



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0854TX-1 for Pasadena Independent School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided details of a plan and specified their goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. The applicant's vision involves more than 53,000 students and has a stated aim of access equitable learning through Personal Learning Environments responsive to student's educational goals, interests, and abilities. The stated aim centers on the 'communication loop' between teacher and student. The applicant seeks to provide educators with e-portal access to instantaneous academic analysis of student's needs, interests, and social-economic challenges. The result will be a computer generated list of academic resources, learning opportunities, and teaching strategies. The applicant also seeks to develop educator effectiveness through a staff evaluation/coaching/development system resulting in increased numbers of teachers, principals, and the superintendent becoming effective and highly effective educators. Consistent with this competition, the applicant has a stated vision that includes college- and career-ready students. The applicant has reportedly established the goal of providing equitable learning to students through Personal Learning Environments. The applicant proposes development of a venue for continuous communication, monitoring, and feedback, and reports that currently teachers have no easy access to disaggregated student data nor do they reportedly have an understanding of the instructional implications of that data. The applicant believes that technology can dissolve these barriers. Subsequently the applicant proposes a 'technology driven infrastructure' with teacher and student e-portals used to develop Personal Learning Environments (PLE-portals). These portals will reportedly be used to disaggregate student data which is then plotted for college and career ready performance and standards. The applicant proposes to use web-based resources to the gauge student's academic gaps and acceleration needs, interests, and socio-economic challenges. The PLE-portal framework will reportedly be used to deliver academic assignments, tutoring, acceleration activities, class resources, assignments, web-based resources, interest index information, fitness information, and college and career research. The PLE-portals will reportedly also be used by students to complete homework, work collaboratively, converse with industry based mentors, research post-secondary career options, research scholarship applications, submit FAFSA applications, and participate in industry based mentoring/shadowing opportunities. The applicant believes that access to e-portals student levels data will increase academic rigor, help create optional flexible learning venues (a reform that includes an 8-period-school day, virtual high school, dual credit, and AP classes), help developing student learning management skills, and increased access to technology. The applicant is aiming to expand a technology pilot high school structure for five of the ten intermediate schools that feed into two high schools. Additional applicant focal points include college and career readiness and developing educator effectiveness.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a description of the process the applicant used to select schools to participate. The process collectively meets the competition's eligibility requirements and a list of the schools that will participate in grant activities was provided. The applicant provided information regarding the total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators. The applicant's reports that all but three schools described in the proposal will be implement district-wide, for all grade-levels, and all content areas. The applicant states that district-wide reforms will reach 58 schools benefiting all 53,165 enrolled students of which 81% are eligible for 'free or reduced lunch' subsidies. In addition, 51% of students are reportedly "high need students." In addition, the applicant states that this project will provide college readiness activities, deepen instructional rigor, deepen student learning, and increase the number of effective educators. The applicant reports that some reforms will target specific grade levels where students will benefit from

them the most. The applicant reports that due to the significant cost associated with technology purchases, they are forced to limit school participation in the one-to-one technology and that they will augment it with a Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) pilot by year three of the grant. The schools chosen for the technology pilot feed into two high schools that already have experience with one-to-one technology. These schools serve a combined total of 7,993 students of which 75% are eligible for the 'free and reduced lunch program and 43% are high need students. The applicant reports that a minimum of 53,165 students will participate in the proposed reforms, 43,184 of the participating students are eligible for the 'free or reduced lunch' subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act; and 26,901 of the students are high need students. The applicant states that the proposed reforms will help 4,110 educators become effective or highly effective in their job skills.

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

10

4

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that district-wide reforms will reach all students and educators, because the e-portals will be implemented district-wide. According to the applicant the district will begin with basic e-portal rollout within 100 days of the grant award. The applicant also reports that educator evaluations will begin with teachers and principals, assistant principals, and the superintendent during the 2014-2015 school-year. According to the applicant increased instructional rigor, college readiness activities, and development of student learning management skills will begin within 100 days of the grant award. The applicant's plan involves pilot reforms that will serve a total of 10 schools during the grant. The applicant states that "since a district-wide scale up would be incomprehensibly expensive, (\$26,500,000 for laptops for 53,000 students with replacements at a minimum every five years and \$3,770,000 for staff to support it), the district will scale up the one-to-one technology by allowing students to use their wireless smart devices (BYOD) in class." This statement raises some concern. It's not clear how all student will obtain the necessary technology, if it's required, if this will lead to disparities In student access, and so forth.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicants projected outcomes do not appear adequately ambitious. There are several projected gaps between 'subgroups', for example between 'white' and 'African American' students in the 2016/2017 post grant school year on graduation rates (projecting 93% and 86% for the aforementioned groups).The applicant reports its state is transitioning to a new assessment of student skills and knowledge. The applicant reports that this transition is not fully complete and met standard and college readiness for these assessments are still in transition. The applicant also reports that none of the state assessments measure learning growth by year and year and one-half increments. To compensate for the student outcome information gaps, the applicant reports that they will track student outcomes from other standardized assessments. The applicant reports having improved student learning, closing achievement gaps, reducing dropout rates, increasing high school completion rates, increasing high school graduation rates, and increasing the number of students enrolling in post-secondary school. The applicant reports that increasing the number of students enrolling in post-secondary school falls in the poorest 23% of the 1,024 state school districts. The state reports turning around low-performing status schools.

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	10

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has made modest and occasionally sporadic improvement in student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps, including raising student achievement, and high school graduation rates. The applicant has achieved reforms turning around its persistently lowest-achieving schools. The applicant makes student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. The applicant reports improved student learning, closing 'achievement gaps', reducing dropout rates, increasing high school completion rates, increasing high school graduation rates, and increase the number of students enrolling in post-secondary school (though the applicant district falls in the poorest 23% of the 1,024 state school districts). The applicant cites a longitudinal data system which indicates modest gains. The applicant reports being in the third year of implementing grant funded school wide-reforms in two schools aimed at turning around low-performing status. Both schools have reportedly improved their status. The applicant reports an intention to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve student achievement. participation, instruction, and services. The applicant district reportedly gives teachers access to student performance data from

standardized testing/assessment information. Teachers also reportedly have access to College Board data once it is delivered to schools. The applicant states that teachers use the data in a professional learning community environment to assist with instruction. The applicant reports that 20% of its schools use the data to engage students in "data talks" to help student take ownership of their performance and set learning goals. The applicant states that parents have access to student personal graduation plans, and student attendance data. This occurs through a website.

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

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports transparency in its process, practices, and investments. This reportedly includes personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, with data listed online. Evidence of a district survey is found in the appendix. The applicant reports that school-level expenditures for regular instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration is available upon request. The applicant reports that actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances information on the survey can be found online. The applicant reports completing this survey annually. Evidence of the survey can be found in appendix. The applicant reports that actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional is available through a state system. The applicant reports that actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level is accessible to non-personnel district-wide expenditures by reviewing monthly board reports that are published on the web at the districts website, and by reviewing the district's annual audit or it may secure school level expenditures by completing a request for information through the Public Information Act.

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

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that the targeted district, has obtained the waivers from their state, which allows the district sufficient autonomy to implement expand student access to learning venues and to implement educator evaluations. These include flexible school day waivers providing flexibility in the number of hours each day that a student attends, and a flexible school day program with the stated aim of increasing graduation rates for students who are in danger of dropping out. The applicant reports that students may attend school on a fixed or a flexible schedule that is not a traditional day, or five day per week requirement. The applicant reports that student's instructional time is funded is at the same rate under as attendance for a full-time equivalent student. The applicant also reports a waiver for teacher evaluation. The state requires that any alternative appraisal system must be developed and supported by locally adopted policy and procedures, and by the processes outlined in the state education code. The applicant states that, "teacher evaluation tools used to evaluate the performance of teachers must include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an element of the evaluation criterion." The applicant reports that agreements are needed for instruction in dual credit classes which result in high school or college credit. The applicant also reports an articulation agreement which acknowledges that college classes taught at district high schools are accepted for college credit.

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

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal and how the proposal was revised based on their feedback (located in the appendix). The applicant has provided evidence of district support. According to the applicant, a 'design team' began meeting in August and met weekly to create a framework for reform that aligned this competition and the four core education assurance areas and the Competitive Preference Priority. The stated framework included streamlining data access through e-portals, 1-to-1 technology, preparing students for post-secondary opportunity, educator development evaluations, external partnerships to address social emotional or behavioral needs, and optional flexible learning opportunities. The applicant also reports development of a strategic planning team that included district staff, community stakeholders, parents, and students. The applicant's 'five year strategic plan' is in listed in the appendix. Evidence that educator input was sought in developing this proposal is located in the appendix. The survey completed by the applicant's educators show relatively high support among teachers for the proposed reforms (roughly 92.2% in favor with 980 educators responding). The applicant LEA is in a state that does not allow collective bargaining representative, but there is reported evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal. The applicant includes letters of support from key stakeholders.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant reports using data systems for meeting state reporting requirements and helping educators respond to student social and academic challenges. An external company reportedly warehouses longitudinal student data and allows the applicant district to utilize it as a reporting portal. The applicant also reportedly tracks enrollment data, special program data, and special education data. The applicant reports having access to student data on discipline, grades, attendance, eligibility for free and reduced lunch programs, and special education student service data. The applicant district reportedly allows educators to see student's longitudinal performance. The applicant reports that teachers need information to improve instruction and that "the time it takes to turn raw data into information that can guide instruction is significant." The applicant is proposing to give teachers 'one click' e-portal access to individual and whole class gap information/resource. The applicant reports that the district has re-written approximately 60% of its curriculum to include college aligned academic standards. Regarding learning management the applicant reports that currently four of the five high schools and three of the ten intermediate schools have implemented the learning management skills development. The applicant reports that in terms of college readiness, their 'department' leads the district in its PK-12 vision of students pursuing post-secondary opportunities. It's not completely clear how this vision translates into substantive accomplishments. The applicant does report experience with college readiness activities, but states that resources have limited district-wide implementation. The extent of these limitations is unclear. Regarding existing educator development resources, the applicant reports that it uses a coaching model to support teachers who are new to the district.</p> <p>Regarding an educator evaluation system, the applicant reportedly uses their state educator assessment tool which is based on classroom observational walkthroughs required, annually. The applicant reports having experience using a value added educator evaluation system. This program provides incentive awards tied to student academic achievement and staff development. The applicant has made the determination that education is a complex process. The applicant has made the positive acknowledgment that the process must be supportive as opposed to simply punitive.</p>		

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 states that the proposed funding opportunity will support district-wide reforms that engage students through a Personal Learning Environment responsive to their interests, learning needs, and life goals. The applicant also believes that this personalized learning environment will result in secondary students taking responsibility for their own learning through critical/problem-solving, working collaboratively, being self-directed, and incorporating feedback. The applicant describes a series of hypothetical situations to describe the process. The applicant also states that by year four of the grant the Personal Learning Environments will result in elementary students taking responsibility for their own learning through critical/problem-solving, working collaboratively, being self-directed, and incorporating feedback. The applicant also uses a series of hypothetical situations to describe how students might identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals. For example, the applicant describes a student using the PLE-portal to link to college/career resources and find that they can pursue a large number of careers in a field related to their interest. The applicant goes on to suggest that students will be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest, again using a series of hypothetical situations to describe what may or may not happen. The applicant suggests that students will have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. No real data is presented, however, to support these claims. The applicant has provided details of a plan and specified their goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant claims that participating educators (as defined in this notice) engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity.</p>		

The applicant states that one week prior to students starting school, educators return for school specific and district-wide professional staff development. The applicant reportedly plans to use this time to introduce educators to the e-portal dashboards specific to their role; according to the applicant teachers will learn how to access student data with one click and how to use e-portal instructional recommendations and matched resources. Again, the applicant uses hypothetical scenarios to describe the potential uses. According to the applicant, counselors will learn how to access student progress on the recommended graduation plan, track their progress on pursuing

post-secondary enrollment or careers, and whether or not they are on track to graduate in four years and enroll in post-secondary. According to the applicant, counselors will also learn how to alert students to activities/steps they need to take to stay on track for graduation. According to the applicant, principals and assistant principals can track whole school student academic performance, teacher instructional growth, and quickly identify any operational challenges. The proposed e-portal will apparently trigger alerts on assessment outcomes, attendance, and discipline. The applicant reports that principals will learn how to access aggregated and disaggregated teacher performance data. They will also reportedly understand which teachers need most help and assistance through instructional modeling and coaching will help principals target campus resources for development. The applicant reports the potential to provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches. According to the applicant teachers will be trained on how to use the teacher student data and the e-portal to adapt content and instruction specific to student needs. According to the applicant, is a student's assessment data indicates that a student's knowledge and skills already surpass the day's instruction then teachers will learn how to drop into that student's portal activity that is aligned to the student's interest and engages the student into the content on a deeper level through collaborative work or project-based learning. The applicant reports that teachers will learn to take e-portal learning deeper during two day summer institutes each year. In addition, the applicant reports that content specialists and technology specialists will be available daily for training. The applicant reports the potential to measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards, or college and career-ready graduation requirements and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators. The applicant reports the potential to access student learning needs information that is matched to resources designed to address learning needs. The applicant also proposes to train educators to use the e-portals to transform student e-portals into PLE-portals, how to monitor student progress, and how to continuously modify a PLE content to assure progress. The applicant proposes that training resources will be used to train counselors on how to use the e-portal student progress data to keep students on-track for graduation.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to organize its central office to support, guide, and lead district-wide initiatives and school-based pilot initiatives. The applicant proposes a central office staff who will lead the implementation of the proposed reforms and guide campus implementation. This staff will include an associate superintendent, a professional staff development coordinator, a

project manager, three programmers to write the software, seven technical/computer staff, two instructional technology specialists, and one compliance officer. In terms of academic related staff, the applicant proposes hiring, two content specialists to support educator coaching, four content specialists to work with educators to integrate e-portal use into their instruction and educational leadership responsibilities, clerical staff to maintain and coordinate all records and documentation, one college readiness director to coordinate all campus based and e-portal college readiness activities and learning, five high school coordinators to coordinate all student optional flexible learning opportunities, a virtual high school director to coordinate expansion of virtual school offerings and student enrollment, and a coordinated school health manager to coordinate the district-wide student health and wellness initiatives focused on helping students take responsibility for their own health and making healthy lifestyle choices. According to the applicant an over-site committee consisting of stakeholders will meet quarterly to review and support program implementation. The applicant suggests giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic.

The applicant believes that they can expand and strengthen existing learning venues that allow students to pursue additional rigorous coursework and to progress in school beyond grade level and seat time limitations through optional flexible learning opportunities. The approach to this consists of an 8-period school day and a "virtual high school" with

the stated aim of allowing more flexibility than outside opportunities. The idea of allowing dropouts the opportunity to earn their high school diploma through a virtual high school seems complex.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that E-portals will be accessible by all students, their parents, and educators involved in the student's learning. The applicant states that it cannot afford to give every student, educator, and parent technology capable of accessing the e-portals, it will strategically erect internet towers across the district, giving every student, educator, and parent wireless internet access. According to the applicant, students who have computers, but not internet access, will be able to access their portal. The applicant reports that students and educators that use district computers will have internet access. The applicant states that those students, parents, and other stakeholders that do not have computers or access to district computers, will receive support to use smart phones, iPads, laptops, and so forth to access e-portals and learning information. Again, this seems like a very problematic aspect to the proposed plan. According to the applicant, they will test and resolve the anticipated system challenges related to safely allowing outside technology access to the districts technology infrastructure. The applicant reports that the appropriate levels of technical support may be provided through a range of strategies. The applicant proposes hiring staff to support this aspect of the plan.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that reforms will be regularly monitored, evaluated, and refined through a rigorous continuous improvement process that assures program improvements are based on program outcome data. The applicant insists that feedback will guide program modifications throughout the program and after the grant funding has ended. To assist with this, the applicant has proposed hiring an external evaluator. This individual will reportedly create data collection protocols, spreadsheets, and databases that will be used to track and maintain process data. The proposed program components to be tracked include linking the district's existing data system with new data systems that can provide academic analysis of student's needs, interests, and social-economic challenges, identify academic resources and learning opportunities, track student academic performance, and transform raw data into instructional information, establish an educator evaluation system that develops teacher, principal, and superintendent skills. The applicant reports that data collected will be analyzed quarterly by the external evaluator, and the information presented to an 'implementation team'. The applicant reports that the implementation team will review the evaluator's process data and grant objectives specific to the development of technology linkages, student learning, preparing students for post-secondary, the development of educators through evaluations and coaching, and the infusion of resources to meet the participant's social, emotional or behavioral needs. The applicant reports that limited progress will trigger program activity reforms.

The applicant has plans to implement an improvement process that provides feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for improvements during and after the term of the grant. However the proposed system does not allow for significant adaptations. The applicant does an adequate job stating how they will publicly share information on the quality of its investments.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that in addition to formative data to make recommendations for the subsequent years of the grant, the summative report will utilize a variety of quantitative measures. The applicant reports that these will be outlined in the performance measures section of this grant. The applicant reports that in order to understand differences between subgroups within the district a comparison group will be created using individual matching techniques. The applicant proposes using hierarchical linear modeling to analyze this data. Regarding the sharing of information, the applicant had indicated that the associate superintendent will provide updates to the Board of Trustees during faculty meetings, parents, and community organization events. The applicant states that sharing will

focus on formative outcomes and benefits to community residents. The applicant reports that principals will be surveyed four times per year during the first year and two times in subsequent years. The applicant reports that this survey will include perceptions of the project at school, satisfaction with professional development, perceived project needs and reporting on leadership initiatives within the school. The applicant reports that in the first year of the grant, parents and other relevant stakeholders will be surveyed twice a year and in subsequent years one time a year. The applicant reports that these surveys will look at parents understanding of the grant elements, their use of it as a part of planning their children’s learning, and their comfort level with the reform processes. The applicant reports that surveys will be administered electronically, using the e-portal, but parent surveys, in particular, will be administered both on paper and electronically in order to encourage the highest possible response rate. The applicant reports that focus groups with parents or other stakeholder groups will also be conducted. The applicant reports that communication will occur on several levels, and that communication will occur with internal and external stakeholders according to the description found above in “Sharing of Information”. The applicant reports that communication will also occur with the departments and schools implementing reforms through their representation on the implementation team. The applicant reports that discussions, tasks, and remedies identified during team bi-monthly team meetings will be taken back to the department or school for consideration and inclusion in their ongoing campus based implementation. The applicant reports that between meetings, ongoing communication will occur through emails, phone calls, and subcommittee meetings.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that this grant will increase student achievement through decreasing achievement gaps, and increasing graduation rates, college enrollment, and post-secondary degree attainment. The applicant also reports that the performance measures reflect issues identified by design team, developed over several meetings. The applicant projects and established goal here annually, 75% of the participating students will receive instruction from a teacher of record who is a highly effective teacher as measured by student performance on a state assessment; that annually, 68% of the participating students will attend school that is managed by a school principal who is highly effective principal as measured by student performance on a state assessment; that annually, 92% of the participating students will receive instruction from a teacher of record who is minimally an effective teacher as measured by student performance on a state assessment; that annually 100% of the participating students will attend school that is managed by a school principal who is minimally an effective principal as measured by student performance on a state assessment, and that district-wide performance on the state assessment for reading will increase by 12 percentage points by the end of the 2015-2016 school year.

The applicant has developed additional performance measures by grade level whereby grades 4-8 will have 57% of participating 8th grade students achieving college- and career readiness indicator scores by the end of the 2015-2016 school year; the applicant has a goal whereby students will increase their performance on the state reading assessment by 15 percentage points by the end of the 2015-2016 school-year; increase the percentage of students in grades 4-8 achieving a “healthy fitness zone” in five or more of the assessments 2 percentage points. For grades 9-12 the applicant has established goals whereby at the end of the 2015-2016 school-year 70% of participating high school seniors will complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid form annually; by the end of the 2015-2016 school year 59% of 10th grade students will achieve the college- and career readiness indicator score on standardized assessment; by the end of the 2015-2016 school-year 50% percent of 9-12 grade students will demonstrate career readiness by being in a coherent sequence of classes for career technology education; by the end of the 2015-2016 school-year participating 9-12 grade students will increase their score on a state reading assessment by 14 percentage points; and increase the percentage of students in grades 9-12 achieving the Healthy Fitness Zone in five or more of the assessments 2% annually. According to the applicant, these performance measures will be reviewed periodically. The idea of changing performance measures seems problematic. The applicant does not speak in great detail to the use of data for program development, only stating that there will be ongoing communication between evaluator and the implementation team.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes hiring an external evaluator to implement an “extended-term mixed-method evaluation” design. This design includes a long-term time-line, or an evaluation guided by the program’s purposes; a deliberate incorporation of formative, summative, and follow-up data collection/analysis; sharply focused causal questions; and rigorous quantitative and qualitative evidence. The applicant outlines basic formative and summative measures, and states that a more specific plan will be developed in conjunction with the program director’s needs. The applicant provided a logic model to detail the overall plan for evaluation.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that proposed reforms can only be accomplished through providing the needed resources to establish and create the infrastructure to support the program. The applicant has allocated \$11,077,541 for 'student learning'. The technology initiatives which are developed through a pilot program has a total infrastructure cost listed as \$12,590,649. In addition the applicant has allocated \$4,938,724 for the development of the e-portal/PLE infrastructure. The applicant had established an educator development evaluation system, and to develop "highly effective educators" the applicant has proposed a "growth award" which had an estimated cost of \$6,111,050 for three of the four years of the grant period. The applicant has budgeted \$3,929,272 to be used during the four year grant period to hire staff to implement district-wide reforms for project administration. The cost to implement these strategies focused on improving student health, reducing family poverty through workforce supports, and increasing student postsecondary institution enrollment through college enrichment activities estimated at \$894,076. The cost of hiring an external evaluator who will be responsible for guiding data collection and data analysis is \$458,688 for the four year grant. The total amount budgeted for the project is \$40,000,000. In the overall budget summary table the listed overall four year personnel cost is \$20,878,370.00. This raises questions about the sustainability of the project beyond year four. The applicant identifies funding sources outside of the Race to the Top - District funds.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant claims that project activities will continue beyond the grant funding period based on the idea that the Personalized Learning Environment initiatives will become part of the district's infrastructure and part of the district's five year strategic plan. The applicant asserts that grant funds will provide the infrastructure and computer programming and data linkages needed for the e-portal and PLE-portal content. The applicant states that its district will continue to support, refine, and expand the portal content. The applicant also states that additional activities will continue beyond the grant year, such as continued improvements training teachers to use e-portal information to create PLE-portals, E-portal tracking of student's progress toward careers and college enrollment, the use and integration of technology, development of educator effectiveness through staff evaluation and coaching, continuation of college-career readiness, continued relationships with community support partners, and expansion of BYOD initiatives. The applicant states that some grant funded staff positions are not needed once infrastructures are established. The applicant also reports that the district will seek to absorb staff positions through existing district resources. The applicant's notion of expansion of "bring your own device" initiatives is potentially problematic and raises issues.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that its students struggle with issues resulting from poverty and limited access to resources. These struggles include poor health. Subsequently the applicant has links academic performance to student involvement in school health activities. The applicant found that academic scores for 'athletes' in grades 7-12 were in the healthy fitness zone more frequently than their non-athlete counterparts and that they also had a higher passing rate on the state standardized measures. The applicant has partnered with public and private organizations, such as the American Diabetes Association, Human Kinetics/FitnessGram-Cooper Institute, and Houston Wilderness-E3-Equation for Healthy Living Intervention Program. The applicant also reportedly partners with or seeks to adopt the "Action Based Learning" program, which combines brain research findings, physical education standards and academic reinforcement to improve student performance. The applicant seeks implementation of Action Based Learning Labs. The applicant also seeks a partnership with Body and Brain Adventure Lab and Neuronasiums. The applicant also reportedly seeks partnerships to reduce the under-employment of student's families, such as</p>		

partnerships with Gulf Coast Workforce Board-Workforce Solutions which provides career readiness services at no cost to students and families including with seminars on resume writing, interviewing, and networking and assistance with job search and career development. The applicant reports a partnership with Rice University to design a five-day student enrichment program for 50 juniors and seniors and a one-day campus visit, and admissions talk during the academic year, annually. The applicant also seeks to partner with San Jacinto College Central Campus to align college/career standards, college transition activities, and secondary to postsecondary career and technical programs. The applicant states that a minimum of 53,165 students will participate in reforms and will have personalized learning environments through the district's plan to meet Absolute Priority I. The applicant reports that 43,184 of the participating students are eligible for the Free or Reduced lunch subsidies and 26,901 of the students are high need students. The applicant states that reforms will help 4,110 educators become effective or highly effective in their job skills. The applicant states that its students struggle with issues resulting from poverty and limited access to resources. These struggles include poor health. Subsequently the applicant has links academic performance to student involvement in school health activities. The applicant found that academic scores for 'athletes' in grades 7-12 were in the healthy fitness zone more frequently than their non-athlete counterparts and that they also had a higher passing rate on the state standardized measures. The applicant has partnered with public and private organizations, such as the American Diabetes Association, Human Kinetics/FitnessGram-Cooper Institute, and Houston Wilderness-E3- Equation for Healthy Living Intervention Program. The applicant also reportedly partners with or seeks to adopt the "Action Based Learning" program, which combines brain research findings, physical education standards and academic reinforcement to improve student performance. The applicant seeks implementation of Action Based Learning Labs. The applicant also seeks a partnership with Body and Brain Adventure Lab and Neuronasiums. The applicant also reportedly seeks partnerships to reduce the under-employment of student's families, such as partnerships with Gulf Coast Workforce Board-Workforce Solutions which provides career readiness services at no cost to students and families including with seminars on resume writing, interviewing, and networking and assistance with job search and career development. The applicant reports a partnership with Rice University to design a five-day student enrichment program for 50 juniors and seniors and a one-day campus visit, and admissions talk during the academic year, annually. The applicant also seeks to partner with San Jacinto College Central Campus to align college/career standards, college transition activities, and secondary to postsecondary career and technical programs.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that a minimum of 53,165 students will participate in reforms and will have personalized learning environments through the district's plan to meet Absolute Priority I. The applicant reports that 43,184 of the participating students are eligible for the Free or Reduced lunch subsidies and 26,901 of the students are high need students. The applicant states that reforms will help 4,110 educators become effective or highly effective in their job skills. The applicant states that its students struggle with issues resulting from poverty and limited access to resources. These struggles include poor health. Subsequently the applicant has links academic performance to student involvement in school health activities. The applicant found that academic scores for 'athletes' in grades 7-12 were in the healthy fitness zone more frequently than their non-athlete counterparts and that they also had a higher passing rate on the state standardized measures. The applicant has partnered with public and private organizations, such as the American Diabetes Association, Human Kinetics/FitnessGram-Cooper Institute, and Houston Wilderness-E3- Equation for Healthy Living Intervention Program. The applicant also reportedly partners with or seeks to adopt the "Action Based Learning" program, which combines brain research findings, physical education standards and academic reinforcement to improve student performance. The applicant seeks implementation of Action Based Learning Labs. The applicant also seeks a partnership with Body and Brain Adventure Lab and Neuronasiums. The applicant also reportedly seeks partnerships to reduce the under-employment of student's families, such as partnerships with Gulf Coast Workforce Board-Workforce Solutions which provides career readiness services at no cost to students and families including with seminars on resume writing, interviewing, and networking and assistance with job search and career development. The applicant reports a partnership with Rice University to design a five-day student enrichment program for 50 juniors and seniors and a one-day campus visit, and admissions talk during the academic year, annually. The applicant also seeks to partner with San Jacinto College Central Campus to align college/career standards, college transition activities, and secondary to postsecondary career and technical programs.

Total	210	142
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	8

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to expand strategies aimed at helping students take control of their health and make healthy decisions. The applicant has proposed utilizing ‘wellness coordinators’ at each of the schools. These coordinators will reportedly attend a state convention to develop ideas from experts in the field. The cost to send 62 coordinators is \$106,000. The applicant has reportedly “phased out recess and physical education time” to dedicate more time to instruction and meet increasing higher academic standards. The basis for the proposed change is that “physically active are healthier and perform better in school.” The applicant is proposing to blend instructional time with increase student activity. The applicant will reportedly utilize “Action-Based Learning Labs” to achieve this goal. The applicant’s proposed “optional supplemental Budget” allocates funding to supply schools with equipment needed to apply “Action-Based learning labs” and train staff. The cost to equip schools is \$443,960; training will cost \$9,600. The applicant will reportedly use the supplemental budget to purchase supplies and materials needed to enhance an existing “healthy lifestyles” curriculum. The related activity kits will cost of \$142,537. Further necessary equipment to enable implementation will cost \$15,000. A proposed partnership with Rice University, and university-based summer enrichment program will cost \$102,000 for the four-year grant period. The total for the Optional Budget Supplement is \$967,131. The applicant has a clear proposed solution, and this potential solution could be replicated in other schools. The rationale for the specific area is complicated. It’s not clear why the applicant would propose an alternative to physical education that combines physical activity with traditional instructional time in academics. There is no discernable plan for how the applicant will carry out activities that would be co-developed and implemented across two or more LEAs.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0854TX-2 for Pasadena Independent School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates in this section that a data warehouse system, or an "E-portal" as they refer to it, is the basis of the reform that they plan to do to utilize a personalized learning environment. The applicant proposes to create a technology driven infrastructure that gives teachers and students e-portals, links student eportals to teacher e-portals, and provides teachers with the means for turning student e-portals into Personal Learning Environments (PLE-portals)

The applicant has four goals that align to their reform vision that will build its work in the four core assurance areas:

1. Creating the PLE portal system that will link student and teacher to monitor data and to give feedback.
2. Providing the educators involved with instant access to academic analysis that is linked to needs, interests, and socio-economic challenges-this is linked to a system that provides resources and strategies that match the academic needs

of each student.

3. Develop educator effectiveness through a staff development/coaching/evaluation system.
4. Graduating students career and college ready.

The applicant does mention that higher rigor and content knowledge in reading is also a key of their plan, and mentions that they will learn new strategies in order to achieve higher reading scores. They do not state what the strategies are, nor the timeline or activities to do so. They do say that they have been re-writing their standards since 2008 to be more reflective of career and college ready standards. They plan to do observational walkthroughs to see how these new standards are being implemented, starting in 2013.

They plan to expand their school day to 8 periods, add a virtual high school, dual credit, and AP courses. They indicate that none of this will be in place until 100 days after the grant begins. They also plan to implement a district wide system that will assist students K-12 to obtain learning management skills, and plan to teach these strategies to their teachers. They also plan to give laptops to seventh graders through this grant, mentioning that they are unable to fund technology as they would like to for their students. They mention that they plan to implement a new educator evaluation system to increase the number of teachers that are effective, but there is no plan for how they will support their development, except that the evaluation system will help.

Overall, the applicant does mention some goals that build on their work in the four core educational assurance areas, but pieces are missing how some of the goals that would make this a high quality plan. This places the applicant in the middle range.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that all but three (one to one technology, Optional Flexible School Day, and BYOD) of their reforms will implemented district wide. This district wide reform will serve 58 schools, benefit 53,165 students, of which 81% are eligible for Free or reduced lunch; and 51% are high need students. They include a table which lists each school, by grade and subject, and educators. 4,110 educators will participate in this grant, 26,905 being high need students, 43,551 qualifying for free and reduced lunch.

Overall, the applicant was clear and concise about the indicators needed in this section, giving them a score in the low high range.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant repeats the goals that they outlined to describe the core values; the portal system, the educator evaluation program, the increased rigor, college readiness, and student learning management skills. They also repeat the optional flexible opportunities they will offer. They do not address how they will service additional schools (as they state all schools will be a part of this reform) nor do they demonstrate a plan of how student learning outcomes will be improved.

Overall, the applicant fails to mention improving student learning outcomes, placing this criterion in the low range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

It is interesting to note that the applicant is very conservative, and not ambitious in the overall goals that they set for the subgroup of reading for all grade levels, with the goal increasing from 1-3 points on average in the 5 years that they set goals. Goals are set by each school, and do vary by subgroup. For instance, one school plans on a 9 point gain in reading for their Special Education population, but only a 3 point gain in reading overall.

The applicant demonstrates by the use of a table their methodology for determining the achievement gap, using the ITBS and STARR scale scores for their assessments, with the goals varying by grade level to close the gap by the end of the term. On average, it seems to be a 5 point spread in closing the achievement gaps for all sub populations, but once again, it varies by grade level. They have a beginning baseline, and do set goal for each of the four years and beyond on summative assessments.

For graduation rates, their overall goal is to go from 83.1% to 85%. They also list graduation rate goals for subpopulations, which are more ambitious, with 9 % for African Americans, Economically Disadvantaged, and at Risk. Their goal for College

enrollment is a baseline of 67 percent, with a post grant goal of 76 percent. They also list a goal for postsecondary degree attainment, with an overall baseline of 23.9%, and a post grant goal of 34.9%.

Overall, the applicant is able to demonstrate ambitious but achievable goals for their subpopulations, but seem to be very conservative in the overall range. This places the applicant with a score in the medium range.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Although the applicant states that they have improved student learning outcomes in their district, the data shows a different picture. District-wide, the district has only gone up 2 points in the Core Content State Assessment Data, starting in 2007. In 2007-08, the district was at 66%. They fell down to 53% the next year, and up again in 2009-10 to 61%. in 2010-2011, they were up to 64%. There was no data for 2011-12 in this category.</p> <p>Their graduation rate dropped by 1.7%, starting with SY 2005-06, and ending at 3% in 2009-10. There is no data for SY 2010-11, and SY 2011-12.</p> <p>High School completion also just goes from 2006-2010. The graduation rate went from 74.3% in 2006, to 78.6% in 2010. In post secondary rates, it is a mixed result from the 5 high schools in this district. It seems to go up, then fall back down the next year.</p> <p>The applicant has two schools in their district that were designated as low-performing schools, and have implemented grant funded school wide reforms to address their needs. The schools are no longer in this category.</p> <p>Student performance data is made available to teachers through its district programs of Aware, Mizuni, and Chancery. They use this data in Professional Learning Communities to problem solve and improve instruction. Parents and students have access to student report cards, personal graduation plans, and student attendance through a program called "Parent Connection" that is located on the district website. They are also given written progress reports from the Mizuni and Chancery systems.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant did address each of the criterion in section B(1). However, student performance data was missing from their analysis, and so it is difficult to determine if the applicant has a clear record of success in this area. Graduation rates are also inconsistent, and information about the lowest performing schools was also vague. This puts the applicant in the low range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant lists the information for personnel salaries as required in this section in Appendix F, which is at the end of their application. In Appendix D, they list every employee in the district by job classification, but this gives no information about salaries. They also enclose a campus profile from 2010-11, which gives actual operating expenditure information about the school year 2009-10. The expenditures break expenses into operating categories, but give no details about the actual personal salaries at any level. They do include a copy of the Texas Tribune in the Appendix, and this gives the PISD salaries as of March 22, 2012. This is the most detail given in the whole section. They also mention that you can find the information about the salaries through the state of Texas Academic Education Information System (AEIS), but no evidence of actual salaries was found in the appendix that they mentioned.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant gives vague and incomplete information about salary scales. They do list non-personnel expenditures at the school level, but the only actual detailed information is found in the Texas Tribune, and that contains information primarily about administrators. This puts the applicant in the low range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates that they have obtained specific waivers from the State of Texas, which allows the district autonomy in specific areas. They are:</p>		

- Optional flexible school day waivers-this is what they referenced in the four core areas of their reform.
- Waiver on using PDAs for teacher evaluation-The applicant does not clarify what a PDA is, but it seems to be the traditional system of evaluating teachers in the state of Texas.
- Articulation agreements with the Institutes of Higher Learning: This is where one of the local colleges that states that college course that are taught in Pasadena High Schools are at college level rigor, and accepted for college credit.

Although the flexible school day is mentioned in their proposal for reform, it is unclear whether their other goals for personalized student environments are such that they will be able to implement them without conflicting with the state. Although they may be, it is not clear, putting them in the low range for this criterion.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates that the Pasadena district established a RTT design team (Race to the Top), that worked to create a basic framework of RTT reforms that they state are aligned to Absolute Priority 1, the four core education assurance areas, and the competitive preference priority. This framework then went to subcommittees that strengthened this framework, and then presented it to a planning team that consists of district staff, community stakeholders, parents, and students. Their suggestions and comments were then included in the program's design. Then they mailed a final draft to all district staff for approval or disapproval. Since the Pasadena school district does not allow a collective bargaining representative, they presented all staff with a copy of the plan for review. 92.2% of the staff approved the plan.

Letters of support for this reform plan were found in the appendix in the back of the application. They also listed organizations that supported this plan, such as Microsoft, Rice University, and College Board. Many other organizations were listed as well, as well as the means of how they will support students and staff in this initiative.

Overall, the applicant does a through job in describing how they involved all the stakeholders, earning a score in the low high range.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates the need for a data warehouse plan that has all the varied sources of data at each educator's fingertips. Their current reality is that each teacher has to look through different systems to find the data that they need, and then understand the results in terms of instructional needs and priorities. A Personalized Learning environment, using an e-portal is the plan to give each educator "one-click" access to what they need to drive instruction.

As far as college and career ready resources go, some of the schools have access to this curriculum to prepare their students, but the plan is to implement college ready standards into 100% of the secondary schools, offering elective courses on learning management skills, and access to e-portals to monitor and view progress.

The district uses a coaching model to support teachers that are new to the profession, but doesn't go into detail on how effective this model is in supporting the teachers. They clarify what the Texas teacher evaluation system is (which wasn't clear in the previous section) , which is a classroom observational walkthrough done annually. The district has a waiver to use a walkthrough rubric that is aligned to educator evaluation goals. They have been using a evaluation system that is an incentive program, tied to student academic achievement and staff development.

Overall, the applicant does address some facets of a high -quality plan. They do list key goals, but some of the activities are vague, a timeline is not in place, and the supporting evidence is lacking in parts of their plan. This gives the applicant a score in the medium range.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates the meaning of what a student is learning is key to their goals by two scenarios, one for a high school student, and one for an elementary student. Both describe the day in the life of a student who would have access to e-portals to check assignments, communicate with peers, download media for presentations, and exploring assignments for

courses.

They continue using scenarios of how the students would be involved in high quality content, and have access to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen student learning. The scenarios continue through personalized learning environments , and high quality content. Although the scenarios are lovely in terms of what could be, they do not address the facets of a high quality plan in its entirety. No timeline is given in this section, and the parties responsible for implementing the plan are not clearly defined.

They do clarify what will happen with the personalized learning recommendations, stating that the teacher e-portal will give each teacher "one-click" access to student performance, exams, assessments, and college entrance exams. The learning assignments will be talored to each student's PLE needs. High needs students will also have the PLE-portals, although they directly may not have access to it, only their teachers. Student PLE-portal training will happen as soon as they enter the district.

Overall, the applicant creates an "ideal world" of what would happen if the PLE portal system became a reality, but fails to address many of the facets of a high quality plan. The only strategy for a high need student is the portal. No accommodations except for the fact a high need student wouldn't have access to it are given. The portal is a good way to look at and examine data and enter assignments, etc, but the overall credibility of the plan is lacking some of the evidence that it needs to be a high quality one. The score is in medium range.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates that they have a professional development plan to educate teachers, counselors, and administrators to the PLE-portal system, adapting the training to meet the needs that the end user will have of this system. The portal system will adapt the curriculum scope and sequence according the needs of the classes, modifying assignments and recommending other resources to use if the class does not understand the concept. The applicant believes that the implementation of this system and the ease of its use will allow educators will make needs of each student more transparent.

The applicant lists the parts of their teacher evaluation plan, which will have observational walkthroughs and coaching, scheduling walkthroughs as a teacher' skill level is increased or decreased. Student academic performance is also tied into the evaluation plan, and use of e-portals will also be assessed. Teachers who meet all criteria will receive a growth stipend. The principal and superintendent evaluations also have the same components.

High quality learning resources will be found through the educator e-portals and delivered to the student ones. Through programming, e-portals will automatically match student academic needs to existing supplements.

It is interesting to note that the district's solution to helping out high need schools is to do more walkthroughs on its educators.

Overall, the applicant is dependant on the PLE-portal as the answer to every problem that they will face. All goals in this part of the plan are tied to it, and training is in place to ensure that all end users know how to use it, and how it can work effectively to serve their stakeholders. The fact that the e-portal is the only strategy in place, and doesn't take training of teachers actually working with students, or evaluating teachers by any method than "do more walkthroughs if they are not proficient".tends to weaken this criterion of the the reform. How they will support high need learners and educators is not addressed. This places the applicant in the in low medium range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates that the Associate Superintendent will be the lead for this RTT initiative. They have a very well defined and systematic list of coordinators, e-project managers, programmers, and technical support to assist in their portal reform. A compliance officer will monitor all aspects of this grant to ensure that the implementation of this grant is following all guidelines and requirements.

Each school will have a leadership team that will spearhead the implementation of the grant. They do mention that each school will have autonomy to support the RTT reforms. Some personnel will be hired to support the school from the district level, leaving the school authority to hire instructional positions and the staffing reorganization that will be needed for the extended day, virtual high school, and dual credit programs.

The applicant demonstrates the the extended 8 period day will help students to remediate or accelerate their learning; Virtual High Schools at all five campuses will be more flexible, allowing students the time and schedule that they need to master learning. Dual credit and AP classes will give more opportunities to accelerate learning.

The applicant plans to use the TEKS (learning assessments of the state of Texas), and other means of assessment that are typical for students entering career or college level classes. Demonstrating mastery is not mentioned for the elementary or middle school levels.

The applicant states that all their learning resources are leveled and respond to needs of students with disabilities and English Language Learners. They feel the PLE-portals will help address the needs of these two subpopulations as well.

Overall, the applicant does have a good structure in place for personnel to support this initiative. The school leadership teams are in place for each school, giving them autonomy to hire staff and reorganize to meet the needs of the school. Emphasis is placed on progress mastery of learning at the high school level. No mention is made of plans for elementary and middle schools, even though they are part of this grant. The same is true with assessments. They are relying on the PLE-portal to address the needs of Special Ed and ELL populations, although they do mention that they level resources. This gives the applicant a score in the medium range. 8

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates that E-portals will be accesable to all students, families, and educators. Although they are not able to give every family a computer, they do intend to construct wireless towers, so that if a family doesn't have internet access, they can connect wirelessly. Everyone will be able to use district computers. The district plans to hire 7 technical support staff whose purpose is to support the technical needs of 4,000 computers and users. Four instructional specialists will help to integrate PLE portals for the district, and they plan to have a help desk available by school year 2014-15.

Although not defined, the majority of data will be exposable in an open format. They mention how schools will have data systems that educators will be able to access, and give them assessment data that will help them prepare for college. There was no mention of how this would be handled at the elementary and middle school levels.

Overall, the applicant relies on the e-portal system and wireless access to give all stakeholders access to learning resources. They have not yet decided how the data will be open, but state it will be. Once again, the emphasis is on the high school level, although all schools are mentioned in this grant. This gives them a score in the low medium range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates that an external evaluator will be hired to track data collection portals, spreadsheets, and databases that will be used to track and maintain data. This data is tracked quarterly, and will be presented to the Implementation Team This team will review the data, and look it from :

- technology
- student learning
- preparing students for college and career,
- developing educators through evaluations and coaching;
- resources that will meet the student;s social, emotional, or behavioral needs.

If the data shown indicates that there is little or no progress towards their intended outcomes, activity reforms will take place. The implemenation team will problem solve ways to refine programs that will result in positive outcomes.

Surveys will be used to gauge student, educator, and adminstrator understanding of the grant reform. Parents will be surveyed twice a year the first year of the implementation, and annually after that. In addition, a sample of 25% of the schools will selected for case studies. Two observations per semester, per grade level, will be conducted to see how the grant implementation is taking place.

Summative data will be used for annual reporting and a summative report at the end of the grant. They will look across the

district, as well at subpopulations. The Associate superintendent will provide updates to the Board of Trustees, facilities, and the community.

Overall, the applicant has clear goals for the way that they will continuously improve this grant, and how they will monitor and share data. There is little mention of the timeline, although some dates are given for specific areas of this section. They do list responsible parties, and include all grade levels in this section, although the emphasis is on high school. This places the applicant in the medium range.

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

5

1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that communication will occur on several levels. The Associate Superintendent provides updates, the implementation team meets, and this information is disseminated back to school sites. In between these meetings, ongoing communication will be through phone calls, e-mail, and subcommittee meetings. No mention is made of how they will get this information to other stakeholders, such as students, families, and the community. This places the applicant in the low range.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

It is interesting to note that the applicant does not have very high standards for the teachers and administrators in this grant. Overall, the applicant expects 92% of their students to receive instruction from a teacher who is minimally an effective teacher, and 100% of the students will attend a school that is managed by a school principal who is minimally an effective principal. There is mention of some percentages of students receiving instruction from highly effective teachers, but that is at 75%.

They do give grade level goals, beginning at fourth grade. The goal is that 57% of participating 8th grade students will achieve the college and career ready indicator score on the Readiness assessment by the end of the 2016 school year. No baseline data was provided to where the students are at the beginning of the grant. For grades 9-12, the plan is that 59% of students will achieve the college and career readiness indicator score on the PSAT. Once again, there is nothing to compare this goal to at the baseline, nor are there yearly steps up to this goal.

Overall, the data is very sketchy, making it hard to see the entire picture. No data was mentioned for PK-3, and although they did list goals for overall groups, no goals were established for subpopulations at all. This places the candidate in the low range.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to hire an outside evaluator. They show in the grant the basic formative and summative measures and procedures, but plan to develop a more specific plan that will be developed with the program director's needs. They lay the key elements of this plan out in a table that is included in the application, listing key elements, goals, short term, formative, and summative evaluations.

A mid year report will examine growth until that point, and summative evaluations will measure progress towards goals. The implementation team will monitor and revise program activities.

Overall, the evaluator and the implementation team seem to be the major players in ensuring their programs are effective. The table does give clear target goals, and evaluations, putting the applicant in the high medium range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrated that they met the criterion in this section. An external evaluator was part of the project, ensuring and over seeing that the mandates of the grant are carried out. With 53,000 students, they were prudent in what they used the 11 million dollar budget with, and adjusting different components if necessary. One question that arose that they used a lot of their budget for personnel to implement the budget, asking the question on how would they sustain this when the term of the

budget came to an end.

Overall, the applicant demonstrated that they identified operational and personnel costs, placing them in the low high range.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant believes that the major component of their reform (the PLE-portals) will continue and sustain after the term of the grant, because the monies garnered from this grant will establish the framework and infrastructure. They intend to continue to offer professional development on training teachers, e-portal tracking, educator effectiveness, continue college and career ready activities, community support, flexible learning environments, and one to one initiatives. Some staff positions funded by the RTT grant will end, once the infrastructures are in place. Some the district will seek to absorb through district resources, or through new grants. A budget is not mentioned in this section, nor how support will come from state and local government leaders, except to say that they will use district resources.

Overall, the sustainability is weak for this section, giving the applicant a score in the low medium range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates the belief that their students are struggling with issues that result from poverty and limited access to resources. Since they demonstrate research that poor health comes with poverty, they are committed to increasing the health of their students, and are working in alliance with public and private organizations, such as the American Diabetes Association, Houston Wilderness, and Action Based learning. These programs provide support to the district's students in the area of health.

The district is shows a commitment to alleviate poverty, especially when it concerns post-secondary education. They state that at some of their schools, as many as 77% of the student's parents do not have a high school diploma. So they are working in tandem with community associations such as Rice University, College Board, and a local college. These entities are working with students to design dual study programs, and to offer extended enrichment programs for high school seniors that would not otherwise have an opportunity to participate.

The applicant shows through the use of a table how they will identify 10 or less population level desired results for students that align with the broader Race to the Top district proposal. The target population group is 4-18 years, with educational, community, and family results listed. They seek to reduce absenteeism, increase the number of students reaching a healthy fitness zone (by 8%), reduce the number of students who test positive for Acanthosis Nigricans (by 3%), raise up the number of students who meet STARR/EOC reading standards (by 12%), increase the number of students reading on grade level (by 15%), increase graduation rates (by 6%), and raise the number of students who enroll in post-secondary schools by 7%. This aligns with their goals that are outlined in section A of this application. The applicant lists a specific indicator for each of the previous goals that will measure results. The Fitness gram results will allow the district to collaborate with partner service whose health is not in the healthy range, but they do not mention specifically they will do so. The e-portal data will be used to determine what outside agencies can support students in need. Subpopulation needs were not mentioned.

The partnership needs will be available to all students in the district. They list how the partner organizations services will integrate education and services, encompassing social, emotional, and behavioral needs. They also define how the partner organizations will measure the effectiveness of their services. Each school will have a committee that serves as the decision makers to coordinate health priorities that respond to their student's needs. Parents and families will be a part of this committee, as well as having access to the e-portal for academic needs.

Overall, the applicant has a plan in place that demonstrates how they will align outside organizations in supporting their reform. The plan is lacking in parent involvement, however. This places the applicant in the high medium range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates that the district has a plan that addresses a personalized learning environment. Through the use of its e-portal system, the applicant will study data, and use this data at all levels, and with all stakeholders to develop programs and strategies to decrease the achievement gap and increase the rigor of student learning. The use of a coaching model for their teacher evaluation system is the plan to support educators and administrators in implementing their curriculum and plan, that is tied to college ready standards. This applicant does not mention the Common Core Standards. The plan focuses on student learning, achievement, and support for students in high school, although elementary and middle school students are involved in this reform. There is data to support what they plan to do, but it is lacking in consistency, and there is little in some areas for some of the years of the study. They do have plans in place that will serve high school students in alternate ways, and partnerships with agencies that will support the students emotionally, socially, and physically.

Although there are strong parts and aspects to this part, the applicant does not demonstrate how it will comprehensively address the core educational assurance areas. Too much is lacking in the elementary and middle school content, data, and strategies, although they are part of this reform. Thus, the applicant does not meet Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	102
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	11

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates through this section that even though a lot of physical activity and physical education has been phased out throughout their district due to time needed for more rigorous instruction, this move has been counterintuitive. And with research proving that physical activity helps build student achievement, they are proposing implementing more physical activity in the traditional learning time. PISD will use the RTT Optional Supplemental Budget to supply schools with equipment to implement Action-Based labs, and to train staff to use them. The total cost to support the schools is \$443,960. The training will cost 9,600.

Another facet to this optional budget is giving the students within this district the opportunity to experience in summer based university enrichment programs, and thus build motivation to attend college. The cost for this part of the optional budget supplement is \$102,000. The total budget for the entire optional budget supplement is \$967,131.

The applicant clearly breaks their proposal into the budget, listing training, travel, supplies, and contractual support. Indirect Costs are calculated in accordance with the indirect cost rate agreement from the Texas Education Agency, with the cost for the four years of 148,034, with the indirect rate applied to the first 25,000 of one professional contract for years 2-4.

The applicant has a clear and concise table that lays out the project level itemized costs, giving the reader a detailed look at the parts of this budget that will make it successful and spread throughout the life of this grant. This places the applicant in the low high range.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0854TX-3 for Pasadena Independent School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. Evidence is present that the applicant has a comprehensive and coherent reform vision, as documented below.

The applicant states the Pasadena Independent School District's (PISD) reform vision is that "more than 53,000 students will access equitable learning through Personal Learning Environments (PLEs) that are responsive to each student's educational goals, interests, and abilities by:

- Closing the educator/student feedback/communication loop by creating linked teacher/student Personal Learning Environment (PLE) e-portals.
- Providing educators e-portal access to instantaneous academic analysis of each student's needs, interests, and social-economic challenges that is linked to a computer generated list of academic resources, learning opportunities, and teaching strategies that match the student's academic needs and serve as the driving force behind creating each student's PLE.
- Developing educator effectiveness through a staff evaluation/coaching/development system that results in an increased number of teachers, principals, and the superintendent becoming effective and highly effective educators.
- Graduating students college- and career-ready."

2. A rationale and explanation were provided for each of the plan's four bulleted goals in item 1 (i.e. Bullet #1-"To create effective PLE-portals, educators must first understand individual student's learning needs and interests. Thus, e-portals will provide teachers with information they need to create PLE's through 'one click' access to disaggregated student data that is plotted to STAAR/EOC/ITBS4/CCR (College and Career Ready) performance and standards and measured against academic set points, based on STAAR/EOC/ITBS/CCR standards and best-practice research. The information produced will match district and web-based resources to the student's academic gaps and acceleration needs, interests, and socio-economic challenges.").

3. A timeline with identified tasks for implementation of the plan is enclosed in Appendix T and includes descriptions of activities from start-up through professional development and stakeholder engagement. Narrative is provide to identify the persons responsible for oversight of the tasks.

4. The applicant states that "PISD will implement district-wide reforms that shift the district's approach to teaching and learning and results in meeting RTT's Absolute Priority 1 goal of providing equitable learning to students through Personal Learning Environments."

5. PISD acknowledged potential barriers to the proposed reform:

- a. "Teachers and students do not have a fluid venue for continuous communication, monitoring, and feedback."
- b. "PISD teachers do not have easy access to disaggregated student data nor do they always understand the instructional implications of that data."

However, the applicant stated that technology can dissolve the barriers (listed in a & b above) and noted that "PISD proposes to create a technology-driven infrastructure that gives teachers and students e-portals, links student e-portals to teacher e-portals, and provides teachers with the means for turning student e-portals into Personal Learning Environments (PLE-portals)."

6. The applicant provided information regarding the process of plan implementation, the supporting plan components and support measures, and the anticipated outcomes, such as:

- a. benchmarks for implementation at 100 days, 365 days, 730 days, and 1095 days,
- b. educator access to and assessment of instructional and disaggregated socio-economic information (through e-portal),
- c. incorporation of college and career ready standards into PK-12 curriculum.
- d. use of teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluation systems to develop educator effectiveness,
- e. increasing student engagement and performance through targeting the improvement of reading skills, increasing academic rigor, providing optional flexible learning venues, developing student learning management skills, and increased access to technology (through a blend of allowing students to "Bring Your Own Device" and providing computers to targeted grade levels),
- f. evaluating progress through the assessment of reading performance and monitoring of initiatives, and
- g. securing stakeholder feedback to refine the plan.

- 7. The applicant maintains that e-portal will provide the venue for "educators to continuously monitor and revise PLEs based on student academic growth."
- 8. Implementation of an 8-period day is scheduled for fall of 2014 (to increase learning opportunities).
- 9. Extended learning opportunities are presently offered and will be expanded: Virtual High School, Dual Credit, and AP classes.
- 10. The applicant has provided evidence of a clearly articulated plan with goals that target the acceleration of student achievement and seek to deepen student learning.

This section is rated in the high range.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- 1. The applicant states that district-wide reform is the basis for including all 58 PISD schools (serving 53,165 enrolled students) and notes that the district meets the eligibility threshold since 81% of the students are eligible for free and reduced lunch subsidies and 51% are high needs.
- 2. In relation to district-wide reform, the applicant has noted: "All but three (one-to-one technology, Optional Flexible School Day, and BYOD) of the RTT reforms described in this proposal will be implemented district-wide, for all grade-levels, and all content areas. Also, while PISD believes that Reading is the foundation of learning and will initiate reading across the core-content areas through WICOR [writing to learn, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading to learn] and RTT reforms success will be measured using Reading performance/growth indicators, all core content learning will deepen as PLE's will address all content areas."
- 3. Additional district-wide reform information was included: "closing the educator/student information loop through PLE-portals that give student's access to academic supports/acceleration, providing college readiness activities that deepen instructional rigor and deepen student learning, and increasing the number of effective and highly effective educators."
- 4. The table/chart provided lists the participating LEA's schools, total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators, as required in the application.
- 5. The information given ties to the overall plan, supports the reform goals, and provides a basis for credible implementation.

This section is scored in the high range.

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

10

8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- 1. The applicant states that district-wide reform will "reach all students and educators" in the following ways:
 - a. implementation of e-portal to scale up annually until it is maximized (all tabs added), as noted in Appendix A,
 - b. educator evaluations to be systematically implemented, starting with teachers, principals, and assistant principals, and following with the Superintendent in 2014-2015 (will include a focus on reading initially with other areas added in subsequent years),
 - c. increasing of instructional rigor, college readiness activities, and development of student learning management skills,
 - d. one-to-one technology pilots, BYOD initiative, and focus on resolution of resulting technology issues (Internet access,

viruses), and

e. provision of optional flexible learning opportunities geared for secondary students.

2. The explanation provided for how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools aligns with the goals and vision set forth for reform. Information regarding timelines or specific implementation focus(es) is used to provide clarity.

3. Appendix B contains the PISD Logic Model. The Logic Model contains linkage to student learning outcomes beyond the participating schools (i.e. increasing the number of high school graduates who enroll in college, decreasing the number of students who enroll in college and are required to take remedial classes/require remediation). The Logic Model provides areas that address: needs and gaps, goals, objectives, activities, stakeholders' roles, outcomes, and measurement of outcomes and tie to the overall vision giving the plan credibility.

4. More information is needed to clarify the full impact anticipated by the implementation of the reform plan and its components (i.e. what the change state should look like, how the reform will resonate through PISD).

This section is rated in the high range.

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

10

3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant has included tables that report performance on summative assessments, decreasing achievement gaps, graduation rate, college enrollment, and postsecondary degree attainment.

2. The following explanation was given regarding summative assessments: "The state of Texas is transitioning from the TAKS test to a new assessment of student skills and knowledge called STAAR and End of Course (EOC) exams. Unfortunately, the transition is not fully complete and met standard and college readiness for these assessments are still in transition. Furthermore, none of the state assessments measure learning growth by year and year and one-half increments (part of the definition of highly effective and effective educators). Thus, to compensate for the student outcome information gaps, PISD will track student outcomes from TAKS, STAAR, EOC's, ITBS, and Logromos (Spanish variation of ITBS) assessments."

3. First and second grade ITBS and Logramos Reading performance outcomes are reported by scale scores; targets are incrementally established per subgroup for the four years of the grant (i.e. First grade ITBS-African American-beginning in 2012-2013 and going through post-grant 2016-2017-142.6...143.4...144.1...144.8...145.5). The remaining summative measures utilize percentages for reporting and for establishing targets for grade levels and subgroups.

4. While the required and optional information (regarding summative assessments, decreasing achievement gaps, graduation rate, college enrollment, and postsecondary degree attainment) were provided and targets were established, no rationale for the targets set was evident.

5. The extent to which the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals for the participating LEA is unclear. Targets do seem obtainable and likely to result in improved learning and performance, but they do not seem to be particularly ambitious.

This section is rated in the low end of the medium range.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. The PISD states that it has improved student learning through closing achievement gaps, reducing dropout rates, increasing high school completion rates, increasing the graduation rates, and increasing post-secondary enrollment. The data and explanation in the plan are insufficient to validate this statement.

2. Additional information is needed to determine a clear record of success for the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. The data enclosed shows the following:

a. inconsistencies in Core Content State Assessment Data, with no explanation regarding the interpretation of the results (i.e. subgroup results fluctuate up and down from year-to-year; data from 2007-08 to 2010-11),

b. charts regarding dropout (data from 2005-06 to 2009-10), and completion rates (data from classes of 2006-2010) have no narrative to describe the results,

c. the graduation rates by subgroups chart shows 5 of 7 subgroups making progress over two years (data from classes of 2010 and 2011), but no explanation is given,

d. the graph provided shows 4 years of data for 5 high schools regarding graduates enrolled in college (data from 2006-2009), with no information, and

e. the charts in a-d have data from varying years.

3. The applicant did provide information regarding growth in 4 schools that had been, but are no longer, considered low performing (i.e. growth of an average of 13 percentage points in ELA and math scores for Pomeroy).

4. The applicant stated that 20% of the schools use data to engage students in data talks; teachers have access to data through applications (i.e. Mizuni, Chancery) used by the system.

5. "Parents and students have ongoing access to student report cards, student personal graduation plans, and student attendance through "Parent Connection" located on the district's website <http://parentaccess.pasadenaisd.org/> Also, parents and students are provided written progress reports at regular intervals throughout the year from Mizuni and Chancery. Through this system, parents can access student grades, daily and set triggers to receive email notifications if a student's grades fall below a minimum value set by parents or if a student is absent. Promotion activities of the "Parent Connection" portal encourage parents to contact the school for clarification and use the information to help their children improve academically."

6. While some components of (B)(1) are evident (access to data), there does not seem to be enough evidence to determine plan credibility in this section.

This section is rated in the low range.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant states that transparency is practiced in its process, practices, and investments through the following actions:

a. Actual personnel salaries are reported at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances. "PISD completes this survey annually each October." A link to the website is provided.

b. Actual personnel salaries at the school level are reported for instructional staff only through the state of Texas Academic Education Information System (AEIS).

c. Actual personnel salaries are reported at the school level for teachers only through the state of Texas Academic Education Information System (AEIS).

d. Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level are accessible by the public. "Anyone can have access to non-personnel district-wide expenditures by reviewing the monthly Board reports that are published on the web at the district's website, by reviewing the district's annual audit or may secure school level expenditures by completing a request for information through the Public Information Act. This information is also available through the state of Texas Academic Education Information System (AEIS). *The Texas Tribune* published the PISD salaries as of March 22, 2012."

2. Documentation of a-d is provided in the appendices, including reports for individual schools that detail non-personnel expenditures.

3. Multiple avenues for addressing transparency are provided. However, it is not clear how stakeholders are made aware of the opportunities to access the information.

This section is rated in the high range.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

1. The PISD states that it has obtained waivers from the State of Texas "in order to implement and expand student access to learning

venues and to implement educator evaluations that allow the district to measure educator growth."

2. The waivers include:

- Optional flexible school day waivers: School districts may apply to the commissioner to provide flexibility in the number of hours each day that a student attends. This program is the Flexible School Day Program (OFSDP). Texas Education Code Sec.29.0822 states one criteria enabling districts to qualify is they must have students attending a campus "that is implementing an innovative redesign of the campus or an early college high school." The program goal is to increase graduation rates for students who are in danger of dropping out of school or have dropped out or who are behind in core subject courses. OFSDP students may attend school on a fixed or a flexible schedule that is not a traditional 180 day, five day per week requirement. Instructional arrangements for OFSDP include extended day classes and/or flexible schedules. A full-time equivalent student is expected to have 1,080 contact hours per year.

- Waivers on using PDAS for teacher evaluation: Texas Administrative Code, Commissioner's Rules Concerning Educator Appraisal Subchapter AA. Teacher Appraisal, section 150.1009, states "any alternative appraisal system to PDAS must be developed and supported by locally adopted policy and procedures, and by the processes outlined in Texas Education Code (TEC), §21.352. All teacher evaluation tools used to evaluate the performance of teachers must include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an element of the evaluation criterion."

- Articulation agreements with Institutes of Higher Education: San Jacinto College has an articulation agreement with Pasadena Independent School District and with local four year colleges. These articulation agreements acknowledge that college classes taught at Pasadena high schools are at College level rigor and are accepted for college credit. For example, the University of Houston articulation agreement says that it will honor the Algebra class taken at a Pasadena High School that is taught by San Jacinto College Professors for college credit. Articulation agreements are needed for instruction in a Dual Credit class will result in credit for high school and college credit.

3. While the PISD has provided some evidence of waivers that support and/or promote autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal, additional information is needed. The information provided does not seem to fully support the reform vision and goals established (i.e. More than 53,000 students will access equitable learning through Personal Learning Environments (PLEs) that are responsive to each student's educational goals, interests, and abilities.).

This section is rated in the low range.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

1. PISD provides evidence of a structured effort to engage stakeholders through intentional cascading of engagement, as described below.

"Pasadena ISD created a RTT Design Team' consisting of such members as: the Superintendent of Schools, Associate Superintendents, Directors, Coordinators, technology specialists, and others with a vested interest in the reform process. An explanation of the timeline and outcomes is given and includes: initially meeting in August and meeting "at least weekly to create a basic framework of RTT reforms that are aligned to RTT's Absolute Priority I, the four core education assurance areas, and the Competitive Preference Priority.

The framework included:

- Streamlining data access through e-portals and creation student PLE-portals,
- 1 to 1 Technology,
- Preparing students academically for post-secondary opportunities,
- Educator development evaluations,
- External partnerships to address social emotional or behavioral needs, and
- Optional flexible learning opportunities."

PISD details the steps to refine the framework: sent to six subcommittees consisting of principals, teachers, counselors, technology staff, and curriculum and instruction staff; meeting several times to refine details of the framework; developing an overview of reforms; and presenting them to the District Strategic Planning Team in late September for feedback and comments. The Strategic Planning Team includes: district staff, community stakeholders, parents, and students. "Their comments and suggestions were included in the program design. Finally, a final draft of the application was emailed to all district staff for approval or disapproval with a request to identify their interest in supporting the district-wide implementation and problem-solving/refinement process."

2. The applicant's state does not allow collective bargaining representative. PISD provided staff with a copy of the proposal and asked them to complete a survey regarding their approval or disapproval of it. "92.2% of the total respondents (1,107) approved of the proposal as written and more than 200 respondents expressed in supporting program implementation refinements and continuous improvements if the district is awarded a RTT grant."

3. "A variety of stakeholder groups met with the Design Team and subcommittees."

4. Organizations agreeing to participate in the district's plan are listed in this section (along with descriptions of their contributions). Examples include: Microsoft, College Board, Rice University, and Action-Based Learning.

5. Artifacts supporting the applicant's description of stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal are located in the appendices. However, while parents and students were represented on the Strategic Planning Committee that reviewed and provided input for the plan, it is unclear if parents and students were represented on the Design Team.

6. Evidence provided aligns with the vision and goals established in the plan.

This section is rated in the high range.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant breaks out the main tenets of the plan, provides an explanation for the current status, and addresses needs to move forward.

a. Existing Data Resources:

The PISD states that multiple applications are used to house data and provide access to information necessary for informing decisions for student learning (i.e. PowerSchool, Muzuni, EXCEED, Aware). No one login allows educators to access and have correlated, integrated data to make informed decisions or to cross reference resources to formulate high quality PLEs. The e-portal with its capabilities would address this need.

b. Existing College- and Career- Ready Resources: College Aligned content:

Currently, the district has re-written approximately 60% of its curriculum to include college aligned academic standards. Learning Management Skills: Currently four of the five high schools and three of the ten intermediate schools have implemented the *learning management skills development* elective class that teaches students to think critically, solve complex problems, work collaboratively, be self-directed, and incorporate performance feedback. All are skills needed to succeed in post-secondary opportunities. Layered initiatives support this component of reform.

c. Existing Educator Development Resources: Coaching:

The following initiatives are used and support the reform vision:

- a coaching model to support teachers who are new to the district;
- Educator evaluation system: Currently PISD uses the state of Texas educator assessment tool called PDAS. PDAS scores are based on classroom observational walkthroughs and only one is required, annually. PISD has a waiver to use an observational walkthrough rubric that is aligned to its educator evaluation goals; and
- Experience: PISD has experience using a value added educator evaluation system that met the requirements of a State funded program called D.A.T.E. This program of incentive awards was tied to student academic achievement and staff development. Through D.A.T.E., approximately 9,845 educators were evaluated and approximately 5,562 educators earned incentive awards. Through D.A.T.E., PISD learned to include stakeholders into every aspect of the process and learned that educator evaluations alone do not result in improved teaching. Teachers need support, guidance, and opportunities to improve instruction.

2. These initiatives are aligned to the plan's reform efforts and lend credibility to its implementation.

This section is rated high.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant uses a variety of scenarios (i.e. Mary and Marcus) to develop and relay PISD's vision for implementing PLEs through the e-portal. The scenarios center around students at varying grade levels and provide detailed descriptions of learning (as it could take place, when the e-portal is utilized, to shape interaction among students, educators, and family members). The scenarios interweave the targeted goals and initiatives into a projected vision where a fostered educational climate and culture allow PISD students to grow academically and socially as they take control of and responsibility for their own learning. While some components of (C)(1) are in place and provide a reasonable expectation of implementation success for the reform plan and its targeted outcomes, more evidence-based narrative/explanation is needed to determine the extent of reform implementation feasibility. The evidence in this section provides a proposed snapshot of the way in which a secondary and an elementary student would be able to access resources, work collaboratively, build on interests, receive peer and teacher feedback, self-pace, check progress, use management skills, and produce performance-based outcomes. A vision supporting an approach to learning that engages and empowers learners in an age-appropriate manner such that all students understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals is projected in the scenarios. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Example: In the scenario, Marcus links his area and perimeter math lesson with his interest in art and architecture and reading (as assisted by his teacher) with Frank Lloyd Wright, an architect; the activities spur Marcus to realize aspirations in the area of architecture. He is also learning to manage his learning by navigating the e-portal to check on his assigned work and view graded work that includes his teacher's comments. He learns to connect content and context as it relates to daily life. A vision more closely aligned to linking college and career components of the reform efforts to proposal requirements includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By now, Mary is beginning to wonder about careers that protect natural resources. Needing a study break, Mary moves to the college tab of her PLE-portal that is directly linked to college/career resources and finds she can pursue a large number of careers in the field of environmental protection. It even provides her with potential income earnings of the career opportunities and college degrees needed for the careers. Realizing that college is not free, Mary stops to work a little on her FAFSA application, but then moves to research for scholarships for environmental science. She flags scholarships that seem possible and then realizes some are contingent on her SAT scores. She moves on to explore her options for taking SAT preparation classes and decides she should take one in the Summer so she can take test in the fall, giving her the opportunity to retake the test if she does not score well. Pleased with how much she has learned about careers and college, Mary returns to her Armand Bayou Chemistry project with new enthusiasm, imagining that someday she might be paid to evaluate water samples and to find water contamination sources. Mary has clearly taken responsibility for structuring her work and for pursuing her interests onto post-secondary preparation activities. Since Mary's family has no experience with college and cannot guide her through the process, there is a chance that Mary might miss a step. Fortunately, Mary's counselor can use her e-portal to track Mary's progress toward enrolling into college and can send Mary e-portal reminders if she falls behind. Supporting evidence correlated to the scenarios would provide clarity and more closely connect plan components of the reform effort. The extent to which high needs learners, such as SWD and ELL, will be supported needs further clarification. <p>This section is rated in the medium range.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant extends the examples from (C)(1) into (C)(2) to correlate the vision, goals, and implementation process of the

reform plan and provides narrative to clarify how it will be instituted.

1. This implementation includes:

The E-portal

a. Specific and district-wide professional staff development will introduce educators to the e-portal dashboards specific to their role: teacher, counselor, principal. Teachers will learn how to access student data with one click and how to use e-portal instructional recommendations and matched resources to create student PLE's aligned to the PISD college standards based curriculum.

For example, Mary's Chemistry teacher will learn how to consider Mary's interests, grade level, and academic gaps in assigning a CCR curriculum aligned project. Her teacher will learn how to choose a project template matched to Mary's interests and her need to meet CCR standard lab probe competencies.

b. Counselors will learn how to access student progress on the Recommended graduation plan, track student progress on pursuing post-secondary enrollment or careers, and determine whether or not students are on track to graduate in four years and enroll in post-secondary. They will also learn how to alert students to activities/steps they need to take to stay on track for graduation.

c. Principals and assistant principals will learn to track whole school student academic performance, teacher instructional growth, and quickly identify any operational challenges. Principals will learn how to access aggregated and disaggregated teacher performance data, how to determine whole school progress toward meeting CCR standards and graduation requirements, and how to use this information to determine the need to improve educator's skills and to allocate campus resources to raise instruction to CCR standards.

For example: So, if Mary begins to miss school, the principal will know immediately and will assign her to the campus intervention team that is responsible for helping students get back on-track for attending school. Likewise, principals will learn how to access aggregated and disaggregated teacher performance data. Understanding which teachers need most help and assistance through instructional modeling and coaching will help principals target campus resources for development.

d. Training resources will assist in teaching educators to use the e-portals to transform student e-portals into PLE-portals, how to monitor student progress towards CCR, and how to continuously modify a PLE content to assure progress toward meeting CCR standards.

Evaluations

2. Descriptions of teacher, principal, and Superintendent evaluations are provided and considered frameworks for how the district plans to use feedback to improve educator practice and effectiveness.

College and Career Ready

3. Reforms will allow the applicant to finish integrating college- and career-readiness standards and graduation requirements into its PK-12 curriculum. The curriculum will be the foundation of the reform's high quality learning resources; it will guide instruction by providing the scope and sequence of classroom instruction.

Digital Resources

4. High quality digital resources will be found through the educator e-portals and delivered to student PLE-portals (i.e. ESL ReadingSmart, SuccessMaker, Think Central, Study Island).

Through programming that uses set-points and linkages, e-portals will automatically match student academic needs to existing district and web-based learning supplements. With 'one click' teachers will have the information they need to build student PLE's and because teacher/student e-portals are linked and serve as a student venue for completing remediation, acceleration, working on group projects, and completing/submitted homework, teachers will have feedback on student performance and student engagement in PLE activities. Thus, teachers will continuously have the information they need to constantly revise and refine student PLE's

Professional Development

5. Professional development across initiatives will be utilized to ensure understanding and fidelity of implementation.

6. Student PLE-portal training will occur the first day they attend a PISD school. Parent e-portal training will occur during each school's open house in September.

7. The applicant has presented evidence, in this and other sections, that the reform components are cohesive and address the key goals outlined in the plan. However, it is uncertain how ongoing training for stakeholders will be implemented or to what extent measures are in place to support high needs populations.

This section is rated in the high range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. PISD states that its central office will be organized to support, guide, and lead the district-wide and school-based reform efforts. A listing of individuals and their respective responsibilities is provided (i.e. Associate Superintendent-provide instructional leadership, oversee staff, manage the budget; Project Manager-oversee e-portal, create data linkages, work with collaborating partners). Stakeholders are also included as part of an oversight committee to meet quarterly and serve in an advisory capacity. The listing provides an organizational overview and explanation of how PISD will structurally manage the reform efforts and will support the plan's implementation. A timeline is present in Appendix T.
2. School leadership teams will be tasked with leading the reform efforts on their respective campuses. The teams will assure program implementation and operational fidelity, manage operational adjustments, and support data collection; they will be comprised of: principals, assistant principals, counselors, teachers, and instructional specialists. The Associate Superintendent overseeing the reform efforts will work with principals to identify other team members, as needed.
3. School leadership teams will have shared decision-making with the hiring of technology personnel and the responsibility for hiring instructional personnel; teams will have autonomy over operational and campus-based implementation decisions (i.e. staffing reorganization for optional flexible learning opportunities).
4. Opportunities will be afforded for students to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not seat time, including: 8-period day, Virtual High School, Dual Credit, and AP classes. Each opportunity listed will expand and strengthen learning venues. Narrative providing details about each opportunity listed is present; however, it is not clear if other opportunities exist for students to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not seat time, or how the structure of the 8-period day will be structured to afford this opportunity.
5. The applicant states that students will have multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards in multiple ways: classroom grades, benchmark performance, and STAAR/EOC assessments. Additionally, other avenues being used to address personalizing learning environments so that students have multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards in multiple ways are discussed in other sections.
6. The PISD has leveled learning resources that "respond" to the needs of students with disabilities and English Language Learners (with most resources being dual language). The e-portal will be for all students so that PLEs are tailored to the individual student and are accessible by all students. Prior descriptions of the e-portal explain its highly individualized structure and capability of addressing each student's needs.
7. Along with the information provided in 1-6 above, information and examples in sections (C)(1) and (C)(2) tie to (D)(1) c-e (LEA practices, policies, rules) in this section to support the evidence of a high quality plan.
8. However, regarding high needs students: specific examples of the resources for students, how they will be utilized, the way(s) in which they will target students' identified needs, how outcomes will result in personal learning environment changes, and how adjustments will be made needs further explanation.

This section is rated in the medium range.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant states that:

- a. "E-portals will be accessible by all students, their parents, and educators involved in the student's learning."
- b. Internet towers will be strategically erected across the district, giving every student, educator, and parent wireless internet access.
- c. "For students, parents and other stakeholders that do not have computers or access to district computers, PISD will help them use their own smart phones, iPads, laptops, etc., to access e-portals and learning information."
- d. To implement the one-to-one technology pilot with fidelity, the district plan includes: hiring seven technical support staff to support the technical needs of more than 4,000 computers and more than 4,000 users; hiring four instructional specialists to help educators fully integrate e-portals use and PLE development into instruction; and by 2014-2015, have in place a student-staffed help desk/repair center to "handle the expected high number of calls and simple hardware repairs that will occur with the e-portal/one-to-one/BYOD learning curve."

2. At the present time, "the majority of information available to students and parents is and will be exportable in an open data format." Determinations are to be made on what data will be accessible through other electronic learning systems (in compliance with FERPA).

3. College Board and Microsoft conversations have determined that it is feasible to have interoperable data systems so that teachers can access internal and external student assessment data and to provide students with direct access to external resources that link with college preparation/readiness.

4. Developing the e-portal infrastructure will require PISD to link internal and external data systems and devise a process for turning raw data into information that can be used to guide and provide rigorous, college-aligned instruction.

5. While the information provided in 1-4 above, through information and examples in sections (C)(1) and (C)(2), ties to this section to support the evidence of a high quality plan, more information is needed about the process to be used for determining what data will be accessible through other electronic learning systems (in compliance with FERPA).

6. More information regarding the following would provide a clearer understanding of the applicant's project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed:

- the type of training parents will receive, conditions they must meet, and the activities that will take place to support/communicate with them regarding use of e-portals and access to information regarding technology (i.e. Internet, devices).

This section is rated in the medium range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant has provided a thorough explanation of the process to be used in implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant and ties the process to the vision, goals, and key components of the reform effort.

a. Reform plan implementation will be regularly monitored, evaluated, and refined through a rigorous continuous improvement process that assures program improvements are based on: program outcome data and timely feedback that results in program modifications (throughout and after the grant funding has ended).

b. To ensure fidelity of implementation, an external evaluator will be hired to create data collection protocols, spreadsheets, and databases that will be used to track and maintain process data.

2. The applicant contends that program components tracked will include:

- Linking the district's existing robust data system with new data systems that can provide instant academic analysis of

each student's needs, interests, and social-economic challenges;

- Identifying academic resources and learning opportunities that match the student's academic needs and displaying this information within the student portal;
- Tracking student academic performance using PK-16 the State of Texas longitudinal data system and other private systems such as National Student Clearinghouse and the College Board. Transform the raw data into instructional information through e-portals;
- Establishing an educator evaluation system that develops teacher, principal, and superintendent skills; and
- Graduate PISD students college- and career-ready.

3. Actions regarding data will include:

a. Data will be collected and analyzed quarterly by the evaluator.

b. This information will be presented to an Implementation Team whose membership includes the RTT Associate Superintendent; campus principal, assistant principal, lead counselor, instructional specialists, teacher, and parent representatives; the Chief Technology Officer and his identified staff, the external evaluator, the Associate Superintendents of Campus Development, the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction.

c. The Implementation Team will review the evaluator's process data and grant objectives specific to (1) the development of technology linkages, (2) student learning, (3) preparing students for post-secondary, (4) the development of educators through evaluations and coaching, and (5) the infusion of resources to meet the participant's social, emotional or behavioral needs.

d. It will also evaluate the fidelity of implementation to determine if program activities are being fully and comprehensively implemented. It will be the Implementation Team's responsibility to problem-solve activity outcomes and to refine program activities in a way that will result in continuous improvement and assure all improvements remain aligned to the vision, purpose, and proposed outcomes of PISD's RTT program application plan. The team will identify program implementation problems, problem-solve program problems, decide upon the plan for improvement, identify key personnel in implementing the improvement, continuously evaluate the success of the improvement activity, and decide upon next steps based on the data received from the improvement activity data.

e. The external evaluator will attend program implementation meetings to assure data collection activities are aligned to program revisions. The Implementation Team will use this approach during and after the term of the grant to assure the grant strategies meet the needs of the students and result in the desired outcomes.

f. An explanation of data collection and measurement is provided and includes: short-term, formative, and summative collection measures (i.e. stratified random sample of students grades 7-12 to assess student understanding, stakeholder surveys (parents and other relevant stakeholders).

4. Publicly sharing information will take place through updates to: the Board of Trustees, faculties, parents, and community stakeholders. Forms of communication will include: presentations, meetings, and newsletters.

5. As previously noted, Appendix T contains a timeline of implementation. Appendix B contains the Logic Model. The Logic Model provides areas that address: needs and gaps, goals, objectives, activities, stakeholders' roles, outcomes, and measurement of outcomes and tie to the overall vision giving the plan credibility.

This section is rated in the high range.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. The PISD states that communications will occur on several levels. Communication will occur with internal and external stakeholders according to the description found in "Sharing of Information" as presented below. Communication will also occur with the departments and schools implementing RRT reforms through their representation on the Implementation Team. Discussions, tasks, and remedies identified during team bi-monthly team meetings will be taken back to the department or school for consideration and inclusion in their ongoing campus based implementation. Between meetings, ongoing communication will occur through emails, phone calls, and subcommittee meetings.

The Associate Superintendent will provide RTT updates to the Board of Trustees, faculty during faculty meetings, parents, and community organization events. This sharing will focus on formative outcomes and benefits to community residents. Thus, each presentation/newsletter will include updates on the investments funded by the grant – the educator e-portals and technology linking, one-to-one and BYOD technology initiatives, student

college- and career-readiness, increased instructional rigor, growth in the numbers of effective and highly effective educators, partnerships and student participation and benefit from activities and strategies addressing social, emotional, or behavioral needs, and findings from the external evaluator.

2. Evidence of ongoing communication is found in other sections of the applicant's plan, such as:

a. Section (A)(1) A timeline with identified tasks for implementation of the plan is enclosed in Appendix T and includes descriptions of activities from start-up through professional development and stakeholder engagement.

b. Section (B)(4) PISD provides evidence of a structured effort to engage stakeholders through intentional cascading of engagement, as described below. (Section (B)(4) provides the evidence.)

c. In section (E)(1) is a description is given regarding how teachers, parents, and other relevant stakeholders will be surveyed in order to assess implementation effectiveness and secure feedback to make adjustments to the plan/plan components, how a stratified random sampling of students will verify student understanding and use of the e-portal. Focus groups with students and teachers will also allow the evaluators to include elementary-aged children in the feedback process.

3. More information regarding the identification of the external stakeholders is needed.

This section is rated in the high range.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant notes that performance measures and their targeted outcomes were identified by the Design Team as being concerns within the school district. Thirteen goals have been established and address: the district, grades 4-8, and grades 9-12.

2. No additional rationale was given for the selection of the performance measures or how they tie back to initiatives.

3. It was stated that the Implementation Team will periodically review each performance measure in a process established to ensure that monitoring, assessment, review, and adjustment are made where needed as established by the guidelines set up by reform protocol.

4. Tables were provided that gave targeted outcomes for the performance measures. However, there was a table for grades PK-3 that did not match up with the performance measures in the narrative. Additional tables gave district level population information for grade spans.

5. The performance measures chosen support the overall vision of the reform project either directly or as a support piece.

This section is rated in the medium range.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant shows evidence of evaluating the effectiveness of the plan through:

a. hiring an external evaluator to implement an Extended-Term Mixed-Method Evaluation (ETMM) Design,

b. a deliberate incorporation of formative, summative, and follow-up data collection/analysis; sharply focused causal questions; and rigorous quantitative and qualitative evidence.

c. use of the enclosed logic model, which includes: Key Elements, Goals/Objectives Short Term Evaluation, Bi-Monthly Report, Formative Evaluation, Mid-Year Report, Summative Evaluation, and Yearly Report, and will provide a system of ongoing communication between the evaluator and the Implementation Team,

d. providing the structure and autonomy for the Implementation Team to oversee grant performance and revise program activities as needed to assure program success (i.e. use of bimonthly reports to provide an ongoing source of feedback, data collected and analyzed using validated instruments that will also allow comparison overtime, latitude for the Team to make adjustments and improvements to the programs), and

e. having the external program evaluator attend Implementation Team meetings in order to understand the program

activities that are being revised and to revise data collection activities as needed. "If problems are identified, the Implementation Team will decide upon the plan for improvement, discuss and support key personnel in implementing the improvement, reconvene the committee to evaluate the success of the improvement activity and decide upon next steps based on the data received from the improvement activity data. The Implementation Team will use this approach during and after the term of the grant to assure the grant strategies meet the needs of the students and result in the desired outcomes."

2. Evidence is provided to show linkage to the vision through the goals and activities listed in the logic model. Those responsible for executing the actions and the rationale for the guiding work are present.

This section is rated in the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. While the budget narrative is not in the body of the application, it is included both in and with the proposed budget.
2. The overall PISD budget is well-organized, includes detailed breakouts of project-level expenditures, and provides expansive narrative (rationale) to explain expenditures included.
3. Alignment in the budget with priorities in the plan is evident; the expenditures in the budget support the plan and its implementation. While there is an explanation regarding proposed sustainability actions/decisions in section (F)(2), a more detailed explanation of how the personnel hired under grant funding will be sustained past the grant would provide clarity.
4. The detailed explanations provide evidence of costs spanning more than one year. Noting one-time versus recurring expenditures would assist with clarity.

This section is rated in the high range.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant states that sustainability will be attained by:
 - a. building capacity so that additional/continued funding is not necessary (i.e training on e-portal components such as: creating PLEs, tracking of students' progress),
 - b. discontinuing grant-funded positions (i.e. two programmers, five high school coordinators), and
 - c. locally absorbing the cost of or securing grant funds for maintaining specified positions (i.e. seven technical/computer staff, one Virtual High School Director).
2. Additionally, the grant funding will be used to provide the "infrastructure and computer programming to develop data linkages for rich and robust e-portal and PLE-portal content." Since these initiatives will be in place by the end of the grant, the district has declared that it will "continue to support, refine, and expand" what has been established.
3. While the applicant has provided a rationale for sustainability, further explanation is needed regarding how the PISD will absorb and support the grant-funded initiatives and personnel once the grant ends.

This section is rated in the high range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1. PISD students have a poverty rate of 24.39%, a free and reduced lunch rate of 81%, and struggle with limited access to resources. The

system falls in the 23% of the poorest systems in the state. In looking at the needs of the students, including determining significant health risk factors that occur in the population, PISD tied student achievement to the overall health of its students.

2. PISD has implemented the state-mandated FitnessGram testing. After correlating the TAKS scores for athletes in grades 7-12 with counterpart non-athletes, the findings concluded that the athletes were in the healthy zone more than non-athletes and that the athletes had a higher passing rate on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills than their counterparts.
3. In an effort to promote student health, PISD is partnering with multiple organizations, such as: The American Diabetes Association and Action-Based Learning.
4. Seven population-desired results with targeted performance measures have been established. The desired results have been correlated with plan goals (either directly or as support pieces) and support improved student learning and outcomes (i.e. reduction of absenteeism for health-related reasons, increase of graduates, improved percentage of students reading on grade level-15%). A chart of these measures is included.
5. Outcome measures include: State of Texas AEIS data, and ITBS assessment results.
6. The plan includes: utilization of e-portal aggregated data to target students for collaborative partner services, school-based committees for implementation, oversight, and evaluation of the program, parent access to the e-portal, and measures for tracking student progress in order to address student needs.
7. Collaboratively, PISD and the partnerships will oversee activity outcomes and refine activities to increase results overtime. The Coordinated School Health manager will hold quarterly meetings with the collaborative partners to assess whether or not activities are occurring as intended and producing the intended results. If not, the Coordinated School Health manager will work with campus leadership teams to problem-solve and refine activity implementation.
8. The amount or types of the communication to and engagement of stakeholders outside the participants (i.e. students, educators, and partners) in this initiative is vague.
9. The population-level desired results seem feasible. However, whether there are plan sustainability measures in place for the CCP project post-grant is unclear.

This section is rated in the medium range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The Pasadena Independent School District has set forth a reform plan that is focused and goal-oriented. The PSD attests that increasing student engagement and performance through: targeting the improvement of reading skills, increasing academic rigor, providing optional flexible learning venues, developing student learning management skills, and increased access to technology (through a blend of allowing students to "Bring Your Own Device" and providing computers to targeted grade levels) will promote access to equitable learning through Personal Learning Environments (PLEs) that are responsive to each student's educational goals, interests, and abilities. A thorough process of continuous improvement provides a basis for ensuring successful plan implementation. Stakeholders have been engaged in the reform process and remain "at the table."

The applicant has an established vision supported with goals and processes that mesh to form a cohesive plan.

As is noted by the examples above, the applicant has met Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	155
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	8
<p>Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant's optional budget aligns with the Competitive Preference Priority (CCP) of addressing students' health (as it impacts academic performance and fitness activities) outlined in the plan and supports implementation of the proposed activities (i.e. purchase of fitness journals, Coordinated Approach to Children's Health (CATCH) training for personnel). 2. Explanation is provided and details the use of the proposed funding to expand the impact of partnership activities that support the CCP (i.e. Houston Wilderness, Action-Based Learning). 3. As noted in the CCP, the initiative's base was established from data gathered in relation to athletes versus non-athletes in regard to health on the FitnessGram scores and academic performance on the TAKS. Also taken into account were high risk health conditions particular to the PISD student population. 4. While it is mentioned in the budget breakout of expenditures, more information regarding the partnership with San Antonio ISD (to develop a Healthy Lifestyles Course) is needed. 5. While the focus/core of the budgeted project (improving health and healthy lifestyles) seems replicable, it seems uncertain that the fully proposed project, as presented, could be replicated. 6. It is not evident that the Optional Budget Supplement has been co-developed and will be implemented across two or more LEAs. <p>This section is rated in the medium range.</p>		