



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0232WA-1 for NorthEast Washington Educational District 101

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant is a consortium of fifteen rural LEAs in a non-Race to the Top state. It embraces the belief that all children can and will learn and proposes an approach focused on both academic and physical, social, emotional, and behavioral needs of students. To achieve this the applicant proposes the establishment of a Center for Student Success that, with its partner organizations, would include a coordinated school health program and an array of comprehensive services. While the applicant's vision, based on the McComb model (Mississippi, 1997), is research-based, it lacks specificity, detail, goals, objectives, and coherence. None of the four educational assurance areas (adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed; providing data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals with data to improve instruction; recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals; and turning around low-achieving schools) is adequately addressed in the reform vision. In subsequent sections the applicant states that Common Core would drive instruction and that the College Board assessments would be used as formative assessments. No clear plan is presented to explain how these would be implemented, the role of state-required assessments, or how teachers would be trained to use the tools. Two student data systems, Skyward and Homeroom, would be used to collect and provide student information. Again no plan is presented for how these programs would be implemented across the fifteen participating districts and how staff would be trained to use them. Recruiting, developing, and retaining effective teachers is not addressed; nor is turning around low-achieving schools.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Schools were self-selected on the basis of six factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located within the seven-county service region served by the North East Washington Educational Service District (NEWESD); • Rural/remote classification; • A shared commitment to personalized learning environments through locally directed improvements in learning and teaching; • A shared commitment to the RTT-D's four core educational reform areas; • A shared commitment to implementation of effective teacher, principal and superintendent evaluation systems by 2014-15; • A commitment to serving students from low-income families. <p>(b) A list of the fifteen participating school districts is included in the application.</p> <p>(c) The numbers of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating high-need students, and participating educators are included.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant expresses the intent to scale up the project to the region, state, and nation and suggests several organizations and venues for doing so. However, no plan is included.

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

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The percents of students performing at or above proficiency on the state assessment and end-of-course exams were given for reading and mathematics, but only for grades three, eight, and ten. Data for grades four, five, six, and seven were not provided. Percents for only All Students and Economically Disadvantaged Students were listed. An explanation for the omission of the other subgroups was not been provided. "Change in achievement levels" is not a plan for determining growth; an explanation of how the growth projections were determined should have been provided. Gap data and goals were presented, but only for reading and mathematics in grades three, eight, and ten for all and economically disadvantaged students. High school graduation rates and college enrollments were provided for all and economically disadvantaged students. The proposal requires data for each participating LEA; the applicant provided only aggregate data.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant provided information for only six of the fifteen participating LEAs, stating that data for the remaining nine districts are not published because "their student pools were too small to protect student confidentiality." Reviewing the numbers of participating students in nine omitted districts does reveal small numbers of students enrolled. However, some indication of a track record of success is required for each LEA. Looking at how adequate yearly progress is determined, for example, might provide the necessary information. For the six LEAs for which data are presented, the application lists only the subject area and grade(s) in which improvement was shown from school year 2009-2010 to school year 2011-2012; improvement type and size are not given.

The applicant, North East Washington Educational Service District (NEWESD), reports that it has implemented "numerous" initiatives that have "significantly" increased student achievement and contributed to student success. Data were presented for students participating in NET, an alternative education and training program administered by NEWESD. The self-reported data indicate success for at-risk youth; however, the total number of students served by the program was not stated, and the participating schools were not listed. Thus, reviewers are uncertain if any of the consortium's LEAs were included in the NET program. NEWESD also implemented a program to reduce alcohol abuse by students and reported success. Again, it is unclear if students from consortium LEAs participated, and no student assessment results were given to substantiate the "success."

(b) According to the application, none of the consortium districts contains schools deemed "persistently lowest achieving." While the applicant discusses how it served one such district not included in the application, it presents no plan for reforming a low-performing school.

(c) The applicant describes two examples of using student performance data to engage students, one for the NET project which is an alternative education and training program for at-risk youth and one used by the Juvenile Court School Services. It was not explained if or how these systems would be used in the consortium LEAs. Further, these systems serve only a small and specialized segment of the student population. The application would have benefited from a description of how the applicant has made data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services for all students in the consortium over the last four years.

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

5

1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant cites the 2008 Washington State Law (RCW 44.48.150) that mandates a website providing access to current budget and accounting data, expenditures, revenues, workloads, caseloads, performance measures, and performance audits as evidence of transparency. It further cites web-based comprehensive data sets on school district expenditures and personnel salaries for all school employees. School-level accounting is not required in Washington state. While the cited websites may provide the required information at the district level, the application would have benefited from a comprehensive listing of the school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration as described in the application. At a minimum, personnel salaries at the school level for school-level instructional and support staff as requested in the application should have been provided. Listings of expenditures to be included as well as those to excluded is provided in section E-8 of the *Race to the Top - District Guidance and Frequently Asked Questions* document. It is unreasonable to expect reviewers to navigate state websites to find required information without at least providing specific instructions for locating the required data.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant cites the State's adoption and full implementation of the Common Core State Standards and new student assessment system by 2014-2015; the State's Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) which mandates that all districts adopt teacher and principal evaluation systems aligned to the 2010 Washington state education reform bill by 2013-2014; and the RTTT Early Learning Challenge Grant awarded to Washington state as evidence that successful conditions and sufficient autonomy exist to implement the personalized learning environments described in the proposal. These initiatives are for all districts in the state and indicate the State's receptiveness to reform. However, the applicant provides no evidence of conditions beyond these initiatives that would support district autonomy.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant queried "eligible" LEAs regarding their interest in participating in the consortium. After "meetings," interested LEAs completed "expansive" questionnaires" covering topics from technology through student health. Reportedly, the questionnaires were completed in consultation with families, teachers, principals, and collective bargaining units. Based on the questionnaire results NEWESD drafted the grant proposal which was then reviewed and commented on by the participating LEAs. The applicant provided no evidence about how this process occurred. Possible forms of evidence might have included a definition of "eligible" LEA and the number of eligible LEAs; a description of the meetings referred to, along with the agendas and lists of participants'; a copy of the questionnaire used; and documentation to confirm the participation and contributions of families, teachers, principals, and collective bargaining units in the application process.

All member LEAs except two are represented by collective bargaining groups. For each of these LEAs *except Lind*, the Memorandum of Understanding for the RTTT-District grant was signed by the President of the Local Teachers' Union or Association. No evidence was included to document the participation of the collective bargaining groups in the preparation of the proposal. Two member LEAs do not have collective bargaining representation. For these two LEAs no evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools supported the proposals.

(b) The application contains letters of intent to partner with NEWESD and/or participate in the RTTT-District grant from The College Board Western Office; DreamBox Learning, Eastern Washington University, and Mobius Spokane Science Center. No letters of support from key stakeholders such as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, and local civic and community-based organizations were found.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The application does not include a plan for an analysis of the current status in implementing personalized learning environments or the logic behind the reform proposal. The narrative is rather a statement of the applicant's beliefs regarding teaching and learning. While the applicant reports conducting two in-depth surveys to inform its proposal, no

evidence of the survey was provided and no summary of needs and gaps was included. The applicant did list information from three survey items (availability of computers for student use, college-going culture, and current practices regarding the implementation of personalized learning environments). The information was largely qualitative and lacked specificity.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The application does not contain a plan for improving teaching and learning by personalizing the learning environment to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. It suggests an "integrated and aligned PK-12 system approach" for which no specifics are given. It purports to build a "college-going culture in every affected community" and to "demonstrate the connection between education and work," but no particulars are included.</p> <p>The application states that Common Core will drive instruction, and professional development will help teachers motivate students. The applicant proposes the use of College Board Resources in grades 8, 10, and 11 to measure student progress and inform teachers. No plan for implementing any of these components, no explanation of how they will fit together in a learning approach, nor a clear description of how the components would be used is included.</p> <p>There is no adequate explanation or description of how students would be involved in deep academic learning experiences. Common Core State Standards and professional development for teachers are mentioned, but no details are given. The Mobius Science Center is cited as a means to provide students hands-on learning experiences; again, no details of how the Center's resources would be used was found in the application.</p> <p>To provide access and exposure to diverse cultures to deepen student learning, the application proposes a "menu of options" to include culture programs in Chinese, Japanese, and Salish (language spoken by many Native Americans in the Inland Northwest). Additional information about the options, the implementation process, and the benefits to all students was not presented.</p> <p>(b) Strategies to ensure student access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development and high quality instructional approaches, environments, and content were vague, fragmented, and incoherent. For those activities mentioned, no details for their implementation were included. For example, the application does not explain how relationships between families and teachers and between students and business leaders would be developed and maintained or how they would empower learners. It gave no details about the online differentiated curriculum that would be used by teachers as a formative assessment strategy or how the digital learning curriculum DreamWorks fits into the learning approach. This section of the application is a jumbled listing of ideas and tools rather than an approach that would engage and empower all learners.</p> <p>To provide ongoing and regular feedback the applicant proposes the use of <i>Skyward</i> to track student demographics, grades, attendance, discipline, and state and district assessment data; and <i>Homerom</i> to provide educators access to graphical displays of student assessment data. <i>Homerom</i> allows educators to see student progress and identify those who need additional help; its early warning system helps identify at-risk students. School counselors would have access to Washington's College Bound Scholarship portal to determine which students completed their financial aid applications. DreamBox provides academic progress reports to allow teachers and students to monitor progress in mathematics. No discussion of the compatibility of these tools was found. This piecemeal approach to information delivery has the potential to provide superfluous, conflicting, confusing, and burdensome data.</p> <p>Specific accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students were not addressed.</p> <p>(c) The narrative addressing mechanisms to provide training and support to students to ensure they understand how to use the provided tools and resources to track and manage their learning was vague.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	5

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The application proposes to implement a series of professional development trainings focused on successfully developing personalized learning environments; the trainings would then provide the framework for each school building to implement a professional learning community that would ultimately bring community personnel into the school. The applicant should have provided detail about and an explanation of what the professional development would entail, what needs it would address, which staff would be involved, how it would fit into the school calendar, the length and extent of the trainings, content, and sustaining activities. How the trainings would become frameworks for professional learning communities needed to be addressed. It was not explained how College Board resources would contribute to training educators to effectively implement personalized learning environments and effective educator strategies.

The application depends on DreamBox Learning and Mobius Science Center to train teachers to adapt content and instruction to provide opportunities for students to engage in tasks in response to academic needs. DreamBox is an educational technology provider that makes available to schools adaptive mathematics curriculum for grades K-5. The related professional development for educators would aid teachers in using individual results from DreamBox as a formative assessment strategy; it would also inform and train teachers about effective intervention strategies. Videos of best practices from the training sessions would be available via the web for member LEAs and outside entities. Mobius Science Center provides hands-on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) learning experiences for students at its facility and through outreach programs. In year one Mobius would work with school partners to develop eight interactive STEM learning models as well as co-pilot two STEM learning modules in each participating school. The programs would be improved and implemented in years two through four of the grant. While these initiatives seem worthy, they do not seem to provide a coherent professional development plan. Again, detail about and an explanation of what the professional development would entail, what needs would be addressed, which staff would be involved, how it would fit into the school calendar, the length and extent of the trainings, content, and sustaining activities. Reading / language arts and serving special-needs students are absent from the application.

It is unclear how the number of students receiving targeted social/emotional interventions will serve as the grade 4-8 measure of student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or graduation requirements and or how this would inform the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators. It is also unclear how the number of students failing one or more courses in a year would provide useful, timely information about student progress in grades 9-12. How data from the student information systems *Skyward* and *Homeroom* to identify students not meeting standards and provide interventions was not discussed.

The applicant will utilize Washington state's *Education Advocate* project, which combines academic and mental health supports for targeted students, and hire mental health professionals with K-12 experience to work with students struggling with academic progress. An education advocate would be placed in each participating middle and high school to work with highest risk students and to work with teachers and administrators. A definition for, a projected count of, and a method of identifying "highest risk" students was not included. The research-based Check and Connect student intervention program to enhance student engagement with learning would be implemented in middle and high schools. The effort will be combined with tutoring, credit retrieval, online learning, and regular classroom work to assist failing students. What or how data would inform this effort was not addressed. Student Assistance Specialists would be utilized to provide early interventions for substance abuse problems, anger management techniques, bullying prevention, and other factors that negatively impact student learning. *Project SUCCESS* would provide the framework of services for students, staff, and families. These seem to be worthy interventions; however, the narrative lacks a "big picture" view of how all the pieces will fit together to meet the goals and intent of the grant.

Washington state law requires all of its LEAs to adopt by 2013-2014 an educator evaluation system that is based on RTTT criteria. The application summarizes possible components of the evaluation system based on the law, but it does not talk about the specific evaluation system/systems to be developed by the participating LEAs. For example, it is not known whether each participating LEA will develop its own evaluation system, whether the consortium will develop a system for all participating LEAs, or whether all LEAs in the State are to adopt the state system. The application does not address the components of the system, what types of feedback might be provided by the evaluation system, how that feedback might improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness, or how it might provide recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement.

The applicant proposes a piecemeal approach to professional development. It appears that options were picked at random without considering how they fit together into a coherent and effective program.

(b) Few details about providing educator access to actionable information to help them identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests were found. Access to two student information systems would be provided to each teacher, but it is not clear how these systems would help them identify optimal learning approaches to respond to individual student needs. Nor was it explained how educator access to the State's Navigation 101 program for students would help educators identify optimal learning approaches for individual students.

Only programs for students were included in this section which asks for resources for educators.

The applicant proposes using The College Board's PSAT and the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) to match student needs with specific resources and to provide feedback about the effectiveness of resources in meeting student needs. While these tools have a role to play in identifying student needs and informing students' college and career planning, it is doubtful they will provide adequate feedback about resource effectiveness.

Once again it appears that options were picked at random without considering how they fit together to accelerate student achievement. How educators would learn to use these resources was not addressed.

(c) Stating that the Teacher Principal Evaluation Program and student information systems would provide valuable information is insufficient to demonstrate that all participating school leaders and school leadership teams would have the professional development, policies, tools, data, and resources that would enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements.

(d) The applicant's plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals is to provide professional development to existing staff and through professional learning communities. The professional development would be tailored to individual participating LEA needs. No supporting details were included. Teacher collaboration models would also be presented; again, no supporting information was provided. A cycle of establishing aligned standards and learning expectations followed by data analysis to inform and improve instructional practices would be implemented to assist teachers and administrators develop a common vision of student learning needs. The application is silent on how effective and highly effective teachers and principals might be defined in district evaluation system(s) or how student growth would be determined.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The consortium includes fifteen LEAs. It proposes an advisory board with one voting member from each LEA led by an advisory chair. The board will meet at least quarterly. Each board member will advocate for adequate support and services in all schools in her/his district. No information is provided about credentials for the LEA representatives or how they will be selected. The role of the board was not delineated. It was noted that the role of each member is as an advocate for adequate support and services for the schools in her/his district. This indicates that district support and services to participating schools may not be a given.

(b) School leadership teams would be formed under the direction of each respective advisory board member and would include teachers, principals, and other school staff (not described). The proposal states that these teams would be granted flexibility and autonomy to support program implementation. It does not say who will grant the flexibility or present any evidence that flexibility and autonomy have been authorized.

(c) The application states that a new learning environment in which students move forward at their own pace would be implemented through this grant, and students would advance once certain learning benchmarks were achieved. No details about the learning benchmarks or how self-paced learning would work were included.

(d) The response to this section is confusing. Mastery of standards would be based on individual student scores on Washington's state assessment, High School Proficiency Exam, and End of Course exams which are administered in the spring of each year. Each student would also receive "lesson" assessments to measure progress in specific subjects multiple times during the year; these assessments would form the basis of students advancing through the curriculum once benchmarks are achieved. How the consequences of the state assessments and the "lesson" assessments would be reconciled was not discussed.

(e) In this section the applicant proposed a blended learning approach combined with individualized adaptive online instruction (20 minutes daily in the classroom or one to two weekly sessions in the computer lab). The adaptive program would be available online from any browser for anywhere/anytime learning. Feedback would be available to educators and parents. The personalized learning component would accommodate the needs of students with disabilities. The applicant does not address member-LEA policies and infrastructure to support these initiatives. In another section of the proposal it was stated that several member districts lacked computers for student use.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) To ensure that participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have access to necessary resources to support the grant, project leaders would develop a checklist of needed resources. School leadership teams would use the checklist to conduct an assessment of existing resources within the school. Each school would use its site budget from the grant to acquire necessary resources. Teams would research community centers and public libraries for internet access for students without home access. It seems much of the needs assessment should have preceded the proposal. It also seems inefficient for each school in each of the fifteen participating LEAs to do its own purchasing. It was not explained how site budgets were determined prior to the assessment of resource needs. How students and parents would maintain records of school performance data was not discussed.

(b) Onsite technical support would be provided by trained school personnel; it is unknown whether these are existing staff who already have the skills to deliver technical support or whether they would require training. The NEWESD Ed Tech Support Center would work with each participating LEA to increase its capacity to improve school and student success by establishing a shared clearinghouse of research for technology integration and provide professional development models. No clear explanation of additional services to be provided or a plan to accomplish them was presented. The focus of the professional development models was not stated. Three Center employees would be dedicated to the RTTT-District initiative; no roles were defined.

(c) The applicant ensures that adequate systems would be in place to allow parents and students to export information in an open data format and to use data in other electronic learning systems. Other than providing students with a USB flash drive (which is unlikely to be helpful for this purpose), no explanation of how this would be accomplished is provided.

(d) The applicant depends on the state's RTTT Early Learning Challenge Grant to develop a PK-20 system to enable all levels to share student data and pledges to work with the leaders of the Early Learning Grant. No timelines or mechanisms for accomplishing this are mentioned.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes activities including (1) providing monthly reports to the project director from the project evaluator, (2) providing quarterly reports at advisory board and school leadership meetings, and (3) posting bi-weekly status reports on the project website to publically share information on the quality of the project. However, the applicant is silent on how the project would be monitored; how progress would be measured; and how necessary corrections and adjustments would be identified, monitored, and reevaluated.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Except for pledging to create a public relations plan that would identify channels and a timeline for developing and distributing videos and feature stories as well as guidelines for the project website and social media outlets, no strategies, timelines, or other information for ongoing communication and engagement is presented.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The only subgroup listed is "Economically Disadvantaged;" no others are mentioned. If this is because of small numbers of students in other subgroups, this should have been documented. The PK-3 academic indicator (third grade state assessment results) does not provide timely, formative information. Behavioral interventions and students' non-academic needs should be defined to provide consistent data; it was not clear how the behavioral intervention data would be collected or by whom. How the applicant will transition from using state current assessment data to the new Common Core assessment data was not addressed. It is unwise to change the measuring stick when determining progress toward a goal. Percents rather than student counts are advisable for measuring change over time because student enrollment may change over time.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is looking at evaluating the effectiveness of various RTTT-District activities. This is different from evaluations described in the continuous improvement plan described above. This section refers to the effectiveness of activities such as professional development, use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, altering school schedules, etc. The narrative references section (A)(4) <i>below</i>. It is not certain to what this refers.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The project will be funded solely by RTTT-District funds. No matching funds are proposed.</p> <p>It is difficult to determine the reasonableness and sufficiency of the budget given the vague descriptions contained in prior sections of the application and the unclear vision and goals presented by the applicant. The budget funds 16.75 FTE personnel to support the project, yet their roles were not clearly defined in the plan. These include the mathematics specialist, science specialist, wellness/nursing director, prevention-intervention director, early childhood director, instructional resources director, program assistants, compliance analyst, videographer/editor, and student assistant specialists. No reading specialist is listed. The applicant did use an acceptable approach to determine inflationary increases for all categories except fringe. No evidence was presented for the projected large increase in medical insurance. The only computers included in the budget are for the project director, math specialist, science specialist, and project manager. It is unclear where the funding for technology for the schools will be obtained; likewise it is unclear where the monies for school budgets referred to in the application will come from (Individual LEA Projects, perhaps). It cannot be determined whether the contractual expenses to The College Board, DreamBox Learning, and Mobius Science Center are appropriate because the application does not make clear the extent of the services to be provided by each contractor. Eastern Washington University's share seems out of line given that the services it will provide were not detailed within the plan. Breaking the budget into sub-projects Early Childhood, Prevention Intervention, Health and Wellness, and Instructional Services was surprising because the divisions were not apparent in the proposal.</p>		

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: No plan is included. This applicant plans to make a plan. It proposes to begin developing a sustainability plan during the first year of the grant and promises to "examine all options" to entirely replace grant funding by the end of the grant cycle. These general statements do not constitute a plan, let alone a high-quality plan.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant would establish a Coordinated School Health Services program coordinated through the Washington State School Nurse Corps and the School Nurse Organization of Washington, based on the McComb Model. It would be directed by a new center, the Center for Student Success, within the Student Learning and Support Services division of NEWESD. The director of the Center would serve as the Project Director for the RTTT-District grant. Health Advisory Committees, in-house teams consisting of a cross-section of school staff, would provide case management services for every student deemed in need. The establishment of the Center for Student Success seems to be the major objective of this grant application. The establishment of such a center and the philosophy behind it is laudable; however, it needs to be thoughtfully placed within the context of a comprehensive plan to improve teaching and learning rather than one of many pieces tossed together and disguised as a cohesive plan to do so. The applicant identifies eight desired results for students in the consortium; the results include six educational goals, one family goal, and one community goal. The state assessment used as one of the indicators will disappear with the onset of Common Core assessments. This is not acknowledged by the applicant; thus, how the transition might be handled is not addressed. The numbers for the performance measures related to non-academic needs are in a different format from those of the other performance measures; the meaning of these numbers is not clear. The applicant proposes to track the selected indicators using the plan described in E(4) of the application. This plan lacks development and specificity. The continuous improvement process described in section E(1) includes monthly reports to the project director from the project evaluator, quarterly reports at advisory board and school leadership meetings, and bi-weekly status reports on the project website. While these reports are vital to the process, they are only one piece of a continuous improvement process. How ongoing corrections will be managed and reevaluated are critical components. How the applicant would monitor, measure, and publically share information on the quality of the project were not detailed. Details are not provided about how the partnership would integrate education and other services; it is simply stated that Center staff will work "hand-in-hand" with teachers and educational staff. Likewise with other components of this section, the applicant pledges to fulfill the requirements but provides insufficient information about how this will be accomplished.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: This is a low quality proposal, lacking coherence and comprehensiveness. It does not address completely, thoughtfully, and in an understandable way how it will build upon the core educational assurance areas. While the applicant mentions adopting Common Core Standards, there is no clear strategy for doing so across the participating LEAs or for providing the professional development to provide educators the knowledge, tools, and resources to bring them to life in classrooms. A		

menu of assessments is presented, but there appears to be no attempt to create an assessment *system* that would provide useful information for educators, students, and parents. College Board assessments would be used as a formative assessment. It is not clearly explained how these would be implemented, how teachers would be trained to use them, or even if these tools would provide appropriate formative information. Two commercial student data systems are proposed to collect and provide student information. It is unclear why two systems are required, how they would provide consistent, non-overlapping information, and how staff would be trained to use the results to inform teaching and learning. The application does not contain a plan for improving teaching and learning by personalizing the learning environment to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. It suggests an "integrated and aligned PK-12 system approach" for which no specifics are given. It purports to build a "college-going culture in every affected community" and to "demonstrate the connection between education and work," but no particulars are included. There is little mention of working with subgroups of students; instead, the applicant produced a one-size-fits-all medley of disconnected approaches. Reading/language arts is sparsely addressed; in fact, no reading/language arts specialist is even included in the listing of required personnel. Recruiting, developing, and retaining effective teachers is not addressed in the proposal; nor are specific strategies for turning around low-achieving schools. The applicant expresses the intent to scale up the project to the region, state, and nation and suggests several organizations and venues for doing so. However, no plan is included.

Total	210	53
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0232WA-3 for NorthEast Washington Educational District 101

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Selection Criteria A – Vision

A1.) The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 does not clearly specify and articulate a clear and comprehensive reform vision. The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 Includes limited evidence that supports the overarching vision of school reform. The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 states:

- a. The applicant shares the importance of developing a program that supports the demands of the 21st century as students prepare for career and college readiness. The applicant noted the importance of an integrated approach via meeting the social emotional needs of the child coupled with an intense focus on the academic skills needed.
- b. The applicant shares some information related to the development of the “two-pronged” program designed to support student academics and a school health program. However, the applicant neglected to include evidence linking the mode of data that would be collected or monitored to measure student achievement.

- c. The applicant incorporated some research in an attempt to support why this particular project would be successful in preparing the students for career and college readiness. The applicant shared the importance of meeting the needs of students on a social emotional level, as evidenced by, the research the applicant shared reflecting the work of McComb School District in Mississippi in 1997. However, the applicant neglected to incorporate the data from that study to support the applicant's claim and the impact of the program on the various demographic groups.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 in the lower range. The applicant clearly and cohesively incorporated the importance of preparing all students for career and college readiness. The applicant neglected to clearly convey the data that would be used to measure student performance and monitor the impact of the program on student achievement. The research the applicant included supported the importance of meeting student needs.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Selection Criteria (A)(2) – Vision: Applicant's approach to implementation.

1. The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 identified six criteria that they used to identify the LEA's that would be eligible to be a part of the consortium. The applicant described the factors 6 criteria but, neglected to share the specific process that was used to ensure that the schools within the LEAs met, collectively, each of the 6 criteria identified. The applicant stated that each school district self-selected.
1. The applicant effectively listed the 15 LEAs involved in the consortium. The applicant did a nice job of naming each LEA and each school within each LEA, the enrollment per district as of May 2012, the Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS) Rate, and the rural designation.
1. The applicant shared the total number of participating students, the percentage and actual number of students who are FARMS eligible (low-income), and the specific number of participating educators. Although the applicant shared the number of participating educators, more detailed information regarding how many participants per LEA would be beneficial. The applicant also shares the exact number of students who are participating and who fall into the high-need status.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the middle range for this section. The applicant clearly listed the schools involved and identified the number of:

- Total students
- Low-income families
- High-need students, and
- Participating educators

The applicant did a good job providing charts that captured data regarding each school per LEA with the consortium.

An upgrade would be for the applicant to identify a clear process used to select the schools: not just the criteria for selection.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

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

1. The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant described the steps they would take to "scale-up" this project and their goal to replicate this project to the larger NEWESD region and the nation. The applicant shared the following steps they would take:

- Initiate immediate expansion to the NEWESD service area which includes 59 districts in a seven-county region
- Disseminate information via American Association of Educational Services Agency (AESAs), the Washington Association of School Administrators, Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Washington State ASCD. However, the applicant neglected to share how the dissemination of this information would translate to all stakeholders
- Finding would be shared with faith-based groups, websites recommended by USDE, community-based organizations, institutions of higher education, etc....

Although the applicant shared with whom they would share the plan, they neglected to share how it translated into meaningful reform to support school organizations outside of the consortium of schools. The applicant failed to share how the scaling-up of this project would assist in meeting the specific needs of a larger population or how this scaling-up would be sustained over time. The applicant did not make an explicit connection between the scaling-up of the project and how scaling-up would support goal attainment.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the lower middle for this section. An upgrade would include the applicant explicitly sharing how this project will meet the need of the participants and others outside of the participant pool. The applicant needs to be more specific regarding how the aspects of this project will be shared, the targeted audiences within each organization mentioned above, and the ideal vision related to district-wide transformation.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

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

1. The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 conveys ambitious yet achievable goals for student achievement, as evidenced on, state standardized assessments. The applicant also identifies ambitious yet, achievable goals related to graduation rates and college enrollment.

The applicant shared detailed graphs that supported the following goals:

- Increasing student achievement of all students to meet or exceed the state AMO by 2017
- Closing the achievement gap by 50%. The applicant referred the reader to a graph that reflected the specific number of economically disadvantaged students who did not meet the state benchmark as compared to other students who were not in this category. However, the 50% decrease is not mathematically represented on the graph. The graph does reflect the projected decrease over a period of time but it does not accurately reflect a 50% decrease a 50% decrease. Each category on that particular graph reflects a 100% decrease.
- Increasing college graduation rate for all students by 2%-3% every year from the 2011-2012 school year (baseline) to the 2016-2017 school year. The projected goal is for 90% of the students to successfully graduate by 2017.
- Increasing the percent of students in college enrollment by 5%-7% per year until the goal of 75% is reached by the 2016-2017 school year.

2.) Although the applicant identifies an ideal goal for the above categories, they do not explicitly share how their vision of the project will result in meeting the set goals. The applicant shares the state’s vision that each student engages in rigorous content and students who graduate prepared to engage in “deeper” learning; resulting in increased preparedness

career and college readiness. However, they do not include specific share ways their vision of the project support will enable the goals to be met in each category mentioned above.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the middle range for this section. An upgrade would include the applicant explicitly sharing how this project will explicitly support goal attainment.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	7

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

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

- a. The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant described how several LEAs within the consortium raised student achievement in the areas of reading, math, science, and writing that met or exceeded the benchmark. The applicant provided a list of specific schools that demonstrated increased student performance in reading. However, a list of the performance gains in math, science, and writing were not provided. The information pertaining to increasing high school graduation rates and college enrollment was captured via data supplied by only one LEA, the lead LEA. The applicant included information related to an alternative program called the NET that supports students with graduating high school and college enrollment.
- b. The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant clearly stated that no schools that are a part of these consortia of schools have been identified as “persistently low-performing” schools. However there are schools within the NEWESD that do have this status. The applicant provided limited information related to the significant reforms in schools that led to increased student achievement. The applicant shared information related to one school implementing a Response To Intervention (RTI) model. However, the details of the intervention were not clear. The applicant shared limited information related to the involvement of teachers and administrator and neglected to share specific details of their role in the program, outside of the mention of one-to-one support for students. The applicant provided a data chart reflecting the student achievement gains of the students. However, a specific number of students at each grade level was not provided on the chart. As a result, there is not a clear understanding as to the impact the intervention had on the student population at large. The applicant did not include any evidence of student performance sustainability as a result of the reform.
- c. The applicant provided specific examples of how they shared student performance with various stakeholders. Please refer to the methods of communication below:
 - The NET program regularly communicated with parents and educators
 - Parent community nights
 - Communication between parents and students, staff and students, and staff and the community
 - Use of technology to make data available and to share data with stakeholders

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the middle range for this section. The applicant should incorporate more specific data to support the claims.

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

(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 NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant shared that LEA processes, practices, and investments can be found on the district website. The applicant shared that personnel salaries for all school employees can be found on the website.

Non-school level expenditures were not shared. However, the applicant noted that school level accounting was not required by the state. The applicant shared that some schools do conduct school level accounting.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the low middle range for this section. The applicant did provide the website to review. An upgrade would be to share how the school/LEA shares information with all stakeholders related to school finances. The applicant did not share how LEA finances are shared with actual school-level personnel.

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

10

3

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

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

The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant reflection was ambiguous and provided limited information related to three “key facets” but, provided limited information related to the details regarding implementation. For example the applicant shared information regarding the regulations that must be adhered to by the state:

1. Common Core - The applicant shared that the standards are being phased in; however, details pertaining to the impact of the new information on the learning environment.
2. State Evaluation System – The application provided more detailed information related to the Washington State Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project. The applicant shared how this evaluation system would begin with the teacher and principal and would eventually lead to the superintendent. However, the applicant did not address the impact of the change on the learning environment.
3. Race To The Top Early Learning Grant – The applicant discusses program strengths but, does not provide details related to its impact on the learning environment.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the low range for this section. The applicant did not provide any information related to the personalized learning environments for the LEAs.

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

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

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

1. The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant described that all of the LEAs interested in participating in the regional consortium were asked to complete an interest proposal, complete a questionnaire, in collaboration with stakeholders (examples given were parents, teachers, principals, and collective bargaining units). The applicant neglected to include sample surveys, stakeholder feedback, or evidence of stakeholder engagement in the process.
2. Most members of the interested LEAs, with the exception of two and the collective bargaining units (not applicable to NEWESD) were represented. The applicant shared that feedback was given to the group. However, there was no specific evidence to support that claim.
3. The applicant included evidence of the mayor’s support.
4. The applicant shared that four stakeholders (organizations) committed to supporting the project. There was evidence of this support in the form of letters to the superintendent. The four groups are:

- College Board
- DreamBox Learning
- Eastern Washington University
- Mobius Science Center

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the middle range for this section. An upgrade would include the applicant explicitly sharing how stakeholders contributed to the development of the proposal and include evidence of this engagement.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

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

The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant provided obscure information related to the project plan, which resulted in an unclear analysis of the plan.

1. The applicant shared strategies that would be relevant to support the project. One strategy mentioned was “online and blended-learning.” However, the applicant did not expound on what the components of online and blended-learning represented. The applicant shared that the pace of learning would be customized to meet the needs of individual students but, neglected to share how this would be determine and a timeline to support the claim of pace.
2. The applicant attempted to share the needs or risks as it related to the projected yet provided inadequate information. For example, the applicant mentions conducting a survey prior to writing the proposal and asking the LEAs to determine if their region was a considered a college-going culture. The applicant did not make a clear correlation between a college-going culture and college and career readiness. The applicant did not provide quantifiable data to support any strengths or weaknesses of the plan.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the low range for this section. The applicant did not provide an analysis on the impact the project would have on students nor did the applicant clearly convey an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, or threats of this project.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	9

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Selection Criteria (C)(1) –Learning: An approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner.

The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant attempted to convey how the plan will support all tenets outlined in the *Learning* selection criteria.

1. The applicant did not clearly convey a specific trajectory that identified specific learning goals with clarity. The applicant shared that providing students with opportunities to work with outside groups (partners), will enhance student learning and expose students to higher level thinking and provide students with a foundation for college and career readiness. The applicant did not provide a strategic pathway for the reader to connect the project to the partner affiliation and how that affiliation will make sustainable and measurable growth for students.
2. The applicant shared that preparatory work at the pre-Kindergarten level will support students in becoming career and college ready. The applicant did not detail what those prerequisite skills/work.
3. The applicant makes several references to the importance of involving the parent stakeholders in the implementation plan yet does not provide specific details related to their involvement.
4. The applicant describes the importance of providing professional development opportunities for the staff and shares the importance of meeting the needs of students.
5. The applicant discussed the importance of data collection and gave examples of the type of assessments that would be used to determine student goal attainment.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the low medium range for this section. Some suggested upgrades would include:

- Providing clarity regarding the role of students in their learning
- Describing the types of professional development opportunities teachers will receive
- Providing how the plan will provide differentiated support for the success of all students
- Sharing data monitoring timeline

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

20

13

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

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

The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant conveyed the main components for all tenets outlined in this selection criteria.

1. The applicant identified opportunities for Professional Development for the staff members who will be involved in meeting the needs of students. The applicant shared the type of training that the teacher would receive at the school level and through the various partnerships.
2. The applicant shared that they will identify multiple measures to assess student progress via standardized assessments and an early student performance warning system.
3. The applicant shared that they would hire professionals to students with the social and emotional development and addiction prevention
4. The applicant shared opportunities for staff to engage in what they called horizontal and vertical professional development opportunities.
5. The applicant shared the state is revamping their professional growth and evaluation system that will reflect standards related to teaching and learning as outlined by the CCSS

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the medium range for this section. An upgrade would be to include:

- Provide more clarity regarding the staff development plan that clearly and coherently outlines opportunities to build staff capacity
- The applicant shares several ways to assess students to determine different areas of performance but the applicant needs to share in a succinct and clear way

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</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 NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant clearly conveyed the main components for most tenets outlined in this selection criterion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The governance structure was specifically outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding. The applicant noted that the consortium would organize an advisory board, comprised of the lead LEAs who will meet quarterly. 1. The applicant noted that each school would form a leadership team, comprised of the principal, teachers, and staff. This team will meet monthly the teams will provide updates to the advisory board. 1. The students will be provided with an opportunity to learn at their own pace. The teachers will provide the interventions needed to support the students. 1. The applicant shared multiple ways to collect student performance data via standardized measures. 1. The applicant shared opportunities students would be given to engage in learning. They will receive independent technology instruction, one-on-one instruction, and access to rigorous curriculum. <p>Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the medium range for this section. An upgrade would be to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing specific data related to the students who receive individualized instruction and who are English Language Learners. The applicant did not provide enough details reflecting how the plan would specifically support these student groups. • Providing a timeline reflecting how the extended pacing supports the CCSS/rigorous curriculum 		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Selection Criteria (D)(2) –LEA practices, policies, and rules: The LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning.</p> <p>The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant clearly conveyed some tenets outlined in this selection criterion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A needs-assessment survey will be given to determine the resources needed for each student in the school. This will ensure that all students and schools have the materials needed to proceed successfully. 		

1. Establishing an Ed Center to allow stakeholders to access data on student performance. Although, via the Ed Center, workshops for staff will be developed, the applicant did not provide details as it relates to the exact type of training staff would receive. The application states that they will integrate technology into the school improvement plan. However, the applicant neglected to explicitly share how this will be done.
1. The information shared regarding information technology systems is underdeveloped.
1. More detailed information is needed.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the lower medium range for this section. An upgrade would be to include:

- The applicant needs to provide more developed and detailed ideas as it relates to the sub-criteria c and d.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: Selection Criteria (E)(1) – Continuous improvement process</p> <p>The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant conveyed some tenets outlined in this selection criterion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant did not explicitly share strategies for implementing a continuous improvement process. The applicant shared that monthly reports would be generated and synthesized into quarterly reports to share with the advisory board, the project manager would share updates, bi-weekly. Although the applicant shared that data would be collected and shared, they did not reveal how this information would be shared with all of the stakeholders. <p>Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the lower medium range for this section. An upgrade would be to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing more details related to monitoring the plan to determine effectiveness • Revealing how the funding is supporting and/or impacting the program that is being funded 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Selection Criteria (E)(2) – Continuous improvement process</p> <p>The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant completely provided sufficient information for this selection criterion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant explicitly shared how they will use various mediums in which information will pertaining to the project will be communicated to the public. The following are modes of communication that will be used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a public relations plan identifying a roadmap to share strategic information • Video distribution • Twitter • Facebook • Project website <p>Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the high range for this section. No further upgrades suggested.</p>		

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Selection Criteria (E)(3) – Continuous improvement process</p> <p>The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 applicant provided adequate information for this section. There were specific upgrades shared that would provide more clarity related to the rationale.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant explicitly stated that the school reform goals are geared toward the students who fall into the “economically disadvantaged” subgroup. The applicant shared that they would use the measures to guide the reform. There was a lack of evidence provided regarding the claims made by the applicant in the rationale section of section. Some of the performance measures presented by the applicant were considered measurable. However, the applicant identified two performance measures that did not include specific criteria for success. See below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “all children enter kindergarten ready to learn” “Support of the non-academic needs of students will increase” The applicant fulfilled the requirement for the 14 performance measures. The goal benchmarks, as quantitatively shared, were ambitious yet achievable. The applicant provided limited support as to how the staff would gage implementation success over time. The applicant states that they will engage in a review progress, annually. <p>Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the medium range for this section.</p>		

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Selection Criteria (E)(4) – “Ambitious yet achievable” plan</p> <p>The are some goals outlined in the are ambitious. The goals that are outlined for the grade 3, Pre-K - 3, and Kindergarten are ambitious. The following goals were shared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All grade 3 students will meet the benchmark by grade 4 in reading All K students will have increased school readiness by Kindergarten as measured by the Dibbles Assessment tool Increase the number of students meeting the state benchmark over the SY 2011 - 2012 baseline data <p>The other goals shared are reasonable but, not ambitious</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The behavioral interventions for students in grades Pre-K - 3 will decrease Increase support of non-academic needs <p>The quantitative data attached to the plan reflect benchmark that are achievable. However, some of the performance targets are not ambitious performance measures. The goals that are proposed to be measured do not lend themselves to the intended outcome. The goals are not convincing.</p> <p>Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the medium low range for this section.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Selection Criteria (F)(1) – Continuous improvement process

The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 clearly conveyed all aspects of the funds needed to support the project. some tenets outlined in this selection criterion.

1. The applicant clearly states that there are no external funds will be used toward this project. The clearly identifies all areas of funding. The applicant provided trajectory of funding allocation over the life of the project. The charts and graphs were clearly shared.
1. The rationale and priority for the investment were directly linked to the goals of the project. The expenditures were reasonable and appropriate.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the high range for this section.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Selection Criteria (F)(2) – Sustainability of project goals.

The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 shared an inadequate plan to support sustainability of the project once the grant ends.

1. The applicant indicated an understanding that it is important to extend the program beyond the life of the grant. However, the applicant did not provide a sufficient plan for sustainability. The applicant noted that leadership members would add this discussion item to meeting agendas. The applicant shared that they would reach out to private businesses to attain partnerships. The applicant neglected to add enough supporting evidence to ensure that sustainability of the project would occur beyond the life of the grant.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the lower range for this section.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Competitive Preference Priority

The NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 shared ideas and information that was directly aligned to the vision and the goals established in the application.

1. The applicant reiterated all of the aspects of the project and the plan outlined to support project implementation. The applicant also directed the reader to refer to previous charts and sections discussed in the application.
1. The applicant did a good job rationalizing the importance of establishing a program to support the social-emotional health and other basic needs of students. The applicant incorporated some research and information from a previous model used to support their claims.
1. The applicant shared the importance of professional development but, lacked the specific actions that would be taken in order to determine if those staff trainings would meet differentiated staff needs.

1. The applicant noted that the Coordinated Health staff would host varied parent events. However, school-level family engagement will be left up to the schools to determine. This will lend itself to increased variability. An upgrade would be to create a family engagement and involvement strategic plan to meet the outlined goals related to increasing family/parental engagement.

Overall, the NorthEast Washington Educational District 101 scored in the medium range for this section due to the fact that the applicant did not provide enough detailed information in critical areas.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The application clearly shared that there is a need to meet the social-emotional and basic health needs of students they serve. However, the applicant had areas within the application that were not coherent or specific. There were several key components to the plan that were underdeveloped like, parent outreach, professional development, and methods that would be used to increase the repertoire of staff and the effectiveness of the training.

The comments of the reviewer, throughout this application, consistently inform the applicant that more details and increased idea development was needed in order to present a plan that reflected clarity.

Total	210	109
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0232WA-4 for NorthEast Washington Educational District 101

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant’s reform vision details an integrated approach, addressing the needs of the whole child – physical, emotional, social and behavioral, with an intense focus on academic skills. The applicant states that this approach to education will prepare students for college, career, and citizenship. A new center for student learning will be developed by the consortium. The plan for this center is key to implementation of the project. The involvement of the Regional Coordinator of School Health and the Department of Student Learning and Support Services will aid the implementation process. The center will provide health and wellness services that help prepare students for college and career success.

(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a plan for implementing reform.

The process for inclusion in this project is described as “self-selected” on the basis of the following factors: the schools/districts met the rural/remote classification, located in the NEWESD area, and a shared commitment to personalized learning environments and the RTT-D core reform areas.

The applicant provides a chart listing the schools and districts selected to participate in the project, including participating LEA information using May 2012 enrollment figures, and free and reduced lunch percentages and rural designation. The data includes subgroups – low income, and high-needs.

The total number of participating students is projected at 6,396.

Note: 2/3 of this total are high-needs students (4,592).

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes its rural background as small, where the schools and districts are often synonymous. As a result, the consortium plans to provide grant services in each building PK-12, ensuring that change is implemented throughout the participating districts.

As a rural consortium, the applicant states that the model is replicable statewide and nationally. More information is needed as to how this model is replicable.

Applicant has identified multiple ways to share their findings. Participants will share project’s progress with affiliated organizations. The agencies and organizations will be updated frequently.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Data from Washington state's Measurement of Student Progress, an annual assessment, is used to set a baseline for the project.

The state is in the process of updating their annual measurable objectives (AMO's). New targets reflect the transition to Common Core standards. The goals of the new AMO's is to reduce proficiency gaps by half by 2017.

Learning targets are defined for graduation rate, college enrollment, and decreasing achievement gaps.

The target graduation rate in 2017 is 90% for the overall group.

The expectation is the same for the subgroup "Economically Disadvantaged", even though the baseline data for this group is 6% lower.

Baseline college enrollment rate is 58% overall, with an even lower rate of 39% for economically disadvantaged students. Targeted college enrollment is at least 75%.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	7

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides four year data for participating LEA's showing improvement in basic skills and proficiency in assessments required for graduation. The raw data charts list subgroups: number of participating educators, low-income students, and high-needs. Student performance data is available through the NET, an ongoing communication tool for parents and educators. Skyward is also currently in use by consortium members.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The OSPI publishes salaries for instructional staff and teachers on its website. A State legislative evaluation committee requires public access to budget and performance data, providing a website created by the Office of Financial Management as a means of sharing current accounting data as well as historical data.

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

10

3

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Statewide reform is in the process of implementation. Baseline - Phase 1, has been implemented in School Year 2011-2012 – developing an awareness of the Common Core Standards. A state reform bill will change teacher/principal evaluation.

More information is needed for personalized student learning environments.

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

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

All stakeholders are represented in the development of the proposal. The applicant addresses continued development and revision as a multi-phase process. Stakeholders will have frequent meetings and consultations as the project progresses. All but two participating LEA's have collective bargaining representation. Those without collective bargaining representation have the opportunity to vote on support of the plan. Letters of support are attached for key stakeholders.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a needs analysis for each LEA and has designed a "check-list", for each LEA to inventory specific needs. Participating LEA's conducted an in-depth survey identifying items needed for successful implementation and current status of personal learning environments. In addition, the participating LEA's surveyed cultural views on education.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>College and training beyond high-school is not a high priority for the rural communities (LEA's) involved in the project. The applicant will use a college and career-readiness plan to demonstrate the connection between college and life-long benefits. Career Pathways will be discussed at all levels.</p> <p>Teachers will receive extensive professional development as they implement The Common Core standards. More information is needed to describe "extensive professional development."</p> <p>Multiple resources have been identified i.e. ReadStep, PSAT/NMSQT and SAT, assessments designed to measure a progression of skills.</p> <p>The consortium will design and implement cultural programs specific to the region.</p> <p>Students and teachers will participate in comprehensive technology training during the first year of the grant. Ongoing support on how to use the tools and resources will assist with implementation.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant plans to provide Professional development in the implementation of professional learning communities (PLC's).</p> <p>MOBIUS and school partners will develop and co-pilot two STEM modules in each school.</p> <p>Dreambox, an online individualized math program will be used by the students daily providing individualized pacing and includes virtual manipulatives.</p> <p>The plan proposes inclusion of the Education Advocate Project – an academic and mental health program designed to support targeted students. Note: <u>Check and Connect</u>- will be used to help re-engage high risk students.</p> <p>The state is in the process of implementing a high-quality teacher/principal evaluation. This new evaluation system takes into account student growth, and will be used to improve educator effectiveness.</p> <p>Comprehensive professional development in the Skyward and Homeroom data programs has been planned to ensure educators know how to use the tools and data. Student entry and performance data is readily available, the tools are designed to help improve academic performance.</p> <p>High-quality resources ie MyMath, ACT/SATPSAT preparation programs, and My College QuickStart will be included in the project.</p>		

The LEA's will receive site budgets based on student headcount.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The multi-district consortium will establish an advisory board with one voting member from each LEA, and will select an advisory chair to lead the group.</p> <p>A school leadership team will have flexibility and autonomy to ensure local factors are addressed appropriately.</p> <p>Students move forward at their own pace after successfully reaching benchmarks in grade level curriculum.</p> <p>A standard state assessment is given each spring, the data for each student tracks improvement and mastery of standards. In addition to yearly state assessments, multiple lesson assessments are given during the year.</p> <p>Classroom instruction and daily individual online learning activities, allows students to progress at their own rate.</p> <p>The online activities will be structured to accomodate learners with IEP's.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant addresses LEA and school infrastructure, ensuring that all participants will have access to the same learning content, tools and resources.</p> <p>Each school will complete a checklist of resources needed to participate in the grant. The schools will use their grant site budget to acquire necessary resources.</p> <p>An Education and technology Support center will be provided to ensure that students and parents have access data in an open data format. The applicant states that a key goal is to develop an interoperable data system.</p> </div>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Leadership committees will meet routinely to discuss progress, problems and adjustments needed to improve program success.

A Project Evaluator will monitor programs monthly.

The applicant plans to keep all stakeholders informed of progress, creating a website to update all participants, in a timely manner, of current status, ongoing academic progress, and calendar of current events.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A public relations plan will be developed using multiple social networking tools.

A website, facebook, and twitter will be used to inform stakeholders of current activities and progress.

The applicant plans to use a professional videographer to document the grant program as it progresses.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant details selected performance measures, rationale, and reviewing progress over time.

Grade specific measures are detailed in chart format.

Skyward will be used to track the performance measures.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A comprehensive evaluation plan will be developed to meet grant requirements. The applicant has established nine additional performance measures to guide reform goals.

Ongoing data collection and analysis will assess progress in meeting program goals.

In addition to summative assessments, interviews, focus groups and surveys will be conducted.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes a budget narrative and tables. No matching funds will be used for this project.

Multiple budget subpart tables describe funds to be used to support implementation.

One-time investments have been budgeted in year one, and will be used throughout the grant funding years.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A sustainability plan is outlined. The consortium partners do not view the grant as short-term, and plan for sustainability beginning in the first year of the grant. Sustainability will be addressed at all partnership meetings and suggested sources will be updated as introduced.

“Fees-for-services” is one suggestion for sustainability.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that their comprehensive approach to meeting the project goals begins with the establishment of a health center. This health model is based on the McComb model.

The McComb model will be used to develop the framework for this project and is described as a coordinated health model designed to improve academic performance. The McComb model defines 9 essential needs that must be met in order for students to be academically successful. The applicant describes the 9 essential needs and will incorporate them into the project.

The proposal details outcomes and supports in tables immediately following this section.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has addressed how it will build on core educational assurance areas, proposing to create personalized learning environments with strategies, tools and supports aligned to the goals. The applicant has provided supports for students and teachers that align with the goals of graduation and college and career readiness.

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

