evaluation plan will provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward the project goals.

It is unclear how the EOSD proposed evaluation plan will have opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the RTTT-D grant.

It is unclear how the EOSD proposed evaluation plan will monitor and publicly share information on the quality of the investments funded with the RTTT-D grant.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the low of the low range.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided an explanation of how the EOSD proposed evaluation process will review the RTTT-D programs and services.

Overall the EOSD evaluation process will review the RTTT-D programs and services for the evaluations of procedures (process); evaluation of objectives (outcomes); participant evaluations and reports (internal and external).

However, it is inconclusive from the provided description as to the EOSD strategies and actions that will be taken for ongoing communication and/or engagement with internal and/or external stakeholders whether those within the school system, school board, parents, community, partners, state department other than the stated required reporting through the APR.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the low of the middle range.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a brief explanation about the proposed performance measurement evaluation process stating that the performance goals are clearly stated with the objectives.

Overall, the EOSD proposed performance measurement evaluation process will determine progress by comparing actual outcomes with state objectives; data measuring the effectiveness including low-income status, number of students, gender, race, grade level, program retention, and high school graduation; overall academic progress determined by comparing test and developmental growth; summer program pre- and post-test results maintained to ascertain needed services; data maintained on those students who are not retained; methods – standardized test scores, grades, student evaluations and questionnaires, teacher evaluation of students' progress, surveys, and interviews.

EOSD identified 11 performance measures to track indicators.

All - 3rd-12th grades -

- will show an increase in student performance on State assessment in language arts literacy and math;
- each school will establish clinical classroom;
- at least 75% of staff will participate in workshops, student groups, and peer coaching.

PreK-3rd grades –

- Increase achievement on NJASK for general education the percentage of “...” ? unknown since performance measure to incomplete;
- increase student motivation; increase achievement on NJASK for math;

4th-8th grades –

- Increase achievement on NJASK in English language arts;

- increase student motivation;

9th-12th grades –

- Increase percentages in language arts literacy on HSPA;
- increase student motivation; increase percentages in math on HSPA

Chart demonstrating the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroups whose teacher of record and principal are highly effective. Results 0% highly effective teachers and 0% highly effective principals.

Chart demonstrating the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroups whose teacher of record and principal are effective. Results 95% effective teachers and 0% effective principals.

The proposed performance measures demonstrate a progressive and informative plan to support achievement for the overall student population as well as subgroups of the special education, LEP, black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and economically disadvantaged.

However, the EOSD provided proposed performance measures do not include all performance measures as required and defined in the notice.

EOSD is missing 4-8 grades (a) – number and percentage of participating students ... who are on track to college- and career-readiness...

EOSD is missing 9-12 grades (a) – number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit ... FAFSA form.

EOSD is missing 9-12 grades (a) – number and percentage of participating students ... who are on track to college- and career-readiness...

EOSD is missing 9-12 grades (a) – at least one measure of career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students who are on track of being career-ready.

Although EOSD provided performance measures for each of the populations – all, PreK-3, 4-8, 9-12 – EOSD did not provide all of the performance measures as required and defined in the notice.

It is inconclusive from the EOSD information provided and proposed performance measures as to a rationale for the selection of the measures.

It is inconclusive from the EOSD information provided and proposed performance measures as to how they will be reviewed in order to improve the measures over time as to the sufficiency to gauge implementation progress

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the high of the low range.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a table for the EOSD Evaluation Plan: Performance on summative assessments (status and growth); Decreasing the achievement gaps; Graduation rates; and College enrollment.

Each evaluation category indicates the activities, key person(s) responsible, information collected, timeline, and evaluation measurement.

Overall, the goal of EOSD is to utilize the data sets in the proposed evaluation plan to:

- increase the understanding of how "...our RTT-D students compare with others..." from EOSD, the State of New Jersey, and national averages;
- enable project decision-making that supports student competitiveness;
- help students to make informed decisions about education and career choices

However, it is inconclusive from the provided EOSD proposed information and evaluation chart how the identified data sets will be evaluated internally and/or by an external evaluator in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the RTTT-D proposal.

It is unclear of the EOSD approach to a continuous improvement of the proposed plan.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the low of the middle range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a budget proposal for the use of the RTTT-D funds in the amount of \$20,000,000 including an overall budget and summary, project-level budgets and narratives for the ten proposed projects.</p> <p>The EOSD ten proposed project-level budget narratives identified and provided a rationale for each cost description, cost assumption including whether the cost is a one-time investment or on-going operational cost, and the total amount for the category.</p> <p>Overall, the EOSD budget proposal is reasonable to support the hiring of 19+ personnel, the development and implementation of the ten proposed projects during the 4 years life of the RTTT-D funds.</p> <p>However, it is unclear from the budgets, summaries, and/or narratives of any reference to and/or evidence of other funding sources such as district, LEA, State, Federal, or foundation. The EOSD proposal only identified RTTT-D fund to support the proposed projects.</p> <p>Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the high of the middle range.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided a description of the plan for sustainability of the proposed project goals.</p> <p>EOSD will create an Advisory Council of stakeholders to support and form a fundraising subcommittee.</p> <p>EOSD sustainability plan includes grant seeking campaigns, fundraising plans, and leveraging internal and community stakeholder support.</p> <p>EOSD stated that the East Orange Board of Education will “strive to maintain the additional teaching staff members” through the attrition and reallocating the schools budget in Fiscal Year 5 of the RTTT-D grant.</p> <p>Overall, the proposed plan of action to formulate grant seeking campaigns, fundraising, and community stakeholder support for funding sources after the RTTT-D grant. The EOSD plan of sustainability for the project goals beyond the RTTT-D funds is possible yet depends completely on the capacity of fundraising, seeking funding sources, and the decision of the East Orange Board of Education.</p> <p>However, EOSD did not prove evidence of current and/or potential support from State and local government leaders and financial support beyond the RTTT-D grant funding.</p> <p>Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the high of the middle range.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The East Orange School District (EOSD) has presented a compelling argument about truancy issues impacting the risky behaviors of students which are ultimately impacting the school and community.

EOSD defines East Orange, NJ, as an economically depressed urban city characterized with high youth unemployment, a high dropout rate, high crime and poverty rate. The city experiences serious issues of gang violence, a high level of adolescent sexual activities, and a high incidence of HIV/AIDS.

EOSD proposes to focus on “truancy reduction” which will impact all the risky behaviors of the EOSD student population and product improvements in academic achievement resulting in higher graduation rates.

EOSD described the formulation of an Advisory Council consisting of stakeholders – community organizations, community colleges, youth groups, and families – with a shared vision, who will mobilize resources, be accountability driven, and direct efforts toward the development of the whole child. Partners will advise on curricula, internships and potential employment, and possible funding of kind contributions.

EOSD listed 13 partners of which 6 contributed a letter of support to the EOSD RTTT-D proposed plan.

EOSD displayed in a table the: Population Groups – birth to age 3, ages 3-4, 4-5 pre-school, Kindergarten, grades 1-4, grades 5-8, grades 9-11, grade 12, and beyond grade 12;

Type of Result – education, family support, community participation, involvement of all stakeholders;

Desired Results – students will be equipped with reading, comprehension, writing, numeracy, and math skills; interventions will reduce the dropout and truancy rates; passing rate for State tests will 95% or better by 2016; students will experience much adult support and reduce factors that inhibit educational and emotional success.

Overall, EOSD proposed a Truancy Reduction in the East Orange School District to produce more students who are community-minded, prepared for a meaningful role in society, and be productive citizens.

Although EOSD presented a rather compelling case of need to address the issue of truancy reduction through the partnership of stakeholders and Advisory Council, the EOSD proposed plan is missing key factors as required and defined in the notice.

It is unclear from the evidence presented how the proposed partnership will track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all participating students.

It is unclear from the evidence presented how the proposed partnership will use the data to target resources to improve results for the students.

It is unclear from the evidence presented how the proposed partnership will develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students.

It is unclear from the evidence presented how the proposed partnership will integrate education and other services for students.

It is unclear from the evidence presented how the proposed partnership will build the capacity of school staff to assess the needs of students, identify and inventory needs of school and community that are aligned with the partnership’s goals.

It is unclear from the evidence presented how the proposed partnership will build the capacity of school staff to create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports to address the individual student’s needs.

It is unclear from the evidence presented how the proposed partnership will build the capacity of school staff to engage parents/family in both decision-making solutions to improve results and address needs.

It is unclear from the evidence presented how the proposed partnership will build the capacity of school staff to routinely assess the progress of implementing the plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems.

Therefore, East Orange School District scored in the low of the middle range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The East Orange School District (EOSD) provided an explanation that the EOSD RTTT-D initiative will build upon the broad education reforms of the NJ Race to the Top program (Phase 3).</p> <p>The proposed EOSD RTTT-D reform goals will be in alignment with the NJDOE RTTT reform goals in that:</p> <p>1.EOSD -- Career Academies (grades 6th-12th) – decrease dropout rate, increase student engagement and motivation; partnership with higher educational institutions to provide GED and dual enrollment college courses.</p> <p>This will align and support the NJDOE – enhanced standards and high-quality assessments through model curriculum and formative assessment platform aligned with CCSS.</p> <p>2.EOSD – Upgraded technology and infrastructure aligned with state stands for online testing and equity with equipment.</p> <p>This will align and support the NJDOE – implementing an instructional improvement system and instructional support tools – comprehensive instructional improvement system (IIS) and NJ SMART.</p> <p>3.Educator professional development – student support services, career academics, common core stands, differentiating instruction, and instructional practices.</p> <p>This will align and support the NJDOE – implementing a consistent, transparent evaluation system for school leaders and teachers – Excellent Educators for New Jersey (EE4NJ) evaluation program.</p> <p>4.Socio-emotional support services to identify barriers for student growth and provide programs to ensure that students are successful.</p> <p>This will align and support the NJDOE – improving standards, assessments, and instruction materials to provide extra attention to most troubled schools and improve academic achievement for all students.</p> <p>The EOSD RTTT-D vision reform will encompass four programs for Pre-K to 12th students to provide the personalized learning experiences through building the capacity of the ten proposed projects and six Career Academies.</p> <p>Overall, EOSD has presented a plan that is a coherent and comprehensive to directly address and impact the outcome of accelerating student achievement, meeting academic needs, decrease achievement gaps, increase graduation rates, and preparation for college and careers.</p> <p>Therefore, the EOSD has met the Absolute Priority 1.</p>		

Total	210	121
-------	-----	-----