



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0319AR-1 for Springdale School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Springdale School District is a non-rural LEA in a non-Race to the Top State. The applicant presents a coherent and comprehensive picture of its current conditions and status and the changes it has experienced over recent years; examples of school and student successes are included. The district utilizes the whole child approach to educating all students as defined by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD); the application includes a table illustrating how the ASCD tenets reflect the RTT-D core areas and clearly demonstrates how current conditions in the district support the four educational assurance areas of RTT-D. The district has aligned its K-12 curriculum to the Common Core State Standards; tracks student data via the district-developed data dashboard; strives to recruit top teachers and retain them with the highest salary schedule in the state; and has implemented the Turnaround School Principles in one district high school. The reform vision is comprehensive and coherent; builds on the District's ongoing work in the four core educational assurance areas; and articulates a clear and credible approach to meeting the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. The applicant clearly and thoughtfully presents three measurable reform goals with objectives aligned to the core assurances. For each objective supporting research is cited; and where available, evidence of success is included.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) The description of the process used to select schools to participate is understandable and appropriate. The applicant used two methods to identify and select the first wave of reform schools. The initial group of first-wave schools was selected based on the <i>ESEA Flexibility Waiver</i> request that identified <i>Priority</i> and <i>Focus</i> Schools. The district has eight <i>Focus Schools</i> and one <i>Priority School</i>. The second method for identifying schools for the RTT-D proposal was high poverty schools with 70% or more of the students receiving Free or Reduced Lunch assistance. Seventy percent of students receiving Free or Reduced Lunch assistance is above the district average of poverty, currently 67% receiving such assistance. This resulted in the selection of thirteen elementary, five middle/junior, and three high schools, including one alternative learning school. All selected schools meet the competition's eligibility requirements.</p> <p>(b) A list of the participating schools is provided.</p> <p>(c) For each participating school, all required information is included: the total number of participating students, of participating students from low-income families, of participating students who are high-need, and of participating educators.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p>		

The applicant presents a high-quality plan for scaling up and translating the proposal into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the initial participating schools. The scale-up plan mirrors exactly the high-quality plan described in the District's Vision; for each goal the same objectives are listed as in the master plan. For each objective, the plan to scale up the reform to all schools in the district includes a list of projects to be brought to scale. For each project, the applicant lists short-term outcomes, long-term outcomes, and required resources. The projects and expected outcomes are clearly described and quantified. The scale-up plan is a clear description of steps to be taken to move all the RTT-D reforms to every school in the district both during the grant period and beyond. Their clarity would allow new staff to continue the reform without pause.

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

**10**

**10**

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

This requirement is clearly met. Baseline data and targets for student performance by grade and content area, graduation rates, and college enrollments for All Students and by the required subgroups are clearly presented, the rationale for the targets is included, and targets for subgroups enable narrowing of gaps between subgroup performance. Baseline data and targets for the optional category, Postsecondary Degree Attainment, is included. The applicant proposes the creation of a database to facilitate tracking postsecondary attainment; the system would also permit gathering information from attendees and graduates to be inform district improvement. Each target is ambitious yet achievable and equals or exceeds the State's targets.

The summative assessments used for baseline and growth targets are identified. To determine status, each school was given a specific trajectory that sets new AMOs as part of the *ESEA Flexibility Waiver* process. The baseline year of 2011 established the number and percent of students who were proficient and above. This baseline was used to establish a trajectory of AMOs that will move a school toward 100% proficient and advanced over the next twelve years. It is anticipated that new baseline data will be established once the PARCC assessments are put into place in 2013. Growth trajectories were established using 2011 baseline data. Each student in a school has an established growth trajectory based on scaled score proficiency formulas for each grade from 3 to 8. The growth score for the school was determined by the number and percent of students who met their individual growth trajectory in the 2011 school year. That percentage was used to determine the difference between the percent of students who met their growth score and having 100 percent of students meet their growth score. AMOs were set by dividing the difference by 12 so that in 12 years the goal is to have 100 percent of the students meet their growth score. The Arkansas Department of Education in its *ESEA Flexibility Waiver* proposal defined the achievement gap for each school based on the gap between the *Targeted Assistance Group (TAGG) Students* and *All Students* performance. The *TAGG* group is comprised of *Students with Disabilities*, *English Language Learners*, and *Students in Poverty* based on Free and Reduced Lunch eligibility. The *ESEA Flexibility Waiver* allowed the state to set adjusted targets for *All Students* to meet proficiency at a level of 50% of the difference between their baseline number of proficient students in 2011 and 100% proficiency with trajectories computed over the next six years. The same calculations were used for students who were in the *TAGG* group. The differences in the trajectories each year show the gap when subtracted one from the other: *TAGG* versus *All Students*. Baseline data and targets for student performance by grade and content area, graduation rates, and college enrollment are clearly presented, the rationale for the targets is included, and targets for subgroups enable narrowing of gaps between subgroup performance. Baseline data and targets for the optional category, Postsecondary Degree Attainment, is included. Each target is ambitious yet achievable and equals or exceeds the State's target.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>

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

(a) The applicant includes documented evidence from external evaluators of its successes over the past years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching despite a rapidly growing population, increasing poverty, and shifting demographics. The evaluation reports acknowledge increased student

achievement, closing achievement gaps; improved language proficiency for ELLs, increased graduation rates, higher public postsecondary attendance, increasing the diversity of instructional staff; creating a more robust data system; and strengthening alignment with college and career ready standards through more rigorous curriculum. To illustrate improved student achievement, the applicant included a table which shows mathematics and English Language Arts achievement data for All, Hispanic, and Poor Students and for English Language Learners for 2009-2011 on the Benchmark Exam. Appendix B3 contains graphs showing student performance on the Benchmark Exams from 2007 to 2011 for these same subgroups. Achievement increased in both content areas for all student groups from 2007 to 2011. Gaps decreased between All Students and each of the three subgroups (Hispanic, Poor, ELL). Four-year high school graduation and college enrollment rates were not found.

(b) The state of Arkansas adjusted its definition of low-achieving schools based on the *ESEA Flexibility Waiver*. The baseline data for the establishment of schools defined as *Needs Improvement Focus Schools* identified eight schools. Of these eight schools, seven of them met their first year goals. The Springdale Alternative Learning Environment (ALE) high school did not meet its first year goals. Due to the ALE's *Priority* status, the district enacted School Turnaround principles, including: naming a new principal; re-interviewing all faculty on the basis of teaching and learning expectations; revising the school mission and vision; and implementing a new classroom walkthrough system being utilized by the school principal to provide feedback to teachers on a daily basis. The ALE has demonstrated success since implementing School Turnaround. Parent participation is increasing and algebra proficiency has grown over 2%.

(c) Student data are presented to the public in the newspaper, via the District's web page, and via Facebook. Students and parents can track real-time grades and assignments using a district-developed data dashboard. Parents and students receive additional information through parent-teacher conferences, interim reports, and report cards.

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

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant includes evidence from the district's website that it provides all necessary information for selection criteria (B)( 2).

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant documents and provides evidence of eleven specific and relevant state and district initiatives that clearly illustrate successful conditions and sufficient autonomy and authority to implement the personalized learning environments described in its proposal. These include the State's adoption of the Common Core standards and involvement in the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, both supported by professional development and an implementation plan; regionally sponsored professional development in student-centered coaching and shifting the pedagogy of high school classrooms toward alignment with the "habits of the mind;" a state data system that allows immediate transfer of student records and transcripts; and the creation of a *Targeted Achievement GAP Group (TAGG)* to track the progress of student subgroups too small to be monitored in traditional accountability systems. The district will pilot the State's new teacher, principal and superintendent evaluation system and is working with the Arkansas Commissioner of Education to pilot a shift away from the Carnegie Unit as the only determinate for awarding course credit; the pilot will include a mastery-learning model. The district has merged general and technical education models through its Medical Academy, Law Enforcement and Safety Academy, Information Technology Academy, and Architecture and Engineering Academy, endeavors it has been encouraged by the state to expand.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**  
 (a) The district does not have collective bargaining representation. Faculty members in each participating school voted on their interest in participating in RTTT-D. In every school at least 70% of the teachers voted to participate. A detailed schedule of events including opportunities for providing input into the RTT-D proposal illustrates the degree of stakeholder support.

(b) The proposal contains letters of support from representatives of government, community, parent, special interest, postsecondary, and student groups. These letters of support are not "boiler plate" but rather are individually authored letters that indicate a good understanding of the intentions of RTT-D proposal.

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

**5**

**5**

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

The District has already developed and undertaken a high-quality plan for analyzing its status in implementing personalized learning environments. Baseline data were available from assessment results; external evaluation data; the State Department's audit process; and faculty, parent, and student survey responses. These data indicated the following needs: improved reading and mathematics skills for all students; a systematic process of curriculum development to align to college- and career-ready standards; enhanced professional development for faculty in major focus areas of literacy, mathematics and English language acquisition; development and expansion of formative assessments; deepened learning experiences for students who are in poverty, particularly in accessing technology resources; a system for personalized learning with expanded career academies and embedded project-based learning; utilization of college and career coaches to support the transition into college; alternatives to the grading model that is currently based on a single method of earning credit; and improving the district's use of the professional learning community model. The District convened a District Improvement Team (DIT) that reviewed the data and identified the need for a comprehensive plan to meet these needs. The District's RTT-D proposal with its clearly defined, rigorous goals and objectives aligned to identified needs is the animation of that comprehensive plan.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>

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

(a) The applicant links each requirement in C-1(a) to the goals and objectives of this proposal which have been clearly presented; explains the rationale and research base for each objective; includes a clear timeline; lists deliverables; and identifies responsible parties. This organized and coherent presentation allows reviewers to visualize the plan and connect each piece to the RTT-D core areas. The narrative serves as a road map for moving from current status to the realization of an even more effective personalized learning environment.

(b) Under this proposal personal Learning and Academic Improvement Plans would become a reality for all students and Family Literacy Programs would be expanded to five additional Title I schools. The District implements several effective instructional approaches and environments and would expand these via the RTT-D proposal. The District has adopted the Common Core Standards, is developing new curricula aligned to those standards, and is identifying course and grade level competencies tied to the standards that would allow students to demonstrate mastery in authentic ways in lieu of seat time. Interim formative assessments are being developed to inform instruction and measure progress toward mastery. Formative assessments linked to the curriculum would provide actionable information to students in a timely way, and inform personalized learning recommendations based on students' current knowledge and skills. Formative assessments such as PLAN, EXPLORE and ACT would help students determine their pathways toward becoming college- and career- ready. Second language learners receive feedback on their ELDA scores that track English Language acquisition. A variety of accommodations and high quality strategies to provide early interventions for struggling students is in place. District plans include one-to-one technology for all students; the one-to-one access model would be phased in in the participating schools over the course of four years. This would enable students to access and interact with digital learning content to carry out instructional tasks and to demonstrate mastery of competencies. The technology would include iPads and netbook carts in each classroom. All classrooms would become "Smart Classrooms" by the incorporation of interactive white boards and cameras in every class. Each participating school would have a computer lab. As part of the district's accountability measures, teachers in every class are required to have six hours of technology per year. The proposal details the one-to-one rollout, including the addition of a technology integration specialist and three additional staff to support the roll-out; and the replacement cycle. The District would keep an inventory listing of technology

that indicates whether all classrooms within the grant have one-to-one technology support including technology for student checkout in each library for all 21 schools included in the proposal. Mechanisms are in place for high-need students to help ensure they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards. Clear timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties are included. This section would have been even stronger with the inclusion of a summary of evaluation data demonstrating the effects of the Individualized Improvement Plans in K-2 and the Academic Improvement Plans (AIP) in grades 3-12 for students not achieving at grade level.

(c) The primary mechanism to support students is interaction with a teacher, mentor, or college/career coach. For example, Career Action Plans (CAP) are developed for all eighth graders. The plans are reviewed annually by students, parents, teachers, and, where possible, a college/career coach. The process is intended to enable students to measure progress toward their goals and make decisions about future learning. Personal Learning Plans (PLP) are in place in all schools. Working together with teachers, students personalize instructional content and skill development to enable them to achieve their individual learning goals. Using personal learning plans, students reflect on areas of growth and development and make decisions about how they can best demonstrate competency of college- and career-ready standards.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

(a) The applicant proposes a rigorous professional development agenda complete with timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. The district has set aside time and funding to allow four days of teacher planning at the elementary level, and three days at the secondary level, in addition to regularly embedded common planning time within the school day and week. All training and professional development are aligned with the reform agenda.

Through its experience with the academy model, the district realizes the need for collaborative planning, high quality professional development, and school change coaching. Thus, it plans to provide common planning time for course-alike and grade-alike teachers by 2014. A timeline for professional development focusing on curriculum development, student-centered coaching, career action planning and personal learning plans, advisor/advisee models, expanded use of technology, and the new teacher evaluation system is included. The professional development activities are aligned with the reform goals and will be ongoing as new teachers join the system.

The seat-time waiver pilot allows educators to personalize student learning by adapting content and instruction to engage students in common and individual tasks to demonstrate mastery of college- and career-ready standards. Recognizing that this will involve a shift in practice on the part of educators, the district has in place professional development and common planning time to allow educators to adapt curriculum to the Common Core framework and to create personalized units and instructional tasks. Because of the large increase in ELLs in its schools, the district will provide professional development on English language acquisition, sponsor English language academies, and cover expenses for graduate credit and assessment on ESL endorsement for all teachers. Specific professional development will be provided for teachers of mathematics and English. A goal of the common planning and professional development is the development of demonstration model units to be shared across the district.

Included in the RTT-D proposal is a plan to expand the current data system to allow all educators to access and interact with student data in real-time for the purpose of informing instructional practice and accelerating student achievement. A series of professional development opportunities for all participating educators to access and gain experience with the new system is planned. Teachers will also receive training in the new student-centered coaching model, with select teachers serving as academic coaches.

The district is adopting a new teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluation system that will measure progress based on student achievement and provide frequent feedback on effectiveness. Training will be provided to all staff.

(b) All educators will have access to students' personal learning plans, career action plans, and cross-curricular data in the expanded data dashboard system. Professional development would be provided to develop effective strategies for using the data to personalize learning. Teachers would develop new curricular units and evaluate their use with the student-centered teaching coaching model.

District educators are already ramping up curriculum to meet the Common Core Standards and aligning instructional content and assessments to college- and career-ready standards as well as working on English acquisition, mathematics, and literacy skills. Personalized learning plans and career action planning would be incorporated into their individualized

student approaches. To support the mid-grant goal that 100% of instruction will be informed by regular, embedded, formative assessments, educators are developing interim formative assessments to drive instruction. Professional development would be provided to help them develop and improve the assessments. Teachers are already using eMINTS (enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies), a partnership that prepares educators to be functional with technology. Professional development centers on developing processes for students to gain and share knowledge using electronic devices.

To support the seat-time waiver which will permit teachers to match student needs with specific resources and approaches, educators will develop new curricular units that include embedded formative assessments and expanded use of technology. It will also allow increased flexibility for students to customize their educational progress to their own demonstrated mastery of college and career ready standards. Educators would have access to tools including personal learning plans, career action plans, and the cross-curricular data dashboard to inform decisions about how to best match instructional processes and tools with student needs.

(c) Because of the academy model, school leaders have experience facilitating distributed leadership models within school sites. The expanded academy model under RTT-D would bring to scale the distributed leadership model across the district. The model allow for broad stakeholder input and collaboration around school reform. School leadership teams are working with the new teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluation system to establish transparency and promote open communication about educator effectiveness.

The section regarding training, systems, and practices to continuously improve progress toward increased student performance and gap closure is not sufficiently addressed.

(d) The applicant's plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers is to improve the quality of all teachers using the new educator evaluation system. The district has developed a rubric that clearly defines Effective and Highly Effective Teachers and Principals. Teachers will receive timely feedback through classroom walkthrough systems, observation systems and conference systems that occur through the school year. Teachers will be given coaching via the student centered coaching model to improve instruction as needed. The proposal does not address hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

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

(a) The LEA central office is organized to provide support and services to all participating schools. The District Superintendent fully supports the proposal and has assigned three central office Curriculum and Instruction executive members of his cabinet to be directly involved in the implementation of the grant, indicating buy-in and support from the top. The Associate Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, Accountability and Innovation would be the direct supervisor of the grant; her/his duties would include overseeing expenditures, procuring professional development agreements, assisting with the bid and purchasing activities and monitoring the timeline for implementation. The Associate Superintendent would also chair the Implementation Task Force. Assistant Superintendents would work on-site at the building level to ensure fidelity of implementation by assisting in gathering the required reporting data; ensuring that the professional development activities are being implemented in the classrooms as designed; and ensuring that resources put into the school are being used as the grant has dictated. An Implementation Task Force, made up of administrators; teachers; students; parents; and community members representing each participating school, would be in place to ensure

support for the grant. A Project Manager would be hired to manage all aspects of the grant including data collection; reports; budget execution; and inventorying of equipment, materials and supplies. To expedite the writing of the curriculum units and lesson plans proposed in the grant, up to eight additional Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA) positions will be created to generate the work in a timely manner. The Business office would support the tracking of expenditures and monitor the receipt of Grant Funds.

(b) Under RTT-D, the school leadership teams in participating schools would be provided flexibility and autonomy in all matters pertaining to grant implementation. The building level principals, in concert with the school leadership teams, would have autonomy to generate school schedules and calendars; make school personnel decisions; and manage school level budgets.

(c) The district is taking the lead in the State to move away from the Carnegie Unit system of granting credit, and is investigating alternatives. The State Board of Education is fully supportive of this, and preliminary conversations have begun between the Superintendent and high school principals.

(d) Students are given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. One example of this is the use of *Cognitively Guided Math* in elementary schools. All students K-12 use rubrics for the evaluation of writing. The secondary English classrooms are learning how to facilitate student mastery through the use of a rubric and peer-editing processes. Writing is reviewed multiple times prior to assigning the final grade. The Algebra program is designed around a mastery-learning model that is being strengthened through the professional development linked to “*Extending Mathematical Thinking*,” a model for teaching that uses mastery learning. In a number of schools, students demonstrate mastery through public exhibitions.

(e) The applicant provides evidence that learning resources and instructional practices are being implemented that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English language learners. One-on-one instruction and assistive technology are provided if needed. Each school has instructional specialists who provide instructional support and resources to teachers in order to meet the needs of students. Many of the schools have reading specialists who work directly with students on a daily basis. Elementary schools have instructional assistants who support the needs of students directly in the classroom. The District has a program that ensures that migrant students have academic resources as well as health services and tutorial services. The district has a supply closet for clothing, school supplies and food for families and students in need. Annually, the community donates funds through a “Christmas card” fund that provides medical and dental support to students as required. The counseling program provides material resources as well as social services and direct counseling.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

(a) The overall purpose of the District’s proposal is to take personalized learning to scale across the district, as evidenced by the goals and objectives of its reform plan (ensuring that every student enters school ready to learn; has the reading and math foundation skills; has parents engaged in activities that will promote expanded experiences; is college and career ready with supporting activities such as career coaches; has access to field trips to colleges; has access to technology; has appropriate pacing through content that is not dependent upon a “seat time requirement”; and has a personalized learning plan with pathways to an academy of choice). The proposal clearly describes the LEAs infrastructure and how it supports that purpose; it identifies specific departments, teams, and positions that would be responsible for the various initiatives contained in the proposal. The table included in section (D)(2) lists by goal resources and technical support available to students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders. Most of the resources and supports are geared toward educators rather than to other stakeholders. Some, for example, extended day/year, the Jones Center Partnership, college and career nights, college site visits, and college/career coaches are intended to support families. Students would have appropriate hardware in their classrooms and devices could be checked out from the school libraries. The expanded data system supported by this proposal would enable delivery of learning materials to students electronically.

(b) The applicant does not adequately address technical support for students, parents, and other stakeholders.

(c) Information technology system acquisition is a major focus of this grant proposal. The system specifications would include links to tutorial systems and ensure that parents and students could export information in an open data format. No other information is provided in the proposal.

(d) The proposal states that the district's new data system would be an interoperable.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The proposal includes an excellent, inclusive continuous improvement process that would provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward goals and identify opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvement during and after the term of the grant. The strategy addresses progress monitoring of all grant activities including the impact on classroom practice. The District Improvement Team would oversee the continuous improvement process and coordinate activities around each goal area. Each project would have an evaluation component designed specifically to measure its impact on student achievement and social and behavioral outcomes, increasing the likelihood that evidence is gathered around particular program elements to determine which are linked with the most efficient, effective, relevant and useful outcomes. Monthly meetings would be held with school improvement teams to evaluate progress toward grant goals. Additionally, school improvement teams would collect and review data to inform the process such as samples of student work, lesson plan design, and formative assessments. Including school improvement teams in the continuous improvement process is a strategy that moves the reform efforts from the district to each of its participating schools. The District Improvement Team would participate in this process as well as participate in classroom walkthroughs to collect trend data on classroom practice. The Classroom Walk Through (CWT) rubric, provided in the Appendix, provides consistent categories of information from classroom visits. The Superintendent, as Chief Executive Officer, would approve and oversee the overall project. This indicates buy-in from the top. The Associate Superintendent would oversee and manage the district improvement team and all activities within the grant. The District Improvement Team would be made up of Teachers on Special Assignment working on curriculum development, and the individuals contracted with the district to support the work, assuring a link between employees and contractors. Experts in evaluation and measurement from the University of Arkansas, along with other national experts, would work in partnership with the district. The Project Manager would collect and maintain the data that supports the work of each goal and publish reports to share information on the quality of RTT-D investments. Lastly, RTT-D would provide for an additional position—the Director of Improvement, Research and Evaluation—who would supervise the evaluation process, collect and analyze data, and give guidance toward improvement efforts. This process evaluation should support accurate monitoring and describing of the work of a RTT-D district and provide a picture of the myriad elements that must function together to personalize education and improve achievement for all students. This real time evaluation process would allow district and school leadership to have frequent conversations about the work and provide evidence to help determine where, and how, to guide, redirect, and refocus efforts.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant meets this requirement. RTT-D information would continue to be posted on the District's website and Facebook page; would be shared monthly with the School Board and minutes of the meetings would be posted on the website; principals' meetings would have a standing item for a RTT-D update; and The Joint Council (representative teacher committee) would receive quarterly updates. Upon grant initiation, a Community Partners (CP) meeting would establish communication channels, timelines, reporting responsibilities and data gathering expectations. Three times annually, the district would convene a CP Focus Group to make adjustments based on feedback received in the interim. The district would build off existing practices to ensure multiple measures of communication and engagement are in place with external stakeholders. Grant progress would be shared monthly during Patron Shelf Meetings, which include community leaders; city council members; representatives from community organizations; and parents from all of the schools. Grant information would be shared through the City Council PTA meeting that is comprised of PTA leadership teams from across the district. In addition, an Improvement Showcase would be scheduled each spring. This event, led by the District Improvement Team, would convene school level improvement teams for a public event to share the knowledge and outcomes developed over the year. This event would serve as the basis for planning program and evaluation activities</p>		

for the coming year. Presentations would include data gathered by the project monitoring system under the direction of the Director of Improvement, Research, and Evaluation. The district improvement team would gather all necessary data and complete all reports required by the USDOE, including annual performance reports and a final performance report. In addition, the applicant expresses enthusiasm about collaborating with national efforts to share evaluation strategies and findings across a national technical assistance system and at other forums as appropriate or invited.

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

**5**

**5**

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

The applicant proposes twelve ambitious yet achievable performance measures. For required performance measure (b), the District's current educator evaluation model does not yield numbers of students with a highly effective teacher **and** a highly effective principal. That data will be available once the new evaluation system is place. For each required and district-generated performance measure the applicant provides the rationale for each measure, the methodology for the data collection, and continuous improvement strategies; for some measures supporting research is cited. Performance measures are specifically defined to facilitate accurate data collection. For each performance measure, baseline data and annual targets for the grant period and beyond are provided for All students and for the district's identified subgroups.

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

**5**

**5**

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

Evaluation activities would incorporate cost effectiveness analyses to examine the costs and outcomes of interventions and improvement strategies. Results would be presented as cost-effectiveness ratios, expressing cost per outcome (e.g. cost per increase in the number of highly qualified teachers or for increased graduation rates). Tying this analysis directly to the logic model would enable the district to determine which programs are effective, as well as the efficiencies and costs associated with alternative approaches. The Director of Improvement, Research and Evaluations would supervise the evaluation process. Investments in professional development would be monitored using research partnerships with the University of Arkansas' National Office of Research and Measurement of Educational Statistics (NORMES) office.

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

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

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

The applicant offers sixteen complementary projects that comprise this proposal (see below). Each project is described in detail and is accompanied by a budget, rationale, timeline, and deliverables; supporting research is provided as applicable.

- Scaling up the pre-K program
- Getting all students on grade level in literacy
- Getting all students on grade level in Mathematics
- Accelerating language acquisition for English Language Learners
- Extended day/ Extended year opportunities
- Service Learning Projects (supporting students' transition to college and careers)
- College and Career Ready Programs
- Family Literacy Model (parental involvement)
- Increased access to Technology
- Piloting the Seat Time Waiver
- Personalized Learning Plans (Career Planning)
- Personalized Learning Plans (Project Based Learning)
- Expanding Multiple Pathways to Graduation
- Strengthening Professional Learning Communities
- Project Manager and Secretarial Staff; stipends for school site managers

- Director of Improvement, Research and Evaluation

The applicant's overall and project budget narrative and tables meet the requirements of this grant:

- (a) The applicant clearly identifies all funds that would support the proposal and identifies the source.
- (b) The amounts are reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal.
- (c) Funds for one-time investments and those that would be used for ongoing operational costs incurred during and after the grant are clearly delineated.

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

**10**

**10**

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

For each of the sixteen projects included in its proposal, the applicant identifies a sustainability plan. For example, Project 1 - Scaling up the pre-K program: The proposal's budget includes a total of ten certified teachers and ten classified aides. The district will use matching funds, district funds, and funds from the Arkansas Department of Education to sustain this ongoing expense. The District would sustain curriculum work past the grant with district professional development funds. The district would sustain ESL-related professional development activities through Federal Title III funds and state categorical funding as needed for new staff members. Extended day/ Extended year opportunities would be sustained using Title I funds. State Categorical funds supporting poverty children, Title I parent involvement funds, district technology funds, and other district funds would support the remaining projects as appropriate.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

For the Competitive Preference Priority, the District is building upon partnerships that have been in place since 2003 when the *Springdale Public Schools Education Foundation (SPSEF)* was formed by community leaders. The SPSEF serves the social, emotional and behavioral needs of students in partnership with the *Springdale Partners in Education (PIE)* and the *Springdale Schools Alumni Foundation*. *PIE* pairs area businesses with local schools to provide guidance and leadership to students through participation in the community; engagement with real world fields of work; and building community pride within the schools. The *Springdale Alumni Foundation (SAF)* provides the opportunity for alumni and patrons to maintain ties to the Springdale Public Schools and community. It has completed several memorial projects across the district and awarded more than 30 scholarships to Springdale graduates. The SPSEF integrates the network of partners who provide services to students by providing financial and human resources tied to school needs. Twelve partnerships are described in the application serving students in all or part of grades K-12 and providing a myriad of services ranging from early intervention behavioral programs to mentoring to students as they transition from high school to college.

The applicant identifies eight desired results including both educational and other outcomes for students that align with and support the applicant's proposal. The results, presented by targeted group, include increased parental involvement and support; increased college enrollment by second language learners; decreased absenteeism and discipline referrals; students coming to school ready to learn with appropriate materials and supplies; decreased obesity rates; poverty students reading on level by the end of third grade and performing on level in mathematics by the end of 5th grade; and increased first-time college enrollees, especially among poverty students. The partnership would track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the district by the *All Students* academic indicator in literacy and math. Academic progress would be tracked for participating students in reading and mathematics. Building level leadership and counselors would use attendance records, discipline records, health records, poverty status, and homelessness status, from the files to target resources for students and to match service providers with students in precise ways. To sustain this over the life of the grant, the applicant proposes a dynamic database of currently available services for use by principals and counselors. Counselors, principals, and classroom teachers would be the primary contact for targeting students who would benefit from services and would determine the support schedule. The roles of the

SPSEF Director are to manage the program, sustain the *PIE*, serve as liaison between the schools and the partners, increase the number of partners. When the need for support exceeds the services available at the school, the school leadership team would work with the *SPSEF* Director to seek additional partners. Moving forward, the District proposes customer satisfaction surveys and improved record-keeping through the establishment of a dedicated database to improve results.

The applicant does not specifically address the integration of these services within the education process or how the partnership would build staff capacity to assess students' needs and assets; create a decision-making process to select, implement, and evaluate supports, and engage parents.

Annual ambitious and achievable performance measures are included.

**Absolute Priority 1**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>	<b>Met/Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The proposal unquestionably meets the Absolute Priority. The applicant coherently and comprehensively addresses how it will build on the core educational assurance areas defined in this notice to create learning environments designed to significantly improve teaching and learning through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. The applicant proposes three rigorous yet achievable goals with supporting objectives to attain its goal of taking personalized learning to scale across the district by ensuring that every student enters school ready to learn; has the reading and math foundation skills required to succeed; has parents engaged in activities that will promote expanded experiences; is college and career ready with supporting activities such as career coaches; has access to field trips to colleges; has access to technology; has appropriate pacing through content that is not dependent upon a "seat time requirement"; and has a personalized learning plan with pathways to an academy of choice. The proposal clearly describes the LEAs infrastructure and how it supports that purpose. The proposal grows from activities already underway in the District and provides documented evidence of their success. The application is clear, consistent, understandable, and research-based. It advocates a whole-child approach and a balanced education system that would personalize teaching and learning. It involves educators from every level within the District from superintendent to support staff and includes mechanisms to keep them connected and informed. Parents are provided opportunities to participate in their children's education, and community partners provide additional resources and support. The proposal is thorough, precise, and straightforward, making it easy to replicate. It does not depend on a buffet of programs and fads, but is grounded in research-based techniques and strategies that have been demonstrated to increase the achievement of all students.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>198</b>
--------------	------------	------------





# Race to the Top - District

## A. Vision (40 total points)

### Technical Review Form

Application #0319AR-3 for Springdale School District	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Selection Criteria (A)(1) – Vision: Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision.</p> <p>The Springdale School District explicitly shared a comprehensive and coherent vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant provided the reviewer with the “Big Picture” regarding the belief system of the school district. The district has clearly embraced the demographic changes and are committed to creating innovative personalized learning strategies to meet the needs of their students. They are guiding their students towards careers in which they are able to build on their dual-language capacity</li> <li>• The applicant provided specific examples of programs that are currently in place to support students in all subgroups with a focus on ELL students and students living below the poverty line</li> <li>• The applicant provided evidence of a current reform agenda that is in alignment with the four core educational assurances areas set forth RTT-D. The agenda items reflect:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implementation of a rigorous and relevant curriculum aligned to the Common Core State Standards.</li> <li>2. Tracking student performance data via a district-designed data dashboard system and formative assessments through partnerships.</li> <li>3. The district recruits "top tier" teachers. They make a concerted effort to hire staff that reflects the diversity of the school population.</li> <li>4. The district has implemented the Turnaround School Principles in the Alternative Learning Environment High Schools. Principals were replaced and teachers were considered for their placement.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The applicant clearly and thoroughly shared the goals which incorporated specific objective for each goal, related to the plan. The goals included:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Goal #1 - Drastically accelerating student achievement by: scaling-up the existing Pre-K program; ensuring that all students are on grade level, in reading, by grade 3; ensuring that all students are on grade level, in math, by grade 5, and; accelerating language acquisition for English Language Learners.</li> <li>2. Goal #2 - Deepen student learning by: closing the achievement gap by: incorporating extended day and extended year programs and Increase access to technology and technology integration in classrooms.</li> <li>3. Goal #3 - Increase equity through personalized learning strategies by: serving as a pilot for the Arkansas Seat-Time Requirement Waiver; extend personalized learning plans, project-based learning and, advisories; expand multiple pathways to graduation, and; strengthen professional learning communities.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p>Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section. The applicant clearly and cohesively incorporated the importance of preparing all students for career and college readiness via the current reforms in place and the proposed goals shared that will bolster the reform.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Springdale School District explicitly provided the criteria that they used to identify the schools that would be a part of the reform proposal.</p>		

(a) The participating schools that were selected clearly meet the criteria outlined by RTT-D. The district identified two methods in identifying the schools. The first group of schools were selected using the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. There were nine schools, 8 focus schools and 1 priority school selected. These schools were selected due to the need for assistance in meeting the new AMO goals identified by the ESEA Flexibility waiver. All of the schools met the 40% free and reduced benchmark, all of the schools are at the bottom 15% in student achievement, and the priority school is at the bottom 5% in student achievement. The second method reflected the identification of high poverty schools (as defined).

(b) The participating schools were all listed and specific data reflecting the number of participating students, educators, high-need students, and low-income students for each school participating in the grant.

(c) The applicant clearly shared the methods and data used to identify the schools that would be participating in this grant. The first method clearly defined the schools in the high-need (as defined) category and the low-income (as defined) category. The second method only identified the low-income (as defined) group of schools but, not the high-need (as defined). These two are not synonymous.

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section. The applicant provided a detailed analysis of the selection criteria, participating schools, and participating students. The schools selected would benefit from the goals and objectives identified in this application.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

Selection Criteria (A)(3) – Vision: LEA-wide reform and change.

The Springdale School District explicitly shared their high-quality reform proposal that described how the plan would be scaled-up, support district-wide change, and reach outcome goals.

The applicant presented a comprehensive plan reflecting the short-term outcomes, long-term outcomes, resources needed, and how the plan would be scaled-up to transcend the schools previously identified. The applicant shared the exact objectives attached to each of the three goals identified. The applicant identified the projects that will assist in scaling-up up the plan/goals to a meaningful reform. The applicant identified specific short-term outcomes and long-term outcomes for each project that supports the objective and ultimately the goals.

The following reflect the specific indicators that will lend to improving student learning:

- Scaling-up the pre-K program to ensure that all high-need students are able to attend this early learning opportunity
- Develop a curriculum that will ensure that students in grade 3 are reading at benchmark and are on grade level by the end of grade 5
- Train all faculty to ensure to accelerate language acquisition of all ELL students
- Conduct college and career readiness nights
- Extend the school day and school year opportunities
- Monitor teacher and principal performance
- Provide opportunities for students to gain credits through personalized learning opportunities

The resources shared in order to make these come to fruition were clearly identified and thoughtfully aligned to each goal.

Although the applicant identified the short-tern outcomes and the long-term outcomes, the timeline was not clearly presented or shared. The short-term outcomes and long-term outcomes are relative. A more defined timeline would pinpoint when these particular projects would be implemented.

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section. The information supported the plan in the chart and was thorough and reasonable. However, a specific timeline would have provided increased clarity.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

**Selection Criteria (A)(4) – Vision: LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes**

The Springdale School District explicitly shared a plan for improved student outcomes that highlighted ambitious yet achievable annual goals.

(a) The applicant identified four criteria to determine proficiency status and growth. The four areas include: summative assessment data (state benchmark data), new AMO's set by the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, Growth score for the school determined by the percent of students who met their growth score and, the adjusted ESEA Flexibility Waiver defining the achievement gap for each school, which is based on the gap between the Targeted Assistance Group (students who are in the English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroups) and all students.

(b) The Arkansas Department of Education defined the achievement gap for each school based on the difference between identified the Targeted Assistance Group (TAGG) of students and all students. The TAGG students are students who are in the ELL and SWD subgroups. The students in these subgroups must increase their proficiency rating by 50% of their baseline scores.

(c) The applicant shared the graduation rate trajectory via a chart. The quantitative gains over through SY2016-2017 are ambitious yet achievable. The growth rate is achievable if the students are engaged or exposed to the objectives and actions of the the goals set forth by the plan.

(d) The applicant identified a specific formula used to determine the growth rate of college enrollment. The applicant identified the projected rate for college enrollment through the SY 2016 - 2017 school year. The data was presented via a chart reflecting demographic student groups an the targeted populations (ELL, SWD, Economically Disadvantaged).

(e) The applicant identified a 4% increase per year.

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section. The information supported an ambitious yet achievable plan. An upgrade would reflect the applicant providing the specific grade levels as it related to the performance on summative assessments. The chart for the literacy and math section did not define the exact levels (primary, middle, or upper)

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

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

Selection Criteria (B)(1) – Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform: Demonstrating a clear track record of success.

The Springdale School District shared extensive evidence that reflected a clear record of growth.

(a) The applicant share specific longitudinal data over a period that demonstrated growth in priority areas. The applicant included artifacts, as evidence, that supported the records of success. The Appendix B3 clearly shared desegregated demographic data reflecting the performance gains for students more than a four-year period, from 2004 - 2011. The data reflected math and literacy gains over time for students in grade 3 - 9 (composite), ELL students, and SWD. The graph reflects that all of the students named in this category performed higher than the benchmark. The applicant included a chart that reflected the data for student graduation rate for a three-year period.

(b) Based on the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, the definition of low-achieving schools was adjusted. The district identified 9 schools (8 Focus schools and 1 Priority School) that met this criteria. The eight focus schools met their first year school improvement goals but the one Priority School did not meet the benchmark. As a result, the district incorporated the principles from the Turnaround Schools. They named a new principal, re-interviewed faculty, revised the school mission and vision and, implemented a new classroom walk-through system designed to monitor instructional practices.

- The applicant included an example of a school under reform that has demonstrated a nominal gain in Algebra (2%) and an example of increased family engagement. The applicant mentioned other examples of schools that were recognized for their performance growth and achievement
- The applicant shared varied opportunities given to parents and students to communicate information regarding instruction and services. They also shared measures taken to inform stakeholders and improve stakeholder (parent) participation rates

(c) The district makes many efforts to make student performance data available to the public. The applicant shared the following ways in which data is made available to students, educators, and parents:

- A district Facebook account
- A district-developed data dashboard
- Parent and student conferences, no less than two times per year
- Students and parents receive grade reports every five weeks.
- ELDA data on ELL students is provided to teachers
- Students and parents use the data to assist in formulating student goals

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section. The information shared provided a clear view of the districts actions to keep parent and student stakeholders informed. Teachers have access to student information to assist them with informing their instructional practices and communicating to the parents and students. However, the applicant only provided limited information regarding how parents use the data to create goals. The applicant neglected to share the process in which this occurs nor did they include the share the frequency of this collaboration. The applicant did not provide enough information to determine if this level of parent involvement is effective.

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

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

Selection Criteria (B)(2) – Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform: Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.

The Springdale School meets the all requirements as defined by Selection Criteria (B)(2).

The applicant shared that all salaries and expenditures are shared with the public on the district’s website. All audit information is available to the public. The applicant provided website snapshots to show aspects of the district budget, salaries, and expenditures

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section.

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

Selection Criteria (B)(3) – Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform: State context for implementation.

The Springdale School District provided extensive evidence that demonstrates that they can execute the expansion of personalized learning environments in their district.

The applicant provided eleven specific examples of evidence that demonstrated the ability to meet the requirement for the expansion of personal learning environments. The applicant shared specific examples that support evidence of autonomy and support to carry out the work of the RTT-D:

- Each school district can provide updates from ADE to highlight the work of the PARCC consortium
- The district has identified a task force to determine a model that will be used to move away from Carnegie Units
- The district will pilot a state-endorsed program to expand career and technical programs. The high schools will determine which content areas that would benefit or support the expansion

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section. However, only a few examples reflected opportunities for the autonomy of the district.

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

**10**

**10**

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

Selection Criteria (B)(4) – Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform: Stakeholder engagement and support.

The Springdale School District met the benchmark for this Selection Criteria

(a) The applicant provided evidence that the stakeholders were involved and actively participated in the development of the proposal. The applicant provided a timeline reflecting dates of various events/meetings that took place in order to involve stakeholders in the proposal and the development process of this grant. (ii) The district does not have collective bargaining. However, the applicant clearly stated a confidence vote of 70% was secured at each participating site.

(b) The applicant provided various letters from stakeholders supporting the plan. The letters were included in the appendices. These letters were authentic letters of support and were not boiler-plate letters.

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section. The district did an excellent job involving all stakeholders in this process.

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

**5**

**5**

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

Selection Criteria (B)(5) – Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform: Analysis of needs and gaps.

The Springdale School District provided a comprehensive analysis of the needs and gaps.

The applicant identified specific areas that need growth and development. The applicant identified baseline data and established the goals needed to maximizing the personalized learning environment. The district took it a step further by establishing a District Improvement Team (DIT) to analyze the data collected and use that analysis to identify opportunities to close the instructional gaps. The DIT set ambitious goals but, also determined exactly what would need to occur to ensure that the goals are met. The DIT identified areas of upgrade the county needs to address around professional development.

The DIT is charged with analyzing the identified goal and monitoring the outcome of the goals. The applicant shared examples of this monitoring which would be in the form of feedback to staff, on-site professional development opportunities, and established rubrics that would be used during instructional walk-throughs.

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>Selection Criteria (C)(1) –<u>Learning</u>: An approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner.</p> <p>The Springdale School District conveyed how the plan will supported all tenets outlined in the <i>Learning</i> selection criteria.</p>		

(a) The district understands that students must see the link between what they are learning and how this is the key to them meeting their future goals. The district shares four specific opportunities that students have to engage in establishing goals. These opportunities occur via: The Family Literacy Program, personalized learning plans, extended day and year program, and student engagement in goal planning and setting. Also the use of the data dashboard to provide access to student information. Although the applicant shared specific opportunities for students to delve into individualized goal-setting, they did not explicitly share the role of the parent engagement. The applicant also did not share exactly how each of those opportunities would occur. More details related to the "how" would support these claims.

The applicant shared that one way to deepen learning experiences in areas of interest would be by providing students with a coherent curriculum and sound instructional models, creating rigorous and engaging interdisciplinary models, and differentiating instruction. These components will support student learning and students meeting career and college readiness. The applicant also shared the importance of structured professional development. The applicant provided a timeline, deliverables, and the responsible parties.

The district has a heightened awareness to the importance of providing students with access to diverse cultures and contexts. The district has taken opportunities to incorporate into learning. They have foreign language programs and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs in two elementary schools and one high school. They have a viable partnership with the Jones Center to support families by providing access to the information pertaining to college readiness.

The district has developed a new curriculum that promotes the skills needed for the 21st century learner. These skills help students develop their critical thinking which is a key component for career and college readiness.

The applicant provided information related to the timeline, deliverables, responsible parties for each proposed idea in this section.

(b) In order to bolster personalized learning goals, the district uses summative data to help create goals for individual student plans. Plans are revisited with parents, students, and faculty in the Spring of every year. The district incorporates the Family Literacy Model to help students build a culture of support and identify the importance of goal-setting beyond high school. The applicant shares how they want to scale this idea up to incorporate more schools. However, the plan only speaks to how to share the information with that parent. It does not share the exact involvement of the parent or the role of the parent once the Spring meeting occurs.

The applicant shares that the district current has high-quality instructional approaches and environments, including:

- The IB program in two elementary schools and one high school
- 20 AP courses
- Dual enrollment opportunities
- Instructional strategies used to teach students to engage in challenging content
- Earning credit through content mastery as opposed to seat-based Carnegie Units

Although the applicant shared that strategies are taught to students, they did not provide details regarding which strategies were used or how they were embedded into instructional deployment.

The district will scale-up the student interaction with digital learning via instructional tasks. The use of iPads and Netbooks carts in each classroom will assist in access. Teachers are currently required to take a six hour technology course per year. The applicant needed to expand on how they plan to support the students in the use of this technology and how using the technology will translate into increasing student learning and achievement.

The system continually provides feedback to the stakeholders. The district wants to scale-up the current data dashboard system that is in place to increase the data that is provided to parents, students and staff.

(c) The district clearly uses data to inform student goals and learning. The applicant shares various training that the students will receive in order assist the student in being an active member in their goal setting and in their development. The applicant shares how the plan will support students use of tools to assist them in their development but, it does not share the exact objectives of the training the students will receive or how what they learn will directly support them. The applicant continuously reiterated the goals of the proposal and provided a detailed synopsis of how those goals would be met.

The applicant provided specific measures that they will take in order ensure that teacher capacity increases through staff development opportunities.

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the medium-high range for this section. They clearly established opportunities to improve teaching and learning by personalizing the leaning environment for all students. The applicant incorporated the importance of involving the parents in this process and also provided details of how they would be involved. The one area the applicant did not develop regarding the parents related to access to technology in the home and how to ensure that all families have access and the knowledge needed to access student information.

**(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)**

**20**

**17**

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

Selection Criteria (C)(2) –Teaching and Leading: An approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students.

The Springdale School District conveyed how the plan will support all tenets outlined in the *Learning* selection criteria.

(a) The district understands the importance of providing their staff with the necessary support in order to support the reform. The applicant shared the need to scale-up the time teachers have to collaboratively plan together. They have started to identify time to provided common planning for teams. This will increase the conversation around teaching and learning with a student-centered model approach, a focus on career action planning and personal learning goals. They will also use that time to discuss their role as a teacher advisee, expanded use of technology and their evaluation system.

The teacher will use the Gradual Release of Responsibilities model for ELL students in order to promote student engagement in their own learning. Teachers will receive training on this model along with additional training on Cognitive Guided Math, Thinking Mathematically, Balanced Literacy, and how to incorporate the CCSS frame to create personalized learning units (differentiation). The seat-time waiver will allow teachers to bolster this personalized learning opportunity for all students.

The use of the existing data dashboard and the student-centered model will foster increased opportunities for staff to use data to inform their instructional practices.

The district will be piloting the new evaluation system for teachers and principals. The new evaluation system meets the guidelines established by the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. The state has a built-in support model.

(b) The scaled-up data dashboard will allow school leaders and educators to access career action plans, student performance data, personal learning plans, and cross-curricula data. The student-centered model will allow staff to reflect on their instructional approach and student needs.

The staff will pilot the seat-time waiver and incorporate the resources received via trainings (previously mentioned) to create personalized learning environments for all students. The applicant shared that the teachers will continue to incorporate the use of technology and model opportunities for students. The applicant did not incorporate details pertaining to how this modeling and technology incorporation will bolster personalized learning environments for students.

(c) The school leaders will ensure that level-alike teachers have increased common planning time which will lend to discussing the plan needed to incorporate various tools into their lessons. The teachers will have access to student data which will help them inform their instructional practices. The applicant stated that each school will designate coaches to facilitate the common planning and the discussion. Due to the seat-waiver, teachers will have the time needed to create teaching and learning opportunities suited for student needs.

All school leaders and leadership teams will receive training on the new systems put in place designed to support career and college readiness. The applicant inferred that this would be a model in which the leadership will be the trainers. The applicant should included more detailed information pertaining to the specifics regarding the trainings.

(d) The applicant incorporated some important ideas that will assist in bolstering opportunities for students to receive high-quality, effective instruction. The applicant noted that the district adopted the new evaluation method and developed a rubric that clearly defines Effective and Highly Effective Teachers and Principals. The applicant shared that teachers will receive specific feedback on an ongoing basis and that they will be recognized for their "outstanding performance." However, the applicant did not include the specific look-fors that lends itself to effective instruction or leadership practices. More detailed information in the section would provide increased clarity.

Overall, the Springdale School District identified and provided information related to all of the tenets. As a result the score is in the medium to high range.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<p><b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Selection Criteria (D)(1) –LEA practices, policies, and rules: The extent to which the applicant has a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p> <p>The Springdale School District conveyed information outlined in this selection criterion.</p> <p>D1 (a) The applicant provided detailed information related to how the district is organized and the roles and responsibilities of specific individuals who support all schools. The applicant also incorporated information related to the roles and responsibilities of individual groups and individuals in place to support the grant. The shared information pertaining to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Implementation Task Force</li> <li>• A Project Manger</li> <li>• Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA)</li> <li>• The Director of Improvement, Research and Evaluation</li> </ul> <p>(b) All schools will be provided with flexibility and autonomy over school schedules, calendars, personal decisions staff selection, and the management of their school level budgets.</p> <p>(c) The district gives students opportunities to progress based on mastering the indicators at their on pace. This is possible due to the seat-waiver pilot. The district will pilot the seat-waiver to provide students an opportunity to earn credits once content is mastered as opposed to the Carnegie Unit. The district is being supported by the the state, the board and parent stakeholders in the development of this proposal and model.</p> <p>(d) The applicant shared ways that the district provides multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of content. They use the eight core competencies outlined by CCSS to guide these opportunities for students in math, public exhibitions (student presentations), end of course assessments, task presentation, and opportunities for public speaking.</p> <p>(e) The district ensures that students with disabilities and ELL students receive equal access to the curriculum. They ensure this by providing one-on-one support, instructional specialists, resources to teachers, and assistants. The district also tends to the social, emotional needs of students and their families.</p> <p>Overall, the Springdale School District scored high on this section. The applicant shared specific practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p>		

Selection Criteria (D)(2): LEA practices, policies, and rules: The LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning.

The Springdale School District conveyed a plan that would support the infrastructure of proposal.

(a) (b) The applicant identified pathways needed to create a viable personalized learning environment. The applicant discussed the components that will support students in this skill attainment. The applicant shared that all school staff and parent stakeholders would have access to student performance data. However, the information pertaining to parent access was not clear. The applicant did not share if all parents have technology access at home or if they will be provided with access at home. The applicant needed to provide additional information pertaining to the training plan that will be in place to ensure that all parent stakeholders are engaged in the process and are active members in this process.

(c) The applicant shared that the district was in the process of bidding on a data system to strengthen the districts current system and make it more user-friendly. The applicant shared the goal of this system which is ultimately to keep parents informed and engaged in their students education. However, the applicant did not provide a timeline related to the training of parents or address technology access in homes.

(d) The district currently has a data dashboard in place. They are looking to scale-up the system to refine the data pool and increase opportunities for stakeholders to use the data to inform the instructional programs for all students. The applicant did not share a detailed plan related to the particular tenet.

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the middle to high range on this section.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>Selection Criteria (E)(1) – Continuous improvement process</p> <p>The Springdale School District conveyed a plan that would support the tenets outlined in this selection criterion.</p> <p>The applicant shared the moral and fiscal responsibility that is attached to the RTT –D budget. The applicant clearly established a sense of integrity as it relates to ensuring that the funds are appropriately allocated. The applicant clearly establishes that all of the goals identified were developed based on an established theory of action. As a result, the goals are aligned to needs for improvement. The applicant noted that a system of continuous feedback and reflection will be designed to monitor the goals and provide opportunities for continuous improvement. The applicant shared the role of many teams along with the role of the superintendent are to ensure that the plan is implemented with integrity. The DIT will be involved with the facilitation of presentations and identification of needed opportunities for professional development.</p> <p>The Project Manager will monitor and collect data pertaining to the individual goals and publish the findings. The Director of Improvement, Research, and Evaluation will collect teacher and principal evaluation data and use that data to provide guidance toward improvement efforts.</p> <p>The applicant clearly outlined how they will use regular and responsible feedback as the foundation toward continuous student improvement. However, the applicant did not share a specific timeline.</p> <p>Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the higher range on this section.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

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

Selection Criteria (E)(2) – Continuous improvement process

The Springdale School District established a comprehensive plan to strategically share information with the public on an ongoing basis.

E(2) The applicant identified multiple measures to share information with all of the stakeholders. The applicant noted that they would share information via:

- Posting all RTT-D information on the district website and Facebook page
- Posting all board minutes reflecting RTT-D information on the district website
- Adding to RTT-D updates to all principal agendas
- Quarterly updates from The Joint Council (teacher committee)

The district will establish a Community Partners committee. The CP meeting will be held three times annually to share information related to communication channels, timelines, data, and reporting of responsibilities. The district will make adjustment based on CP feedback.

The district will share grant progress monthly at Patron Shelf Meetings, which include: community leaders, city council members, representatives from community organizations, and parents. The district will also share information at City Council PTA meetings.

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the high range for this section.

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

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

Selection Criteria (E)(3) – Continuous improvement process

The Springdale School District provided explicit information for this section.

(a) The applicant explicitly stated the school reform goals which were ambitious yet achievable. The applicant clearly identified a rationale, methodology, and the continuous improvement needed to support each goal. Each rationale was explicit and related directly to what is needed to support the reform. An example of a viable rationale was in support of the "highly effective principals and teachers are proven to have an impact on student achievement. The applicant's rationale cited the districts involvement in a study called, The Widget Effect. The findings noted that the current model of analyzing teachers did not discriminate skill levels of teachers and principals. Therefore adopting the new evaluation system will support previous findings and bolster the district's ability to establish a more reliable way to discriminate between effective and highly effective staff. The methodology established how each objective will be carried out and the continuous improvement provided an outcome.

The plan has the appropriate number of performance measures required. The performance measure were clearly identified. The plan clearly established the rate of growth over time.

The Springdale School District met all parameters of this section.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
--	----------	----------

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

Selection Criteria (E)(4) – “Ambitious yet achievable” plan

The applicant established opportunities to identify ways to determine the effectiveness of described funding as it pertains to the grant. The Director of Improvement, Research, and Evaluation will supervise the evaluation process. Investments in professional development will be collaboratively monitored by the district and the University of Arkansas. The applicant established that the funds would be used to scale-up the plan to ensure long-term sustainability. The applicant reiterated the importance of closely monitoring the technology integration and closely monitoring professional development for teachers. They will analyze the overall impact of the learning by gathering data on enrollment and attendance; academic achievement; and stakeholder satisfaction surveys.

The Springdale School District met all parameters of this section.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Selection Criteria (F)(1) – Budget for the Project</p> <p>(a) The Springdale School District shared a comprehensive budget that will support the proposal.</p> <p>(b) The proposed expenditures are reasonable and support the goal implementation of the plan. The applicant identified specific projects that are in place to support each goal objective. The applicant carefully allocated funds for each project.</p> <p>(c) The applicant provided a coherent rationale for each project. The applicant clearly delineated funds that will be needed for the life of the grant or if the funding was a one-time investment. The applicant also included line items from fund sources outside of the grant that will be used to support the project. The applicant shared the timeline for each project expenditure.</p> <p>Overall, the Springdale School District provided scored in the high range for this section.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Selection Criteria (F)(2) – Sustainability for Project Goals</p> <p>The Springdale School District provided a list of sixteen projects that would derive from this proposal.</p> <p>The applicant shared a list of project goals that are a focus in this proposal. The applicant shared how the projects will be sustained beyond the life of the grant. The applicant identified the following as matching funding sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arkansas department of Education</li> <li>• District funds</li> <li>• Federal Title III funds</li> <li>• State Categorical funds</li> <li>• District Technology funds</li> </ul> <p>The rationale for each project was appropriate and supported the goals of the reform. The overall budget summary chart clearly shares the grant expenditures over the course of the four-year grant period.</p> <p>Overall, the Springdale School District provided scored in the medium high range for this section.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

Competitive Preference Priority

In 2003, The Springdale School District and a group of community leaders established the Springdale Public Schools Education Foundation (SPSEF). The SPSEF was charged with raising private funds to support the school system. The SPSEF in partnership with the Springdale Alumni Foundation and the Springdale Partners in Education support teaching and learning, provide additional educational resources, support social-emotional needs of students and engages a broad-based community support system.

(1) The applicant shared that the SPSEF integrated a myriad of partners who provide financial support and human resources needs to students. There are 12 partnerships that are in place to serve students and families. These partnerships are geared toward supporting students and families with varying needs. There was one partner, The Family Literacy Program that directly supported the ELL students and their families.

(2) The applicant identified eight desired outcomes targeted for ELL students (K-7 and 9-12) and students who fall into the category of low-income. The types of results are geared toward supporting; family, education, and community. The desired outcomes were clearly defined and aligned to student needs.

(3) The applicant shared the student performance data are tracked and for participating students. The school leaders and counselors use data including attendance, discipline, health records, poverty status and homelessness status to target the students and match them to the various programs. The district has identified and decision-making model and infrastructure to select, implement and evaluate the supports to address the individual needs of students. The district is still analyzing protocols to scale-up this support in a methodical way. The district admittedly shared that a more concerted effort to establish overall satisfaction records need to be collected in order to manage the logistics.

(4) The partnerships do not have a clear mode of integration. This is an area that will need to be addressed.

(5) The applicant shared that SPSEF builds the capacity of all staff and partners via an annual meeting where all partners and school personnel meet to share mutual needs. The applicant did not explicitly share how the partnership would assist teachers in increasing their ability to meet the needs of their students. The applicant did not provide explicit ways in which, parents are involved in the decision-making process to improve student results over time.

Overall, the Springdale School District scored in the medium range for this section. More detailed information is needed to get a clear picture of the role of the partnerships as it relates to teachers and parents. Also, additional information pertaining to the plan to integrate these partnerships to ensure continuity of services for students and families.

**Absolute Priority 1**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>	<b>Met/Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The Springdale School District did an excellent job creating a comprehensive and well thought-out plan. The vision and the beliefs of this school district were woven throughout the application. The applicant clearly identified the three goals that were collaboratively identified to support educational reform. The applicant clearly identified the importance of

ongoing professional development, collaborative planning, and ongoing feedback to create a personalized learning environment for all students and in turn increase student achievement. The applicant conveyed the importance of working collaboratively with stakeholders to establish a network of support to meet the needs of students and families. The applicant is committed to accelerated instruction and deepening the learning experiences for students in order to prepare students for career and college readiness. The use of the new evaluation system for teachers and principals coupled with the seat-time waiver pilot program from the state, students will have increased access to effective educators, quality instruction, and increased opportunities to master indicators in an individualized learning environment.

This is a strong and competitive application.

Total	210	186
-------	-----	-----



## Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0319AR-4 for Springdale School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a comprehensive and well-written plan. Its reform vision aligns with the Race To The Top core assurances by using the whole child approach to education as defined by the ASCD (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development). For example, the applicant will train all teachers in Cognitive Guided Mathematics model that promotes the use of process skills defined in Common Core State Standards. The applicant has identified three main goals: accelerating student achievement, deepen student learning through the use of technology, and personalizing student learning strategies. Specific objectives for each meeting each goal have been outlined, i.e. scaling up its existing pre-K programs in order to accelerate learning for high needs students.

The district is well supported by over 150 community business and university partners. Letters of support are thoughtful and show a deep understanding of the plan goals.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant’s approach to implementing their reform proposal begins with participant selection. The selection process uses two methods of identification. First, participating schools were selected based on the ESEA Flexibility Waiver request that identified Priority (bottom 5%) and Focus Schools (bottom 15%). Secondly, all of the schools selected meet the 40% free or reduced lunch criteria - participating schools are high poverty schools with 70% or more children receiving free or reduced lunch assistance.

The applicant has provided extensive data (in table format) listing each participating school's raw data and percentages that meet and exceed grant requirements. This demographic data identifies both student and teacher information. The estimated number of participating students is over 16,000.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has developed a high-quality plan, sharing its vision for reform. The goals and objectives will be scaled up to show meaningful reform and support district-wide change. The applicant provides a table that summarizes the goals and objectives, as evidenced by its methodical and detailed presentation. Each goal is identified with specific objectives listing “scaled up” projects, short and long term outcomes and resources to be used to reach their goals. For example: information provided in the table for Goal 3 – Increasing equity through personalized learning, presents objectives, i.e. participation as a pilot site for the Seat Time Requirement Waiver where an alternative to the Carnegie credit system is established.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The goals for improved student outcomes are outlined. Baseline assessment data (2011) establishes the number and percentage of students who are at proficiency level or above. The summative data submitted is based on the

current assessment system with growth trajectories that have been calculated and established for each student. The goals are ambitious and achievable as evidenced by the Math Performance growth for the African American subgroup that grows from 65.04 in 2011 to 79.61 by 2016. The methodology for determining growth is provided - the formulas used to set the goals are defined overall and for each subgroup. The applicant has presented a specific methodology for determining the decrease in achievement gap based on the gap between TAGG students and all students performance over the next six years.

High school graduation rate data baselines at SY 2010-2011. The high school graduation rate over time is ambitious and achievable as evidenced by its gradual increased graduation rate overall and by subgroups. The table for the graduation rate goal demonstrates this gradual improved expectation. For example, the graduation rate for English Language Learners grows from 71.95 percent in year 2011 to the goal of 83.64 percent by 2016. The current college enrollment rate overall is 46.37% with growth at 73.19% by SY 2016-17.

Optional postsecondary degree increases are projected at an overall increase of 4% per year, a reasonable and achievable goal.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of improved student learning and achievement. The district underwent a Quality Assurance Review and Audit in (2010-2011). External evaluators identified growth in the following areas: closing the achievement gap, increased diversity in instructional staff, improving current data system, and aligning curriculum to college and career-ready standards. The audit results provided information that will be used to implement change where needed. The applicant provides trend data that shows improved student outcomes over the past five years as evidenced by its graduation rate increase from 78.5% in 2010 to 80%. Annual school performance report cards list achievements in their lowest achieving and low-performing schools.

The district was selected to participate in an investigate study known as The Widget Effect. The study identified a high need for change in teacher evaluation. A new teacher evaluation will be in place by SY2013-14. Resources for this grant will be used to build on to their data collection system, improving the way performance data is distributed to stakeholders. Achievement data is shared through public presentations, newspapers, and posted on the district's website. The district has developed a data dashboard where parents and students can access real-time assignments and grades. The data dashboard provides ongoing data information that is used to inform instruction, and improve participation and services. Parent Teacher conferences are well attended. Progress reports and report cards provide ongoing student improvement and intervention as needed.

The District Instructional Team will monitor and analyze the data throughout the project. The team will be involved in Teacher evaluation, professional development and will aid in making adjustments as needed.

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of improved student learning and achievement. The district underwent a Quality Assurance Review and Audit in (2010-2011). External evaluators identified growth in the following areas: closing the achievement gap, increased diversity in instructional staff, improving current data system, and aligning curriculum to college and career-ready standards. The audit results provided information that will be used to implement change where needed. The applicant provides trend data that shows improved student outcomes over the past five years as evidenced by its graduation rate increase from 78.5% in 2010 to 80%. Annual school performance report cards list achievements in their lowest achieving and low-performing schools.

The district was selected to participate in an investigate study known as The Widget Effect. The study identified a high need for change in teacher evaluation. A new teacher evaluation will be in place by SY2013-14. Resources for this grant will be used to build on to their data collection system, improving the way performance data is distributed to stakeholders. Achievement data is shared through public presentations, newspapers, and posted on the district's website. The district has developed a data dashboard where parents and students can access real-time assignments and grades. The data dashboard provides ongoing data information that is used to inform instruction, and improve participation and services. Parent Teacher conferences are well attended. Progress reports and report cards provide ongoing student improvement and intervention as needed.

The District Instructional Team will monitor and analyze the data throughout the project. The team will be involved in Teacher evaluation, professional development and will aid in making adjustments as needed.

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

**5**

**5**

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

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

The applicant has met the requirements.

The applicant has an active district website, where school level information is published. School expenditures and personnel salaries for school-level instructional staff and teachers are made available on this website.

In addition, districts are required by the state to submit a budget to the department annually. The information is published and made available to all stakeholders.

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

**10**

**9**

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

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

The district has sufficient autonomy under state legal and regulatory requirements as evidenced by its extensive list of state initiatives that support implementation of personalized learning environments. For example, professional development in the use of high quality strategies and tools in a personalized learning environment will be provided. The strategies and tools align with College and Career-ready standards. The applicant has provided a realistic timeline for implementation of common core standards. State provided reading, math, and science specialists work with teachers in a regional cooperative. This state level support is key in the implementation of an expanded effort in personalized learning environments.

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

**10**

**9**

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

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

The proposal describes extensive evidence of stakeholder participation in the development of the plan. Stakeholders are identified along with a timeline documenting their participation. The timeline outlines activities focused on the development of the plan, participants, and opportunities for feedback. The feedback from stakeholders was used in development of the plan. Administrators, faculty, patrons and community partners have been involved in the systematic development of the project. Letters of support are included in the appendix. The letters of support have been received from community leaders, students, parents and staff and show enthusiastic support for the grant. The applicant is a district without collective bargaining representation. Therefore, the plan has been presented to each participating school faculty, receiving a confidence vote of at least 70% in support of the project.

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

**5**

**4**

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

A thorough needs analysis has been conducted by the district with baseline data collection from a variety of sources. Achievement and trend data has been included for the current and past three years and will be used to establish current status in implementing personalized learning environments. External evaluation data, accreditation procedures, and surveys were used in developing the plan. The district assembled a District Improvement Team responsible for reviewing the data and identifying multiple improvement needs and gaps. The feedback from parents, students, and faculty has provided extensive information as to technology, professional development and parent involvement.

The baseline data collected will be used as they develop an improvement plan for personalizing student learning, accelerating student academic achievement and college readiness.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative describes the need for each student to have personal goals in order to understand what they are learning and how to accomplish the goals. Students have been engaged in goal setting activities through personal learning plans that have been implemented in the district for ten years. The plans are developed in the fall of each year and are reviewed throughout the year in order to make timely adjustments toward meeting the goals. The district has adopted the Common Core Standards and is in the process of developing new curricula that engages all learners in an individualized learning environment. Common Core Standards are aligned to college and career ready standards and graduation requirements. The applicant plans to scale-up digital learning content and lists tools and resources that are high quality and directly aligned to goals. The district plans to create and refine formative assessments and addresses the high quality strategies and accommodations needed for struggling students. Students and families are given opportunities to review the transition to common core standards. Multiple training and support opportunities will be made available throughout the grant years.

The applicant has outlined and presents in table format, goals, initiatives, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties. The plan identifies and defines three major goals: accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and expanding personalized learning. The goals have been clearly presented and the objectives within each goal are detailed. The rationale and research base for each objective is included. For example; the district is scaling up its Career Action Plan. The timeline for revising their current PLP and CAP models will begin in January 2014 with the intent of implementation beyond grant years. The responsible parties for the design and implementation will be the District Improvement Team.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district has designed a plan that is comprehensive and aligns to the goals. Programs and initiatives are in place to support the district in meeting the goals. Collaborative planning time will be expanded to allow participating teachers to receive training in the development and implementation of professional learning communities, focusing on effective implementation of personalized learning environments. All participating teachers will have access to coaching as the project is developed and implemented. The focus will be on curriculum development, career action planning and personal learning plans. The district is committed to providing teachers and students with necessary tools, data, and resources to improving individualized learning as evidenced by its focus on expanding the use of technology.

An improved teacher evaluation system will assist schools in assessing teacher effectiveness, enabling students to receive instruction from identified high-quality teachers. A new teacher/Principal/Superintendent evaluation system meets all guidelines for the ESEA Flexibility Waiver and will be put into practice.

Again, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties are identified in the plan with sufficient support for successful implementation.

The plan addresses the need and use of technology for data collection and individualized instruction.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA central office is organized to provide support and services to RTT-D participating schools to facilitate learning. The Superintendent is fully supportive (as expressed in a letter of support). This extensive support is evidenced by the assignment of highly trained experts to this project. The central office has assigned three Curriculum and Instruction experts to be directly involved in the implementation of the grant. Associate Superintendents will oversee curriculum, assessment and accountability. Assistant Superintendents will work onsite at the building level to ensure fidelity as implementation progresses.

Participating schools with have flexibility and autonomy in local school management procedures. They will have autonomy to generate school schedules and calendars and leadership teams will have direct involvement in personnel selection, staffing roles, budgets and scheduling.

The applicant is piloting an alternative to the Carnegie Unit’s seat time requirement. This alternative focuses on student progress measured by competency rather than time. Students were allowed to test out of basic courses by demonstrating that they have met the competencies. Mastery learning strategies with frequent assessment and monitoring activities will be endorsed. Examples of demonstrated mastery learning strategies include the use of rubrics and peer-editing processes in secondary English classrooms.

Multiple learning resources and instructional practices are accessible and adaptable to all students – including high-needs students, students with disabilities and English Language Learners. School specialists and instructional staff provide in-class support as needed. The applicant describes support for families and students outside the school

day. Their migrant program ensures that migrant students have access to health programs, tutorial services and multiple academic resources. Community programs and donations provide medical and dental support to students as needed.

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

**10**

**9**

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has designed a high quality plan, setting goals that are ambitious and achievable with implementation procedures that will allow them to meet their goals.

The proposal describes how the LEA and school infrastructure supports scaling up personalized learning across the district by ensuring that each student enters school ready to learn, has math and reading foundation skills, parent engaged activities, college and career readiness skills, access to technology and has a personal learning plan. The applicant gives examples of specific infrastructure support. For example, the ESL Department will support all activities targeting ELL students. The infrastructure supports professional development in the area of grade level content, technology access and usage. Partnerships will be established to promote service learning projects and family literacy.

Goals are set to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning and increase equity through equal access to resources and technical support. The acquisition of a comprehensive information technology system is a major focus of the grant proposal.

The applicant is reviewing technology vendors, seeking an all-inclusive interoperable data system that allows parents and students to export data to other electronic systems.

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

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

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

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

The applicant has met the requirements.

The applicant includes a rigorous continuous improvement process that will provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward meeting goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvement to the grant during grant funded years and beyond. The improvement process builds off of progress toward and the achievement of outcomes described earlier in the proposal. The applicant's strategy for rigorous continuous improvement addresses frequent progress monitoring of academic growth and instructional practices. Professional development, professional learning communities, and the integration of coaching and mentoring help with school improvement and progress toward meeting grant goals. The periodic monitoring allows for timely modification of individual learning plans. This ongoing data collection process will be shared with stakeholders. The Project Manager will collect and maintain data and publish reports of progress. The District Improvement Team will coordinate goal activities and oversee a system of evaluation. An evaluation component is provided for each project. This ongoing monitoring will be shared publicly in meetings, conversations, and through printed and electronic media.

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

**5**

**5**

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

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

The applicant has met the requirements.

The applicant's plan provides for ongoing communication and engagement. This ongoing communication and engagement is evident through the following: continuous progress of the grant will be posted on the district's website and facebook; information will be shared in monthly school board meetings with minutes published on the website; updates of RTT-D at principal meetings; and Joint Council quarterly updates. Community Partners will establish communication channels with patrons, parents and all stakeholders. The communication channels will provide all stakeholders with input opportunities throughout the grant. The applicant will complete all USDOE required reports, and looks forward to collaborating with other forums.

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

**5**

**5**

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

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

The applicant has met the requirements.

The applicant has set ambitious and achievable performance measures with annual targets and has formulated gradual trajectories for improvement. The applicant has outlined each performance measure, rationale, methodology, and targets continuous improvement. Each performance measure is addressed by whole group participation and by subgroups, setting baselines and yearly targets. For example: the number and percentage of

grade 3 students who reach or exceed their grade level benchmark in reading: Rationale; 3<sup>rd</sup> grade is a pivotal year for being on target for college and career readiness; Methodology; benchmark data for the number and percentage of students meeting proficiency standards and the growth performance by SY2014-15. The on-track for graduation performance measure gives overall and subgroup baseline data with yearly progress data. The applicant has designed a high quality approach to implementation that allows for timely adjustments and changes as needed.

The applicant has explained each performance measure, the rationale for selecting the measure, its methodology, and targets for continuous improvement.

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

**5**

**5**

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has met the requirements.

Evaluation activities will incorporate cost effective analyses to outcomes of interventions and improvement strategies. The analysis is tied directly to the logic model and will enable the district to determine successful programs that are cost-effective. The evaluation process will be supervised by the Director of Improvement, Research, and Evaluation. Additional evaluation data will include enrollment and attendance, and stakeholder satisfaction surveys.

Technology evaluation will be an ongoing process. In addition to data collection, technology will be implemented as a learning tool, research tool, and an aid to problem-based learning. The district is committed to sustainability of the project.

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

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

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the goals of this project. The budget narrative and tables are comprehensive, addressing each grant requirement. The applicant clearly provides a thorough and thoughtful rationale for its investments and priorities as evidenced by its commitment to scale up the Pre-K program. The district proposes to add 5 additional classrooms for pre-school activities and has budgeted \$280,000 during the grant period. Extensive charts are provided for each budget -The overall budget, and each project budget identify timelines and deliverables, along with cost and responsibility.

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

**10**

**10**

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Sustainability has been addressed for each Project goal. The applicant provides a list of each project with strategies for sustainability beyond the grant funding years. This project listing is comprehensive and includes extensive documentation of support from state and government leaders as well as financial support. For example, Project 7 – College and Career Readiness Programs; nine college and career coaches will be sustained through existing ADE funding budgets and Title I parent involvement funds. The applicant has designed a reasonable high quality plan.

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The district has presented a comprehensive plan meeting the requirements of RTT-D. The proposal has addressed the development of sustainable partnerships that will support the plan beyond grant funding years. In alignment with the Whole Child approach to education, the partnership will promote the highest quality of education, support the teaching process, and provide additional educational resources not otherwise available. The Family literacy and parent involvement project has been specifically addressed as a key support system for students reaching college and career-readiness. Goals have been set for improving education and family supports, recognizing the importance of parent and family support and including them in the decision-making process for participating students. The applicant's education foundation pairs businesses to local schools, providing additional educational resources, supports the social, educational and emotional needs of students. The foundation integrates a large network of partners who provide financial and human resources as needed by specific schools. Annual performance measures are ambitious and results are achievable.

**Absolute Priority 1**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>	<b>Met/Not Met</b>	<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has created a comprehensive plan that meets the requirements for Absolute Priority 1.

The applicant has addressed how it will build on RTT-D core educational areas, and has created a plan to improve individualized learning environments. The project will implement strategies designed to improve teacher quality, ensuring that students with highest needs are taught by high quality teachers. The applicant has designed a project that will support student improvement through personalizing student learning, providing tools and strategies specific to skill development and mastery, and the use of technology to assist with goal achievement.

The goals of improving graduation rates, and college and career-readiness are reasonable and achievable.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>196</b>
--------------	------------	------------

