



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0231OR-1 for Hillsboro School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The vision described by Hillsboro applicants clearly articulates a credible approach that could accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning and increase equity through a personalized learning approach involving technology. Their comprehensive vision incorporates recommendations from the National Education Technology Plan as well as Institute of Education's Doing What Works Clearinghouse. Some issues addressed and indicators are:

1.) an increase in and deepening of student learning.

This is evidenced by the plan to promote an inquiry-based curriculum and connect to the real world through the use of IPADs by both students and teachers. Another indicator of increasing and deepening student learning is the focus on the portfolio capabilities of the data system that will allow all stakeholders (students, teachers, parents, etc.) to reflect on the academic growth of students as seen in multiple pieces of evidence. Also, the proposed online age and grade-level rubrics will clarify expectations for all grade levels.

2.) assessment across the system.

This is evidenced by the multiple layers of assessment data that will be gathered using the new integrated technology system allowing ubiquitous access on many levels of the district. Auto-alerts for students not meeting targets are one example of the impact this seamless assessment system could have on decision-making in the Hillsboro district.

3.) support for teachers and leaders.

Evidence for this lies in the fact that there is a plan to create a Personalized Learning Task Force made up of effective teachers and principals that will act as Subject Matter Experts as the overall district plan is implemented. These people will serve as support for all teachers and leaders across the district. Another way there is support for teachers and leaders is in the fact that Instructional Coaches are embedded in the district through this plan. As building-based staff developers, they will be able to support teachers, leaders, and each other as this new initiative unfolds. Finally, the incorporation of a Professional Learning Community culture in Hillsboro will help teachers support each other day to day throughout the year.

4.) the design for infrastructure

Hillsboro has a thoughtful plan to build on existing infrastructure as they implement this Race to the Top model. The NextGen system will enhance existing capabilities and is broad enough and deep enough to be useful for many years to come.

5.) a plan to increase productivity and efficiencies for students, staff and resources

Thinking ahead in planning, Hillsboro has addressed multiple issues that could become potential roadblocks to success. For example, in choosing to go the broadband route for technology, they have addressed the need to embrace technology that will last longer and be more efficient than quicker fixes might have been.

In seeking out the myriad of community partners they have such as Intel, the city administrators, the parks and recreation department, etc., the Hillsboro district is ensuring there is strong communication between these various entities and there

will be cohesion in the implementation of the plan and little duplication of services. This shows Hillsboro is planning to make good use of the district and community resources and expertise as this high quality plan goes forward.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro applicants provided well-designed charts articulating the demographics of the district and described their plan to roll out the implementation of their plan.

a.) Hillsboro sees the need for shifting the current delivery model of instruction used in their district. The plan to develop a personalized learning model for the students and teachers stems from multiple sources including the District Report Card results where students with limited English proficiency, black students and students with disabilities were noted as not meeting benchmarks on the 2010-11 Report Card. These results were not new to Hillsboro as the previous years' report cards indicated similar issues. The Oregon Healthy Teen survey information about the population they are educating in Hillsboro schools gave leaders other information that would help them address needs of their dropout and graduation rates. Results led Hillsboro to plan to start pilot programs for personalized learning in elementary schools and provide tablets to every teacher in the district in year one and then add more layers of implementation in the following years. This type of thoughtful implementation stems from lessons Hillsboro has learned in the past from previous district initiatives and from studying other Race to the Top plans and should lead to effective implementation of this model.

Always using assessment information to make decisions, Hillsboro is exploring options of what accommodations will meet the needs of their targeted populations of LEP, black and students with disabilities within the first year of implementation. This shows they are conscious of their target areas and will address those with interventions as the years proceed.

b.)The Hillsboro district meets eligibility for the RTT grant with more than 50% of their clients qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch. The district administrators chose to implement their plan district-wide to touch all students' needs.

c.) The total number of participating students is about 20,500 with 50% of those from low-income families. There are 3,300 English language learners and 2,600 students receiving special education services. All participating schools are listed in charts in application.

Overall, this section deems a score in the high range. The plan is articulated clearly. The grant criteria have been addressed and the participating population is noted.

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

10

8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

There are indicators that Hillsboro has put forward a high-quality plan.

a. Goals are clearly listed. An example of how well understood these 5 key goals are is that they appear in every letter of support from outside stakeholders so that they too are cognizant of the goals for this Hillsboro project. Although the applicants gave the teachers' association the required time to respond, the absence of the response could be a concern.

b. Activities are described in a 23-point listing in the application. They seem thoughtfully planned and inclusive. Possible concerns are the logic in focusing on technology to address ELL student literacy needs.

c. Timelines are coherent and reasonable. Based on the previous experience Hillsboro has in implementing technology initiatives, there is some basis for deciding on the roll-out model they have included here where there are pilot schools and then additional schools added later.

d. Deliverables are articulated along with the timeline. (i.e. student learning will improve at least 3% each year over the 4-year period for all students.)

e. The key administrators and/or position holders that will be responsible for aspects of the implementation and what their responsibilities will be are included. (i.e. Kathy Robinson is responsible for interactions with national evaluators as well as data collection and assessment monitoring.)

f. Overall credibility of the plan is in the high range. The two concerns are

- 1.) the lack of clear evidence of buy-in from the majority of district teachers
- 2.) the logic in expecting the use of technology to significantly address the issues of English language learners.

OVERALL

Although most of the information for A(3) seems to be addressed in the earlier sections A(1) and A(2) such as the plan to scale up to middle and high schools in the district, there is a need to include a finalized statement of how this plan will specifically address outcome goals.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro has demonstrated some positive trends that would indicate their vision would result in improved student learning and increased equity for students throughout their district. Their expectations for improvement in the areas of performance on assessments, closing achievement gaps, increasing graduation rates and improving college enrollment rates seem realistic and achievable for the most part.

PERFORMANCE ON ASSESSMENTS

a. The district report card for 2010-11 (Illustration 3) shows more categories as met from 2007 through 2011. In Language Arts the change was from 5 categories met in 2007 to 7 categories met in 2011. In particular, the Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups showed progress.

b. The 2010-11 Final AYP report for reading shows that Hillsboro met the academic status target goal in all categories except students with learning disabilities, but that group met the academic growth target.

Although there has been progress in the last year, there is some concern in these areas:

a. Progress is not consistent in Math for all subgroups from year to year. There were more subgroups that did NOT meet in 2009-10 than in 2008-2009. Although the 2010-11 listing showed more categories had been met, this indicates there may not be a solid approach to math instruction that supports all students no matter which group is currently in the system.

b. Cohorts of students in the Hillsboro system may not be progressing as much as the overall scores appear. For example, in reading, the group of students that were 3rd graders in 2007-08 went from 82% meeting and exceeding standards to 77% meeting and exceeding standards as 5th graders in 2009-10. Similarly, 6th graders in 2007-08 went from 75% meeting and exceeding in reading to 63% meeting and exceeding by the time they were 8th graders. (Appendix B)

Although expectations for growth on the state test are realistic at 3%, the Hillsboro plan has not specifically addressed the focus on literacy instruction that may be hampering the overall improvement of students throughout the district. The far-reaching goal of 10% increase in reading achievement for high need students each successive year of the grant plan timeline is truly ambitious and sets a high bar for those students and staff to achieve.

ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

Thorough study of the gaps through the use of the Pareto Analysis led to targeted focus of the vision designed for 4 identified groups: ELL students with disabilities, ELL students in general, and Hispanic male students at 6 elementary schools and Black students in math. Based on the history of the district before this analysis, there was an increasing achievement gap across the district as noted in the Appendix A (increase from 45 to 50 in math and 40 to 60 in reading

drawn from the 2010-11 to 2011-12 data). It is not certain that the plan to use technology will address the needs of ELL students in particular.

Although there is an expectation that the new focus on personalized learning will support those groups in most need throughout the district, the Hillsboro plan does not specifically include ideas for summer and other extended learning opportunities (extended day and Saturdays) that would ensure those targeted groups of Hillsboro students are guided in their instruction and would be accelerating their academic achievement in order to close the gap that exists. The 3% increase target for all students seems realistic on the state assessments. The 5-10% increase target on the state assessments sets the bar high for those populations (ELL, Black males in math, and students with disabilities) that are the focus of this grant.

The overall plan to decrease the gap in reading and math with the annual decrease set at 5% for the high need population is a laudable goal and is within reason to achieve as a deliverable in a high-quality plan.

GRADUATION RATES AND COLLEGE ENROLLMENT RATES

Hillsboro sets their graduation expectations to coincide with the state of Oregon plan by 2025 to have

- 40% of the population hold bachelor's degree or higher
- 40% of the population hold an associates degree or credential
- 20% of the population hold a high school diploma

Because this plan includes baseline data, the targets of 5% increase for the high needs population are an expectation that remains to be realized. Likewise, the data for college enrollment is also a baseline and projections will have to be tested. This goal of 5% increase does seem like an ambitious, yet achievable goal.

OVERALL

This places Hillsboro District in the high end of the middle range. While the targets are ambitious for all of the groups identified, the determined focus of Hillsboro to make a difference for these students, the success from the last few years, and the culture of data-driven decision-making at Hillsboro will likely lead to a successful outcome.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	8
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
Hillsboro has had some success last year targeting their areas of need. Their increasing use of data to focus intervention will be key to build on that in the future.		

a.) As described in (A)(4), although the last year of scores shows solid results in student achievement, there are inconsistencies in the trends of improvement over the last 4 years. Gaps are increasing and a sampling of cohort results does not indicate that the progress Hillsboro has made is due to solid system-wide programs in teaching reading.

b.) From 2008-09 to 2009-2010, Henry Elementary went from In Need of Improvement to Satisfactory on the District Report Card. This is evidence of Hillsboro targeting support to one of its lowest performing schools. An area of concern is that there was a definite downward shift in schools rated above the basic level of Satisfactory on the District Report Card from 2007 to 2010. In 2007-08 there were 20 schools listed ABOVE the basic level of Satisfactory. In 2009-2010, there were only 10.

c.) The various formats of communication that Hillsboro has used over the years to keep all stakeholders abreast of district information are impressive. This strong effort should only be enhanced by the integration of the technology data system they propose to use in the future.

OVERALL

Because of the uneven results in student achievement mentioned previously in (A)(4) and above coupled with the downward shift in school ratings, there is some concern that the vision described by Hillsboro may not be the exact match for the issues they face. Yet, they are keenly aware of their challenges because of the focus on using data at the district level. The scoring for this section remains in the low middle range because of these factors.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro has described the comprehensive system of transparency existing in their district. They use multiple outlets such as website, news media, flyers and brochures, etc. to ensure their constituents are kept informed of district business.

a. This includes financial statements that are available 24/7 online containing information about personnel salaries of instructional staff, teachers, and other non-personnel expenditures at the school level.

b. A myriad of other information about Hillsboro such as District Report Cards, district events and parent information, curriculum and assessment information, etc. are available to keep the stakeholders associated with Hillsboro in tune with district operations.

Because of this level of transparency and their commitment to maintaining this kind of communication stance as a goal in their high-quality plan, Hillsboro has built a high level of trust with stakeholders. Although the application states that the district website allows the public the ability to download the various communications, assurance that families who do not have access to the website are still kept informed through other means is a missing piece.

Overall, this puts Hillsboro in the high end of the high range for this section.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro's use of the Common Core Standards, the teacher evaluation model and noted key outcomes for school districts in the state of Oregon provide a framework around which their plan of personalized learning can be built.

While meeting the state expectations, Hillsboro has autonomy to adopt their vision of personalized learning for their students and staff.

A number of initiatives that Hillsboro has already pursued and implemented such as the NextGen Accountability System and their Data Center Application system are aligned with the state of Oregon's 40-40-20 goal for high school and college graduation rates as well as SB 290 which deal with accountability across the school system.

Because of Hillsboro's consistent attention to the state requirements and initiatives, they are able to translate state policy into local actions. This serves them well and they score in the high end of the high range for this section.

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

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro has involved multiple stakeholders in this proposal.

a.) Although there are many opportunities listed in Appendix D for various stakeholders to be informed about this specific proposal, the description in (B)(4) does not link those groups to the development of this RTT proposal. The bigger concern is that there is no letter of endorsement or description of meetings with teachers who will be implementing this proposal's ideas.

b.) The list of stakeholders endorsing this proposal come from many layers of the learning community including the city, the business community, social agencies, students, parents, etc.

Because of these factors mentioned above, this section has earned middle range score.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The Hillsboro district has demonstrated that they have most features of a high-quality plan for analyzing their current status and how they will proceed during the implementation phase.

Key Goals include

- reaching out to students through a system of adult advocates so students can set their own goals and be supported to achieve them

- ensuring access to data for all so that data-driven decisions can be made, and

- using the Pareto analysis to identify populations that need to be targeted for expanding outreach

By zeroing in on the targeted populations (ELL, Black boys in math, etc.), the Hillsboro district has cut through the mountain of data available to them to focus their interventions and support.

While listing the activities and parties responsible for their plan after the needs analysis, there is no specific timeline or specific deliverables mentioned in this section.

This section is an indication of the quality of their current status analysis, but also shows where there is more information needed and places them in the middle range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	19

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. Hillsboro has a plan that ensures all students have an opportunity to experience deep learning.

a.) Through the use of personal tablets in Hillsboro's high-quality plan, students have the world at their fingertips. They are able to have access and exposure to other cultures and explore areas of their own academic interest. This is one key goal in Hillsboro's plan.

b.) Hillsboro has the system designed to connect the Common Core State Standards to the students' progress through their accountability system and the student is able to save evidence of their competence of those standards through the portfolio in Hillsboro's plan. By using the Common Core Standards and their self-assessment, students will be able to understand the link between what they are learning and what their goals are. Hillsboro's plan requires students to master critical academic content in the Common Core Standards through inquiry learning. Evidence of this learning is kept in the accountability system in Hillsboro's plan. This connection is a powerful link for students and other stakeholders as they evaluate student achievement.

2. There are mechanisms built into Hillsboro's plan to provide multiple supports for students.

a.) Through the personalized technology capabilities built into Hillsboro's plan, students themselves as well as teachers and parents can become more informed of each student's progress toward goals and use the information to seek or provide additional support when needed.

b.) The idea of matching the targeted population identified in Hillsboro's gap analysis with mentors in the community provides an additional support for those students.

c.) Collaborative learning that is part of Hillsboro's plan allows students to develop skills and traits such as teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, problem-solving and creativity as well as communication. The support of peers through this process is one aspect of the plan that Hillsboro has designed for its students.

Because of the broad and creative ways Hillsboro has planned for students to become more involved in their own learning through setting their own goals, providing evidence of their competence and supporting students along that path, this section scores in the high range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1.) Hillsboro does have a plan to increase the capacity of its teachers and leaders in their ability to deliver high-quality instruction.

a.) By involving everyone in Professional Learning Communities, that helps create the culture of learning for all and leads to more powerful teaching.

b.) The technology support will enhance the instructional materials and feedback that Hillsboro's staff is able to use. Technology training is part of the plan.

c.) Through the incorporation of Hillsboro's instructional coaches to individualize staff learning, Hillsboro ensures that the model of personalized learning they are planning for their students parallels that of the personalized learning for the staff in their system too.

2.) Hillsboro has a plan to link adult evaluations to student learning and supports for addressing adult needs.

a.) Through the use of their assessment system, progress of individual students, staff and leaders is able to be readily evaluated. It will provide real-time feedback and can be used for reflection on effectiveness of teaching and leading.

b.) Hillsboro has already identified two low-performing (Focus) schools and taken steps to turn those around through the appointments of new leaders.

This exemplifies how Hillsboro has already been using data to inform decisions - one of their goals in their high-quality plan.

c.) The weekly academic seminars that Hillsboro staff participate in provide a forum for discussion and professional development on the interpretation of assessment data and how to differentiate instruction.

d.) With Hillsboro's adoption of the Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support System, there is justification that the teachers and leaders in the district will be proficient and/or supported in their goals as professionals. This is an integral part of Hillsboro's plan.

Although there are multiple pieces of evidence for the case that Hillsboro teachers and leaders are capable in their capacity to implement this plan, the curriculum maps discussed in the application are not present. This would provide insurance that Hillsboro students are pursuing a rigorous course of study.

There is a solid foundation for how Hillsboro is addressing the improvement of teaching and leading in the district. Therefore, this section earns in the high range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. Hillsboro has a plan for structuring its organization to provide support for schools in multiple ways.

a. Personnel have been added to specifically address the implementation of this new personalized learning approach including the instructional coaches.

With coaches being responsible for implementation, this is one example of how Hillsboro identifies parties responsible in their high-quality plan.

b. The sharing of top-down leadership through the establishment of school leadership teams is a good start to expanding its organizational power and authority to reach all sources of talent across the district. There is no mention of the scope of the school leadership team authority over schedules, calendars, etc.. The autonomy and authority of these teams is an essential component of RTT.

2. Hillsboro has a plan to ensure ubiquitous access to curriculum, feedback and support for all stakeholders.

a. By providing educational content through the personalized learning devices, all students and staff have the capability to learn 24/7.

b. By linking all feedback systems and recordkeeping through the district technology assessment system, Hillsboro is ensuring that students can work on instructional projects and receive feedback anywhere and anytime. Because of the standards-based grading incorporated into Hillsboro's plan, students have the chance to demonstrate mastery in multiple

ways over multiple times. This will become a way of thinking for teachers and leaders as they shift to the standards-based system and have the capabilities described in the Hillsboro plan's use of a technology-based portfolio system that can be used by all students. Parents, students and teachers will have instant feedback at their fingertips and students will be more invested in the quality of the work they produce because of the plan designed by Hillsboro.

Because of the thorough plan to address organizational structure and access to learning for all stakeholders, this section earns a score in the high range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. Hillsboro's plan leverages the use of technology to ensure all students and other stakeholders have access to resources that support personalized learning.

a. Infrastructure in the system and training for stakeholders in the use of devices and equipment (i.e. design and administer video-based training with video-triggered testing, etc.) This is an example of activities that are part of Hillsboro's high-quality plan.

b. Thoughtful plan for the ability of stakeholders to import and export data and minimize roadblocks to integrating with other data systems (i.e. Eliminate silos, use a multi-content delivery network distribution via Blue Coat, Cisco, Microsoft,, etc.)

c. Through the learning opportunities available both through peers and online, Hillsboro has maximized the support for this shift to personalized learning for all. (i.e. ability to capture content from a wide variety of sources and manage it automatically, access content on the go, enable teachers to use cloud capabilities, etc.)

Although the plan is multi-faceted in implementation, it assumes that all technology can be learned by parents online or possibly from their students. This is one small concern in the much greater scheme of the entire plan.

Because of the comprehensive plan to address personalized learning infrastructure needs, this section scores in the high range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro has a master plan to continuously improve after the grant period has ended.

a. Working within the framework established by the state of Oregon, Hillsboro looks to meet established benchmarks and goals on a trajectory to Oregon's targets. In the plan, Hillsboro stakeholders are apprised of the district's progress toward those goals through the district's idea to connect all the information in one technology tool. It is a high-quality plan in that there are designated goals and a timeline built into the Oregon targets which Hillsboro is adopting.

b. The Hillsboro district already had a Continuous Improvement Plan in place before the grant proposal was created. This indicates a culture of improvement was established and is an ongoing way of thinking in this district. It involves monitoring and measuring Quality Instruction, Leadership, and Collaboration. It again exemplifies characteristics of a high-quality plan in that it sets and designates key parties responsible for implementation.

c. District staff continuously evaluate the feedback they receive from multiple events, multiple sources and multiple stakeholders as they look to improve. (i.e. weekly school classroom walkthroughs by executive staff, semi-annual staff surveys, quarterly superintendent listening sessions, monthly focus group sessions with parent groups, etc.)

One additional source of feedback on the plan might include student groups.

Because of the comprehensive plan for ongoing feedback and improvement framework, this section earns a score in the high range.

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

5

4

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro has a solid plan to improve ongoing communication and stakeholder engagement after the grant period has ended.

a. By using lessons learned from other RTT applications, Hillsboro demonstrates thoughtful planning for improvement in all areas including communication and stakeholder engagement both inside and outside their district. (i.e Rhode Island's strategy for ongoing communication with RTT stakeholders over the duration of the grant to both inform and solicit feedback, Rhode Island's use of technology to track the kinds of communication and stakeholders that were engaged in the process, etc.)

b. Designating a district administrator to be responsible for this continuous communication loop is one necessary step.(i.e. Elizabeth Graser)

c. Providing a yearly district progress report in easily understandable terms will help keep stakeholders informed of this major shift in education in the Hillsboro district. (i.e Through the use of traditional means and social media, the district has multiple avenues to keep the public informed of progress during the grant cycle and beyond. Elizabeth Graser will be responsible for this by the deadline of September 2013.) By naming specific parties who are responsible for implementing specific parts of the plan Hillsboro is demonstrating that this is a high-quality plan.

Although this plan is very comprehensive for this section, there was no mention of translating documents/website information into alternate languages for families/stakeholders needing that support.

Because of the solid plan to continuously communicate and engage stakeholders during and after the grant, this section earns a high range score.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro has a plan for evaluation of the impact of the their implementation of personalized learning.

1. By partnering with Education Northwest as an outside evaluator, Hillsboro shows that it takes evaluation seriously and minimizes the risk of bias in that process. The naming of the outside evaluator who will be responsible for this aspect of the plan is an example of how Hillsboro takes care to think through when planning and provide details.

2. Because the tool that Education Northwest had not been developed/identified at the time of application, it is difficult to tell whether it would meet all necessary criteria put forth in this section of the grant application.(The goal is 12-14 performance measures.)

Because of the undetermined evaluation tool, this section earns a score in the low range.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Hillsboro district has a plan to monitor the effectiveness of the RTTD funded activities.

a. Even though they did not currently have data on the percent of students with highly effective teachers and principals, they have a plan to gather that in 2011-2012 and beyond. This is an example of one deliverable and timeline in their high-quality plan.

b. With the ultimate measure of success of all initiatives (professional development, service delivery, leadership teams, etc.) dependent on improvements that increase student learning and graduation rate, the Hillsboro district relies heavily on

the Hillsboro School Performance Benchmarks document in Appendix A Illustration 12 to show that improvement and communicate that effectiveness to stakeholders.

c. There might be reason to drill down into some more specific analysis at some point which is not evident. (i.e. analysis of how a particular training for teachers has been implemented with fidelity, etc.)

Because of the reporting of effectiveness and noting specific persons responsible for this (i.e. Steve Larson and Northwest) but lack of depth in analysis, this section earns a middle range score.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Hillsboro has cited sources for the revenue streams needed, but also has challenges in the funding of sustainability of this personalized learning initiative.</p> <p>a. Although the funding sources and amounts are listed, there is not a projected amount needed from each source to supply funding for various aspects of the initiative in the future. Priorities are missing.</p> <p>b. The plan to seek out other sources is mentioned such as other potential grants and business partners, but no solid stream of revenue is identified to maintain the investment in technology (lost and broken tablets, training for new staff, etc.) that is part of this initiative.</p> <p>Because of the incomplete details supplied in this section, this section scores on the middle range.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is evidence of support for Hillsboro's plan from other sources after the terms of the grant expire.</p> <p>a. The state of Oregon, the city leaders of Hillsboro and area business partners and local social agencies provided endorsement of the plan.</p> <p>b. Lacking is a more detailed explanation of how the 3 years after the grant will be funded, supported and prioritized.</p> <p>Because of the lack of details in this projection for after the grant period ends, this section earns a score in the low mid-range.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Hillsboro has a a plan to integrate community services with its educational organization.(i.e. Washington County's Family Resource Center, District Attorney's Office, Child Protective Services,etc.)</p>		

- a. The community partners such as the Washington County Family Resource Center were chosen for their ability to provide long-term support for the district. By identifying specific parties responsible, Hillsboro is showing that this is a high-quality plan.
- b. Their plans developed after studying other RTT states' success and more likely provide a viable partnership with the multiple organizations they have chosen.(i.e. Rhode Island)
- c. Benchmarks for measuring the success of this partnership are in place. (i.e. reduce discipline referrals,OHT survey).The community partners were chosen in part because of the guarantee that each organization has internal tracking and performance management systems in place to monitor their services, products and staff. This will allow Hillsboro to continuously track and review success of the collaborative initiatives. This is evidence of the thoughtful approach to planning and implementation Hillsboro uses.
- d. The partnerships provide ongoing technical assistance and training/guidance to all involved to build capacity of staff on both sides of the partnership.By identifying 10 indicators of population level results that address the whole child (i.e.academic and behavioral) and impact both the schools and the community at large, Hillsboro is taking a step in focusing all resources (community and school) to garner improvements in all those areas. Through working together, the capacity of the Hillsboro staff and community partners will expand.
- e. There is a plan to scale up the lessons that Hillsboro learns through this to other area communities with high-needs populations. The specificity of providing a two-month deadline to begin implementation is an example of how thoroughly Hillsboro is in planning.

Because of the extensive partnership network and the comprehensive plan of operation, this section earns a high range score.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro's comprehensive and innovative plan meets all of the requirements for Absolute Priority I.

- 1. The materials, support and training for students and teachers to develop this personalized learning environment that will deepen instruction and learning have been clearly laid out.
- 2. The online accountability system that is standards-aligned and designed to measure success on multiple levels is a key factor in Hillsboro's ability to create a culture of data-driven decision-making across their district and community.
- 3. Using technology tools to target students with identified needs is made possible with the plan Hillsboro has designed.
- 4.By collaborating with community and state partners, Hillsboro has strengthened their ability to deliver a sustainable program and improve student success on multiple levels.
- 5. By taking the steps necessary to develop and support this new vision of what schools can be, Hillsboro has provided evidence that the integration of technology and the existing framework of schools is a critical piece in bolstering personalized student learning that leads to student and community success.

Total	210	166
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0231OR-2 for Hillsboro School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative says, "Our vision is to leverage existing strategies and resources..." However there is no discussion of what the existing strategies and resources are. There is no evidence provided to support a claim that work has been done in the four core educational assurance areas. This did not adequately address the criterion. The approach presented is credible allowing for some points to be given in this criteria section.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a,b,c) The proposal states that all schools, teachers, and students in the district will take part in the grant planned intervention. This includes 1,083 educators, 20,403 students, and 49.08% economically disadvantaged students.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no evidence to support the claim that the proposals goals will continue "the success our district has already achieved while implementing similar technology-driven initiatives." The plan described only addresses professional development and infrastructure. Student achievement is not addressed. A high-quality plan must include deliverables. The Hillsboro proposal includes people and the activities they will be expected to do, but there are no deliverables or timelines in place.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(A)(4)(a) Performance goals set forth in the application narrative for summative assessments are likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity for the 2 identified subgroups, limited English proficient, and economically disadvantaged.</p>		

(A)(4)(b) The goals set forth in the narrative, if achieved, would be expected to decrease achievement gaps for the 2 identified subgroups, limited English proficient, and economically disadvantaged.

(A)(4)(c) The plan is to put in place an automatic alert when a student appears to be losing ground. What interventions will be put in place are missing from the plan.

(A)(4)(d) There is no historical data to indicate how this goal would affect the subgroups' enrollment in college.

The lack of focus on the achievement, or lack thereof, of subgroups is troubling.

Since there is no data given, there is really no way to know if the plan to integrate technology into the district will increase postsecondary degree attainment at this time.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	8
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(a) Appendix A(B)(1) indicates a closing of achievement gaps in sub populations other than LEP and Students with Disabilities. These 2 subpopulations are still not meeting standards. No data was presented for high school graduation rates or college enrollment. Hillsboro School District has not collected these data.</p> <p>(b) The District Report Cards provided for 2008 through 2010 school years indicate that the district did not achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in any of the Report Cards provided. Reform plans have been implemented, however the data is not yet available to determine if the interventions are working.</p> <p>(c) Data is being made available to students, educators and parent groups to inform and improve instruction and services in a very limited way. EduPoint may improve the availability of student performance data for students and their families but it is impossible to determine the success of the program since it will not be implemented until 2013..</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Hillsboro Schools maintains a website that provides 24/7 access for anyone who is seeking information concerning personnel salaries at the school level for instructional and support staff and non-personnel expenditures. However this access is only available to constituents with the capacity to access the website. The existence allowed for a point to be allowed for this section. The criterion asked for a high level of transparency, therefore evidence provided did not meet the criterion. There is inadequate evidence that this website is used/accessed by a significant number of people interested in the data. Other forms of communication would be necessary to be able to call this a "high level of transparency."</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>In 2011 the State adopted SB290 requiring districts to put in place core teaching standards to be used for teacher evaluations. State law requires schools to focus on the specific needs of special education students and English language learners to ensure a closing of the achievement gap. This focus will give added focus while at the same time allowing for autonomy for how support is delivered. Points were deducted because no other regulatory information was given as evidence in the proposal to support autonomy for implementation of personalized learning environments.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:		

(a) There is no description of how students, families, teachers, and principals were engaged in the development of the proposal nor how the proposal was revised based on any engagement or feedback.

(a)(1) There is no letter of support from the teachers union.

(b) There were multiple letters of support from a wide range of community, and student groups. Most letters contained exact wording leading this reviewer to believe that a letter of support template had been provided.

The criterion required meaningful stakeholder engagement. The proposal did not adequately address the criterion. Points were given for the letters of support that were gathered.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:
 There is a high-quality plan provided by Hillsboro School District that provides for analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the applicant's proposal, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address. The strategic plan that the application is based on was developed through a strategic planning process that engaged all segments of the community, government, students, and educational personnel.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 The Personalized Learning Environment proposed by the Hillsboro School District, as described in the narrative of the proposal, will adopt standards and assessments, build data systems to assess student achievement and inform students, teachers, parents, and community members of individual students' success.
 The proposed PLE should provide an understanding that what students are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals through project based individual student centered learning based on the curriculum standards set forth by the OSEA. The PLE would also assist students in setting developmental goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements. Acquisition will be evident as students use the technology described in the application and will assist students in how to structure their learning to achieve their goals. Measurement of progress toward those goals will be made available through a portal developed by CASLS.
 Students will be able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest through the ability to develop their own, unique learning experiences. The technology will provide access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning; and critical academic content and skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving will be encouraged and assessed using the Galaleo K-12 Assessment System developed by Technology Assessment Incorporated.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The HSD plans to employ Personal Development Coaches, Professional Learning Communities strategies, and collegial dialog to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

The HSD has identified a District Implementation Committee and has used "What Works" best practices and strategies from RTT states, especially North Carolina, to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of resources in meeting student needs.

The teacher and principal evaluation system was developed and vitalizes the Oregon Department of Education and the Educator Effectiveness Workgroups state guidelines for teacher and admin evaluations based on evidence. Senate Bill 290 put in place requirements for LEA evaluation systems. The evaluation system will be based on professional practice responsibility and student learning.

The applicant has a plan to ensure that all students have access to high-quality effective teachers and principals especially in the areas of English language learners and students with disabilities.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	2
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant states in the narrative that Hillsboro School District has practices, policies, and rules that facilitate learning in place, but none are offered as specific examples.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: The application plan is to have in place school infrastructure that supports personalized learning for all students, teachers, and administrators. The infrastructure will also support student engagement, learning, and assessment. The infrastructure is not presently in place. The application plan would provide the infrastructure through the use of RTTD funds and leveraging of present E-Rate funds. Points were reduced because the infrastructure is not in place and therefore cannot support personalized learning environments as required by the criterion. Points were given for the planning that has been done to put in place the necessary infrastructure which will include a robust longitudinal data warehouse to provide instructional videos, multi media presentations and other resources for individualized student learning opportunities..		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: HSD has in place a rigorous continuous improvement process (CIP) that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward goals. This CIP will provide the necessary feedback to adjust strategies to ensure student and teacher growth.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: HSD has in place comprehensive strategies for ongoing, focused communication and thorough engagement with internal and external stakeholders that has allowed for ambitious strategic planning. These strategies include: multiple forms of printed mailings and newsletters, TV stories streamed on the internet, monthly Board meetings, Citizen Curriculum Advisory meetings, Latino Coalition for Equity meetings, a Blog, and brown bag luncheons with the Greater Hillsboro Ministerial Association. HSD has researched RTT state grant recipients' lessons learned and is focusing on Rhode		

Island's communications tracking tool as the means for extensive RTTD grant activities communication. An employee has been named to be responsible to document the communication efforts.

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

5

0

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

HSD plans to have Ed Northwest develop performance measures using RTTD funds. The Scoring Guide states, "The applicant must have a total of approximately 12 to 14 performance measures." Performance measures do not exist in the grant proposal narrative and the reviewer was not directed to any appendices. A high-quality plan does not exist.

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

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Plans to make required adjustments, if data indicates adjustment to be necessary are vague. There is not a high quality plan presented to evaluate effectiveness.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables however the plan is lacking in all areas. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) No funds beyond the RTTD grant have been allocated to this project. (b) The budget is personnel heavy. An allocation for technology is approximately \$10,000,000 for 20,000 students and is reasonable. Professional development and coaches expenses are appropriate. Contracted expenses are justified throughout the narrative. (c) Does not provide a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities, including-- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) As stated before, there are no funds identified to support this large-scale implementation of the PLE except those from the RTTD grant. (ii) No strategies were included in the narrative or the budget detail to describe how HSD will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments project. 		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>A brief explanation of how some activities will be scaled back and what funds the district receives was included in the narrative. There was no discussion of a high-quality plan for sustainability after the term of the grant nor were any funds included in the grant budget that would indicate the district's intent to use funds to support the grant implementation during nor after the grant term.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- (1) From the narrative it appears there are weak alliances with community-based organizations. There is insufficient descriptions in the narrative describing strong alliances to support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1;
 - 2) Eight population-level goals have been set for students in the LEA that align with and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top – District proposal.
 - (3) Describe how the partnership would –
 - (a) The PLE reporting capabilities will be used to track the selected educational indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the LEA or consortium and at the student level for the participating students. The HSD will be used to track physical and emotional indicators at the aggregate level but will be insufficient to take the data to the individual student level because the indicators are anonymous.
 - (b) Targeting **resources** in order to improve results for participating students with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty or family instability, or other child welfare issues was not discussed.
 - (c) All students in the district are included in the indicator groups.
 - (d) There is no indication how the partnership with community-based organizations will provide a means to improve results over time.
 - (4) No description was given of how the partnership would integrate education and other services for students.
 - (5) No partnerships were described that would build the capacity of staff. Capacity of staff will be accomplished internally with a contracted organization and teacher coaches.
 - (6) Performance measures were described that are ambitious and achievable and HSD has described desired results.
- Partnerships are weak at best.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Hillsboro School District has an ambitious yet achievable plan to level the playing field for all students through the infusion of technology and internet connections for anytime, anyplace learning. Using common standards teachers will be trained by teacher coaches to personalize strategies and supports for students to meet the needs of the underperforming students as well as those who are presently thriving. The strategies should decrease achievement gaps and increase the rates at which students are graduating from high school prepared for jobs of the 21st century.

Total	210	113
--------------	------------	------------





Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

A. Vision (40 total points)

Application #0231OR-3 for Hillsboro School District

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant articulates a clear and comprehensive vision that directly addresses Absolute Priority one and if implemented correctly could create a sustained model that would impact student achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The articulated vision discusses community partnerships • The application focuses on leveraging the power of technology • The application discusses the impact that technology use will have upon student, teacher, and administrator performance • The application also provided desired outcomes that would occur as a result of implementing their vision for 21st century schools <p>The applicant did a below average job in addressing four core educational assurance areas as outlined in this notice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant did address the adoption of CCSS by the state of Oregon and their subsequent adoption of the standards. • The application mentions the use of data to improve student achievement, but does not discuss the building of data systems • Within this section of the application nothing was mentioned about recruiting and retaining effective teachers • The application mentioned challenges facing the district, directly mentioning changing demographics, but did not directly discuss a vision for improving struggling schools <p>The applicant did not clearly establish goals that would lead to an acceleration of student achievement and deepening student learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application discussed the personalization of learning and how that will correlate to increased student performance, but no direct mention of how the vision would directly impact student achievement was present. <p>The application did a good job of discussing how their vision would increase equity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple mentions through the section discussed how the vision for improvement in the district would provide students personalized support through powerful learning experiences with both differentiated and common content. • The graphics provided in the Appendix also point to the importance of student created content in creating a personalized learning infrastructure. <p>Overall the applicant does an above average job of articulating a comprehensive and coherent vision, thus resulting in a rating in the higher end of Medium.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant did an average to below average job of describing the schools it selected to participate. The applicant explained that by year 4 of implementation that all district schools would be impacted by this reform. The district also discussed how it would select the schools selected to participate in pilots based on readiness surveys. The district did not embed such a survey or discuss any preliminary findings that would support them in this process if they were to receive the grant.

The applicant did provide a list of schools that would participate in the grant in the provided table. In the tables provided, the applicant did address the number of low-income students and families that would be participating as well as high need students. The data provided in the table, however, was entered in a manner which led to the total number of students participating in the reform activities to be '71,4105.' This appeared to be a result of the application noting the enrollment of each school as the total enrollment of the district. Thus, the totals were the sum of the district's total enrollment many times over.

Overall, this section of the grant scores in the middle range of the medium category. All areas of information requested were provided, but the information provided was vague in parts and some components of the table contained inaccuracies as described above.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide a high quality plan detailing how the reform proposal would ultimately impact student achievement. Within the application there was no mention of several things necessary for a plan to be of high quality, such as:

- Timeline
- Activities
- Deliverables
- Goals
- People responsible for each of the above

There was also no mention of how the reform actions would support school and district-wide change. Most importantly, there was no mention of how this plan will ultimately impact student achievement.

Overall, this area of review is scored at the low end of low. The application did not address the criteria addressed as essential for this component.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did a moderate job of discussing how their vision would lead to increased equity for their students. Their application is moderate in this area because it addresses the issue and provides the data as desired, but does little to directly link the vision to the improvement in the goals as provided.

- The vision and data provided discuss ambitious yet achievable gains in student achievement.
- The material and data provided did not directly address ESEA targets, so it is not clear that the goals set forth exceed this benchmark
- The data and goals provided directly address the achievement gap between all students - low income students - and ESL students --- the application does not address racial achievement gaps in this area

The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to thoroughly articulate clear goals for college enrollment and college completion rates.

- The applicant states that 22 percent of their students enrolled in college after the 2012 school year, but has a goal of 70 percent college completion in 2016. These numbers are contradictory and not clearly addressed at any point.
- Three schools have a significantly worse college enrollment rate than the other district school and that is not addressed specifically at any point.

Overall, this section rates at the very bottom end of Middle. The application does establish a fair amount of ambitious, yet achievable goals - but fails to thoroughly vet their own data and to address all subgroups.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	4
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application is deficient in articulating district-wide longitudinal success throughout the narrative. In the narrative they reference the school report card in the Appendix which provides a better understanding of some of the applicant's successes, but does not address the stated criteria in appropriate detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report card provided hard data for only two years. The data provided for four years is simply met or not met. • With the data provided it is difficult to tell if there has been recent growth in overall student achievement. • Overall, from the limited data provided in the narrative and table it appears as though the district is being relatively successful with 84 percent of students meeting ELA state standards and 74 percent meeting math. • In ELA there is a 15 percent gap between black and white students and in Math a 14 percent gap exists between whites and Hispanics exists. This data was provided in the table, but not addressed in the narrative. <p>High school graduation and college enrollment were not mentioned directly in this section. Data review from other sections does not demonstrate this is a strength of the applicant.</p> <p>The application discusses strategic planning that is designed to usher students into the 21st century and the subsequent reforms that have been birthed from that plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the reforms have been directly targeted to those with high need or those who have previously struggled • The initiatives discussed do pertain to Priority One • No mention of what impact these initiatives have had upon academic achievement took place in this section of the application, however. <p>The application does discuss how the school report card is available to the public, but little else was discussed with making data regularly available to any stakeholders besides educators and students.</p> <p>Overall, this section scores at the very bottom end of Middle. The applicant earned this score through the relative success the district has achieved and the 21st century nature of their strategic plan. This criterion, however, failed to discuss many of the components adequately enough to earn any score higher than a 4.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The application narrative referenced a website that may have contained some of the necessary components of this criterion. The application failed to provide any screen shots or substantive documentation to support the statement that the applicant satisfied the components of this criterion. In addition to providing the evidence, the narrative referenced salary scales being available online, but did not address the availability of public viewing of actual personnel salaries as described necessary in this criterion.

Overall, the applicant received a 0 in the criterion for failure to substantively address any of the components outlined as descriptors for increasing the transparency in LEA processes.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant has sufficient autonomy under state law to take the necessary actions to implement their vision and is within regulatory requirements to implement what is proposed.

- The application articulates that not only does the district have the autonomy to do what is proposed, but that the state of Oregon has actually helped facilitate much in terms of education reform
- The direct premise of the applicant’s reform strategy revolves around one person/one device technology use and this type of reform fits nicely with what the state of Oregon is trying to accomplish in terms of their state level reforms.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 The application discusses how the district has encouraged meaningful stakeholder support and engagement throughout their educational community, but did not directly address how stakeholders were involved in the development of this plan.
 The plan was supported by the bargaining unit as evidenced by their signature on the application.
 The plan did not directly reference any input from students, parents, community members, or even administrators outside of Central Office.
 The application did contain many letters of support from a variety of different community organizations and leaders demonstrating support of the application.
 Overall, the application scores in the medium range for this criterion. The community at-large and the association were clearly supportive of this process. However, there was not enough evidence of other parties being involved in the creation of this plan for it to score in the high range.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:
 While the desired format outlining a high quality plan inclusive of goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and identification of those people responsible for completing were not present in this section, it still scored extremely high. The reason is that this criterion asks for the applicants plan for doing an analysis of the current situation. In this case, the applicant had already completed the plan, identified their current status, and provided a rationale for their proposal.

- The current status identified several subgroups of students, including students at specific schools that would benefit the greatest from implementing reform to directly address Absolute Priority One.
- The applicant also provided desired outcomes that will come from identifying these groups of children and what roles individuals within the school and community will play in implementing this reform.

This criterion receives maximum possible points.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high quality plan outlining how they plan to implement reform in a manner which supports the learning of all students and enables them to be college and career ready.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan provided discusses some activities, rationale for the activities, and how such activities could possibly increase student achievement. • Throughout the section there was no direct mention of: goals, timelines, deliverables, and people responsible for delivering each. • Overall, their plan had many creative and substantive ideas that may improve student achievement, however, it was not presented in a manner that made the improvement process systematic or coherent. <p>The application demonstrated that the Central Office personnel and grant writer had firm understanding and vision for student learning. However, there was no clear evidence of parent or student support for the implementation of this plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At no point in this criterion was it mentioned or discussed that students understood that learning is key for their future or that they could pursue learning goals they were personally interested to that were linked to CCSS. • The application did directly mention the students would have the ability to have advanced learning experiences and be exposed to content that would help them master content such as goal-setting, teamwork, critical thinking and problem solving <p>The applicant did a good job of discussing their strategy to ensure students have access to digital content and the necessary training to take advantage of a digital personal learning environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application discussed how sequencing and timing of coursework could be varied while content remained common for students. To explain, one student may progress through a given course faster or in a different order than another, but all students taking a particular course would be exposed to the same material. • The application also discussed training that would be provided to help support students through the transition to digital learning • Student data and early warning systems would be developed to better inform students of their own progress throughout the school year. <p>The application clearly and definitively discussed mechanisms in place to provide training so that children understand the tools being given to them in order to track and manage their learning.</p> <p>Overall, this criterion scored in the middle of the average range. While many of the components were addressed, the applicant failed to create a high-quality plan for implementation which discussed timelines, goals, deliverables, and people responsible for delivering each of the aforementioned. While many of the concepts discussed are very sound and based in research, without a comprehensive plan it is not possible to move past the middle level for this criterion.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	7
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application has a multitude of progressive ideas and demonstrates that the district has put considerable thought into creating a personalized learning environment for their students. However, the closest the application comes to delivering a plan is when talking about addressing the lowest-performing schools and their proposed turnaround. The application states, "Specifically, we will start with a goal and realistic timelines for turning the school around . . ." Essentially this statement indicates that the applicant's plan is to have a plan at a later date.</p>		

The application did a fairly comprehensive job in detailing how all educators, including teams of educators, will participate in training to support capacity building.

- The application stated the district moved toward the Professional Learning Community model during the 2011-2012 school-year.
- The application laid out several activities for teachers to complete over the course of the grant. These activities included, but were not limited to, employing lessons learned from other states through the RTT competition and adhering to best practices as described by *Doing What Works*
- The application directly addresses how the district will help support teachers adopt content and instruction to meet individual needs and academic interests of students through differentiation by referring to lessons learned through the North Carolina RTT processs
- The application discussed how to improve teacher and principal evaluation systems and how data would be used to support that process as well as instruction in concert. The application referred to changes in Oregon state code that would facilitate this process.

The applicant does a moderate job of discussing how they plan to facilitate all educators being able to understand and use digital tools, data systems, and methods of complex feedback.

- The application discusses how the current systems they have in place call for teacher collaboration and training is in place to help train teachers how to build data collection systems and use the data collected.
- The application does not directly address a systematic approach to supporting this for every participating teacher and every participating building throughout the district.
- There was also no direct mention of a data warehousing process that would simplify the process for teachers and allow information collected to be more actionable.

The application discussed a wide variety of resources available throughout the district to strengthen their efforts and to approach creating a personal learning environment. The application, however, failed to lay out a clear vision or plan for how schools and school leaders will have access to training in order to structure policies, tools, data, and resources to support this process.

- The application refers to expectations of educators and how they are to use information from evaluations to improve instruction, but does not discuss any specifics or plan to ensure this occurs.
- There was no mention of using data regarding climate and culture to impact reform efforts or any specific mention of training designed to educate educators on how to best eliminate the achievement gap.

A high quality plan again does not exist to make sure highly effective teachers and principals are working with the most traditionally under-served students. The application, did however, mention that it is has a plan to have a plan in this regard, and that they have already taken action in two particular instances.

Overall, this section rates in the lower portion of the middle range. The application provided a lot of good ideas and demonstrated research in the composition of the narrative, however, concrete plans were not available and many of the components of this criterion were not mentioned whatsoever.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A high quality plan is not exhibited in the narrative for this criterion.

- The narrative mentions the infrastructure in place and the willingness to expand personnel if the grant was won.
- The narrative also mentions the goals to be achieved by expanding the infrastructure if the grant was won.

- Throughout the narrative there was no timeline for activities, deliverables, or identification of personnel responsible for ensuring completion of the plan.
- The application also did not mention school leadership teams, creating a system where credit could be earned by mastery – not time, policies allowing students multiple opportunities for success, or providing adaptable activities for the most traditionally underserved children.

Overall, this criterion scores at the low end of the low category for failing to address nearly all of the subcomponents of this criterion.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application produces a coherent plan with activities, goals, and people responsible for accomplishing and ensuring the plan is carried out. The plan, however, does not provide specific timelines for specific activities nor does it address in any specifics how this plan would be executed.

- The plan addresses the issue of ensuring all stakeholders, regardless of income would have access to learning tools and resources. The plan discusses leveraging e-rate to provide such services for students and parents.
- There was not mention of providing technical support in any substantive manner for students and parents.
- The application does discuss at length the openness of the system of how instruction can truly be transformed through the move to personalized learning environments. The application, however, does not mention how the system would be designed to incorporate tools and resources specifically for those students who need additional support.
- For the first time in the application (at any length), the applicant mentions a longitudinal data warehouse system. The application did not discuss how this would actually work or how it would be accessible to multiple stakeholders.

Overall, this section ranks in the middle section of middle. A plan exists and many components of a high quality plan were evident, however, many of the subcomponents of this criterion were not addressed or not addressed with enough complexity to provide any confidence that this plan would be comprehensive enough to be successful.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided their district approved Continuous Improvement Plan in narrative form and visually in the Appendix. The plan does a below average to fair job of addressing the components established as part of this criterion.

- A plan does exist for monitoring improvement of the district. That plan while cyclical and ongoing, provides no timeline of activities and does not mention the impact of receiving the RTT grant at any point.
- The plan does discuss processes in place to provide timely and regular feedback, but does so only in response to seven areas of focus that have already been pre-determined. There is no mention of how RTT fits into that pre-determined plan
- There is no mention of how this will look during the time of the grant as it compares to after the grant. The application does discuss mid-course reviews, but does not offer any concrete options as to what this might look like or how they may change this based on their progress through the RTT process.
- There was no mention of how this information would be publicly shared or how stakeholders outside of Central Office would participate in the review.

Overall, this section scores in the low end of the middle range. The applicant outlines their already existing Continuous Improvement Model and how receipt of the RTT grant would impact this established process. The plan provided, however, is devoid of timelines and thus results in the rather low score for this criterion.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant provides a comprehensive plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

- The applicant described the process used by Rhode Island RTT and discussed wanting to incorporate many aspects of that plan while also learning from areas that could be improved upon.
- The goals for ongoing communication include: engaging stakeholders and soliciting feedback, identifying momentum building strategies, and providing comprehensive annual updates

Overall, the applicant will score high in this criterion. The plan for communication is flexible, comprehensive, and seeks feedback to allow for continuous improvement of the plan.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The application does not have a high quality plan in place for this criterion.

- The plan neglects to address the requisite amount of performance measures dictated by the necessary components of this criterion.
- The proposal called for the applicant to produce between 12 and 14 measures, the applicant provided three
- The performance measures did not establish annual targets, address subgroups, identify why they made the selections that they did, provide timelines, or describe how this would impact future decision making.

Overall, this criterion will receive a 0. The applicant failed to complete this portion of the application in the manner needed to achieve points for their effort.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 There is not a high quality plan in place for the district to assess if they spent money received through the RTT grant appropriately.

- There was no mention in the narrative or charts provided of how the district would assess the money it spent on professional development, technology, creating a learner-centered system, establishing community partnerships, compensation reform, modified school structures or any other activity to improve results.

This criterion will receive 0 points. The main components were not addressed in any sufficient manner.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 The budget summary provided in the application identifies in a relatively thorough manner how all funds will be used.

- The application mentions Title funds, but does not include them in their budget breakdown. Nor does their breakdown mention any other funds that will be used.

The expenditures discussed for the project are reasonable in nature, however incomplete in thorough explanation and consideration of operational and infrastructure costs.

- There was not a thorough explanation of how infrastructure and operational costs could remain so low with the massive additional of technology and mobile devices.
- There was no clearly communicated approximation of annual increase in costs based on use of bandwidth, electricity, and other operations costs.

The application provided thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities and it did align directly with the rest of the grant application. However, in terms of addressing operations and long-term costs the application did not do so thoroughly.

- Descriptions were thorough as to why expenditures were necessary and how they fit with the overall schematic of the plan.
- The narrative addressed the concept of one-time versus operational costs, but a more thorough breakdown on tables is needed.
- A comprehensive plan for longitudinal stability was not provided.

The application provided the two budgetary components requested, overall budget and project level budgets. The two components were aligned with each other and the rest of the plan.

Overall, this criterion scored at the high end of the middle range. All necessary components were addressed with the exception of more details on operation costs and sustainability.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application does not provide a high quality plan inclusive of deliverables, goals, timelines, activities, and people responsible for the completion of the plan in terms of budget sustainability.

- The application refers to keeping some money from the grant for use after the four year window.
- The application also discusses how it can continue to work with community partners for additional funding.
- The application details the Title monies that flow through the district.
- The application does not provide a budget for years after the grant or provide any comprehensive plan, or even recognition, that this major instructional change will impact budgeting forever after in this district.

Overall, this section scores in the low section of low. Many components of this criterion were not addressed and no concrete, high-quality plan was in place.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The application addresses many different partnerships whose services will be integrated into the district's efforts to improve overall school performance.

- The partnerships detailed in the plan provide additional student and family supports with a particular focus on addressing social-emotional and behavioral needs of students.

- Examples of partnerships included those providing support for students in the areas of: health services, social-emotional surveys and prescriptive efforts to support kids, and even supporting students efforts to receive needed child support.
- The partnerships described do not contradict the rest of the plan, but do not directly align or support other reform efforts mentioned throughout.

The application provided populations level desired results that aligned with the applicant's broader proposal.

- Although the population level results were aligned, the quantity provided did not satisfy the number requirement for this sub-criterion

The application also failed to describe in detail how partnerships would work to improve student outcomes and how the district could measure effectiveness.

- There was very little discussion of using data in any fashion to validate partnerships and new initiatives from the district.
- There was not a thorough explanation of how these partnerships would integrate education and non-educational programs

The applicant did not address how partnerships would impact staff capacity in areas that helped them identify community and student needs, engage families, and create decision-making processes to identify and select supports for students in any detail.

The applicant identified two ambitious yet achievable performance measures. While those two goals were related to the overall application and the partnerships outlined in this criterion those performance measures do not exhibit that the applicant has a high quality plan.

Overall, this section scores at the high end of low. It is evident the applicant sought out partnerships in order to improve their schools, but the plan in place does not meet many of the components established in this criterion including outlining 10 population level outcomes and describing how the partnerships would increase staff capacity for handling future situations.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Establishing a personal learning environment was undoubtedly the theme behind the entire application and was discussed in nearly every established criteria.

- The primary focus of the plan was to distribute electronic devices to all students to allow for a more flexible and personalized learning experience.
- Multiple times throughout the plan the applicant discussed students being able to accelerate their own learning or seek remediation through technology - thus personalizing their learning environment.

There were many more instances that could be pointed, but the theme of personalized learning was evident in nearly every criteria.

Total	210	83
--------------	------------	-----------