



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1289NJ-1 for Patterson School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has set forth a vision of the reform that is coherent and articulates a somewhat credible approach to the goals stated in the question. The applicant has answered all parts of the question, with some strong answers discussed below. However, the weakness in the answer lies with the credibility of the goals stated. Though the goal of 100% of students being "prepared to be successful in the institution of higher education of their choosing, and in their chosen profession," is a wonderful goal to articulate it seems very hard to achieve. Making ambitious yet achievable goals is important and it is unclear how achievable this is even with the proposed grant.</p> <p>The other weakness of the proposal, is that though the areas of reform are tied closely with the Core Assurance areas, many of the reforms are empty phrases with no substance behind. The District states that it will Improve the Graduation Rate, but does not say how, except by saying that the District will "support the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments" and that the District will implement a consistent, transparent evaluation system. There is no real clear explanation of how any of this will happen, except in its brief discussion about high school redesign.</p> <p>The strengths of the proposal are its very clear and coherent redesign of all high schools. By converting all "large traditional high schools into twelve small thematic/career technical education programs and converting all high school to "schools of choice" the District shows a commitment to personalized and choice based academics. The District has also pushed for advanced professional development, the development of "the Innovation Zone" the implementation of "robust student assessments," and the creation of a "new teacher and administrator evaluation system tied to student achievement."</p> <p>Additionally, the District shows a very strong direct linkage among the RTTT-D Core Assurance Areas and both the State's and the District's Reform Areas. Not only does the District show how the State and the District are aligned in many ways, but also the depth in which the District is trying to address the Core Assurance Areas. For instance, in adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed, the District highlights, not one, but 7 different programs or areas of focus. The weakness in this part of the application surrounds the lack of explanation of some of those areas of focus. For example, the District gives a tangible example of supporting the students to succeed creating a "Pre-Kindergarten to Grade Three Reading System," but then also just puts "Increase Academic Rigor" without any explanation of how this would occur.</p> <p>Lastly, there are some formatting issues of the proposal that just call into question the level of commitment of the District to support the high level of support needed.</p> <p>As a composite and holistic vision the District does come with a strong alignment with the objective of the question, but a real weaknesses in some explanation and its ability to be achieved. The other strong worry is the lack of an explanation of a specific reform for any population other than high school. This answer is thus in the low range for failing to truly explain its vision. Score of 3/10</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District's explanation of the process that was used to select schools to participate seems to indicate that all schools in the district will be a part of the program. Because there is no real explanation and no description of the process, but a perceived understanding that all the schools will benefit from the program, this section can be seen as attempting to answer the question. Additionally, sub parts B and C are answered in full. Thus holistically this section receives a medium score of 5/10. There is no description of the process, but there is a tacit understanding of why the entire District was chosen to participate.</p>		

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District fails to include a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform. The plan presented is a list of bullet points of dimensions of "school effectiveness." Then the application included a flow chart stipulating that the district will start with a vision and then it will end up into schools and departments within the District. This answer is very weak, with no description of how it will be scaled up and how it will support schools. There is no conversation about how the applicant will reach its outcomes goals. There is barely an attempt at an answer. This score is in the low range only receiving points because of a stated District wide support for the Dimensions of School Effectiveness. (2/10)</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It is unclear if the applicants vision is likely to result in improved student learning in the goal areas because though the vision is closely aligned to the goal areas, there is little understanding of how these stated goals will be achieved. Yes, performance on summative assessments will likely increase because of the stated creation of an Intensive Intervention Structure to Support Student Achievement, but since there is no explanation of what that intervention is, the likelihood of success cannot be evaluated. Graduation rates are likely to increase because one of the stated programs to be created is "Improve Graduation Rate, Reduce Dropout Rate," but that is only a bullet point. That is all the explanation or information given. It is impossible to judge the likelihood of success if the plan does not state how the goals will be achieved.</p> <p>However, the stated goals and the formula the District uses to create these goals does seem to make sense at times. There are some goals that do not seem achievable or comparable to the other stated goals. For instance, according to the District female graduation rates will increase from 69.3% to 91.1% post grant, yet the male graduation rate will go from 58.4% to 62.6%. There seems to be a huge discrepancy between the expectations for male and female students. At once, the female goals seem very high and barely achievable and the male goals seem completely unambitious. In the College enrollment rates goals section,) a much more serious problem occurs. The numbers presented don't make sense. The Rate as described by the notice is to be expressed as a percent of students from different subgroups and their rate of college enrollment. Yet, the district states that 84% of Economically Disadvantaged students are enrolled in college even though the overall rate is 68%. The General Ed rate is 60% and the Special Ed rate is 29% yet the over all is 68%. Unless there is an entirely other category of student the numbers just don't add up. This highlights a serious validity issue when looking at these goals.</p> <p>Because of the lack of clarity and explanation of the vision and thus how it can lead toward these goals, coupled with the goals seemingly being disparate and at times incompatibly with the data presented this answer is in the low range. (2/10)</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	4
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District fails to show a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement or in increasing equity in learning and teaching. The District's major evidence for its clear record of success are policy plans and implementations. For instance the District states that it has "Restructured and re-staffed the lowest performing" schools. It has implemented new Standards, created new Learning Walk protocols, contracted with a number of companies and firms, re-organized district staff, and launched a new district website, among many other policies. However, the District provides little information of these policy changes creating a positive change for student learning. The District does highlight and should be commended for its increase of graduation rates to 64% from 45% and mentions an increase in college enrollment (but the chart it refers to does not show growth but goals for growth). And the District does provide information that students enrolled in the Innovation Zone schools have increased the rate of intending to attend college. Yet, the district does not discuss closing achievement gaps, raising student achievement or improving student learning outcomes.</p> <p>The District's explanation of how it will achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its lower performing schools is also problematic. The District has already received SIG grants and are implementing interventions and support services. Yet, even by the District's own admissions the schools have "undergone various levels of district-imposed interventions with varying degrees of success." There is no evidence that another grant, much larger would be implemented with better success in these low achieving schools.</p>		

The District does make a strong attempt at its explanation as to how it will make student performance data available to multiple stakeholders. Because of the "Performance Matters" database, "all formative, summative, state, and district assessments" are kept in one digital accessible and searchable database. This database has the ability to be opened to parents, but it is unclear if it is at this time. The District says that it is exploring that option, but that "currently, data on student performance is forwarded via mail." Thus, there seems to be an acknowledgement that there should be access for parents and students but it does not exist at this point.

Thus, with the lack of clear success in places other than graduation rates, in a weak track record of success in low performing schools, and a database that is built to be accessible to parents and students but is not at the current time, the answer is in the low range. (4/15)

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

5

1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The District fails to show a high level of transparency in any part of the process, practice or investments. The District does not provide any narrative as to how accessible any of this information is and only provides a total funding allotment in the aggregate for sections B2A-B2D. The District makes no attempt to explain the numbers or how any information is accessible. The lack of understanding of the intent of the question and the failure to answer shows a very poor response. This was a very minimal effort. (1/5)

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

10

9

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Because the District is located in a State which received RTTT funding during Phase 3, the State is organized to support implementation of the grant. The State has reorganized around four building blocks of reform that seem to be strongly aligned with RTTT priorities. Thus, the District will have the autonomy and legal ability to implement the proposal. Additionally, the District is part of a State pilot program for a new evaluation system that aligns with RTTT. Thus, the score is in the high range because the State is supportive. (9/10)

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

10

3

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The District has demonstrated some evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement. The District held a community forum (read one forum) on April 30, 2012. The District stated that 25-300 stakeholders were there. In a District of almost 30000 students not to mention parents, teachers, and district employees this number represents a very small fraction of the stakeholder population. Additionally, the District stated that the final plan was edited to reflect stakeholder issues before being adopted on May 2nd (two days later) at a scheduled Board Meeting. It is hard to believe that any substantive changes could have been made to the plan if any were discussed at the Community Forum. This seems very disingenuous as an example of meaningful stakeholder engagement. It should be noted that the District does state that it had done much stakeholder engagement through a comprehensive needs assessment, but there is no indication that this needs assessment was aligned with the proposal. Thus, not addressing the question of meaningful stakeholder engagement with the proposal and support of the proposal. Though the District should be commended for doing a needs assessment and surveys about the District writ large, the District did not seem to do much real engagement around the proposal and thus is graded in the low range. (3/10)

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

5

4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

In this section the District does demonstrate evidence of a high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementation. The district separates out the four assurance areas and then goes step by step through the strategic plans needs and gaps then to specific activities that will be conducted, then to the deliverables looked for then a timeline and finishes with who is responsible for the specific section of the plan. It is clear, concise and cogent. The reader is taken through why, how, and who will do the job. This is a very strong section of the proposal. (4/5)

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

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	3
-----------------------------	----	---

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The District is tasked with creating an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, specifically high-need students. At first the District is asked to show how students will understand what they are learning, identify the learning, and in general are involved in their learning, especially with respect to choice. The District's initial response is to support the students by assessing them more frequently. And then depending on how the students do on these assessments change attempt to change the curriculum so the students can do better on these assessments. There is no discussion about the students choice, the students engagement, or the student understand anything other than doing better on the assessments. This section fails to address the question almost completely.

The second part of the question asks the District do discuss how it ensures students have access to a personalized education, a variety of choice, and high-quality instruction, with a focus on college and career readiness standards. The District's response to this question states that students' progress will be monitored via the "Performance Matters" database. The District then continues to discuss the numerous assessments that will be used to look at the progress of the student, "Curriculum-embedded Interim Assessments", "Teacher-Made Assessments," the "DIBELS Progress Monitoring" program, and the "Read About Monitoring Progress Reports." The District then discusses other examples of assessments that are computer adaptive. The District does not address how the education is going to be personalized. In fact, it doesn't even talk about the curriculum at all. There is no discussion about what will be taught, how it will be taught, how the students will have choice, how the students will have access to high-quality instructional approaches and environments. The District only focuses on the assessments and not the instruction, thus not addressing the question in any real sense.

The third part of the question asks the District to show that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources. The District answers this question by discuss the numerous ways in which staff will be trained to understand and deliver curriculum aligned to the Common Core. These ideas include peer-to-peer support, monitoring of lesson plans, the purchasing of curriculum maps aligned to the Common Core. The District does not expressly say that by training the teachers in the Common Core they will then turn key and provide training to the student that they will understand how to use the tools and resources. The District does not discuss how the students will be supported or even what the tools and resources are they will be provided to them. The only mention is that each student will have a personalize learning environment and this will include setting learning goals, but it is unclear if the student will have any part on this discussion at all.

In total, the answer fails to adequately address most of the questions, from a failure to show how the students will be involved in their learning to a failure to show how the students will be taught. The only instructional piece discussed is how the student will be assessed. Additionally, it does not address anything about different kind of learners or specifically the high-needs learners. This answer falls in the low range. (3/20)

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In this section the District is tasked with the job of creating a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college and career ready. It asks for instructional strategies and how the teachers are going to be trained in them.

The District responds to this section by extolling the virtues of its new evaluation system for teachers and administrators. This evaluation systems is balanced between performance and practice indicators and test data. There is a comprehensive discussion on the evaluation measure that the District will use to judge the teachers. This evaluation says that it will support the teacher in "preparation for Instruction" "use of data to inform instruction" and "deliver quality instruction" among other things. It is clear that the District has an adequate monitoring program and effectiveness method, thus answering C2aiii and C2aiv, but it does not show how the instruction (it does not talk specifically of any kind of instruction or curriculum) will be personalize or how the students will have opportunities for students to engage in curriculum.

The second part of the question asks that all the teachers have access to resources to help students become college and career ready. This section the District provides a high-quality answer for how the teacher will be trained and supported but does not directly show how the teacher will have access to resources to help students become college and career ready. The District shows strongly how the teacher will get training in the assessments, in how to teach well through "Demonstrations of Learning" The teacher will have a lot of support from job embedded coaches to video training to a coaches academy to workshops and faculty meetings. If the District interprets "resources" to help students as being trained will to provide instruction then this area of the question can be thought of highly. However, there is some question as to "resources" being the skills or being things like computers, curriculum, software or other teaching tools to help students become college and career ready.

The third part of the question asks that all participating school leaders and teams have training and all tools necessary to enable them to create the effective learning environments that will meet the students' needs. The District explains that it has a performance data management system that identifies areas of need and provides specific recommendations for pd at the individual and building levels. The Office of Staff Development has an evaluation support plan linked to observations and evaluation results. The District has a strong grasp of a teacher evaluation system that works to improve individual teachers. For this subsection the District has a strong response.

For the last part of the question, the grant asks the applicant to have a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from high quality teachers and principals. Here the District provides strong examples of how it will do this. Teachers will be graded on a clear and high-quality rubric using test scores and observations. The performance evaluation rubric directly addresses the question in a high-quality manner.

Thus, in aggregate the Districts response to C2 is in the middle range, with a generally weak response to how the District will implement personalized learning and college and career readiness (because of a lack of discussion of curriculum, student resources, and individualization) but a strong discursion on how the policies will be used to evaluate the teachers and create high quality teachers in the classroom. Score of (11/20)

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	0
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: The District is asked to create a high-quality plan to support the project through policies and infrastructure that gives the different stakeholders the resources and support they need. Specifically, the District is asked to 1) organize its central office to provide support to all schools, 2) provide school leadership team with flexibility and autonomy 3) give student the opportunity to progress on mastery not time, 4) give students opportunity to demonstrate master in a variety of ways, and 5) provide learning resources and practices for all students. The District fails to address any of these five requests. The sole evidence offered by the District is that its bylaws, administration, programs, and other parts of the District are able to conduct "business related to the wellbeing of student and promote high education standards for all." This answer truly fails to address any of the question's components. (0/15)		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: This question asks the District to provide a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every stakeholder with the support and resources they need. The quality of the plan will be determined based on 1) its support of personalize learning by ensuring all stakeholders have the tools for implementation, 2) that the stakeholders have appropriate levels of tech support, 3) information tech systems will allow parents and student to export the information, and 4) that the schools and district has interoperable data systems. The only evidence the District provides to answer this question and the four subsections is a diagram/flow-chart that shows how the district implements and plans for the process. The District does not attempt to answer the question. There is no discussion of data systems or how the stakeholders will have technical support. This answer fails to address the question in any meaningful way. (1/10)		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: This section asks the District to create a high-quality approach to continuously improving its plan. The question requires that the District provides timely and regular feedback on the progress toward the project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvement. Additionally, the plan must discuss how the District will 1) monitor, 2) measure and 3) share the information on the investment. In order to answer this question the District stipulates that the district leadership will ensure the implementation and ensure		

continuous improvement by using the existing "Effective Schools Initiative." This Initiative is build to change the "culture and climate of schools," and the system at large. The model includes "indicators" that explain "effective practice." The District then expounds on these "indicators" saying that they will provide a blueprint of creating effective schools, provides a curriculum for continuous PD, provides tools for "gathering consistent information," provides uniform expectations and practices, among other actions.

The answer provided does address part of the question. It is clear that the Effective Schools Initiative (ESI) will provide feedback on the goals since the ESI provides the tools for gathering the information. However, there is no plan discussed as to how the information will be shared publicly or on how what is shared will be able the investments themselves. The answer does not talk about the sharing of how the project in total is doing. There is also no discussion of the rate at which the feedback is given and to whom the feedback is given and how the feedback is given. Also, the answer says that each school will use a "locally developed" assessment tool, so it is unclear how the District at large will be able to assess each schools improvement and how to change the implementation, if necessary, without having some oversight on these "locally developed" tools. This answer is in the low range of medium because it does provide a system of continuous improvement but its rigor is unclear as well as how the information will be shared, especially the information about the investments funded by the RTTT-D grant. (5/15)

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

5

1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This sections asks the District for its strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with all stakeholders. In order to answer this question the District states that once it gets information the "superintendent's cabinet" will "issue decisions regarding instructional and programmatic changes." These changes will then be shared with teachers and other school based employees. Then members of the community will receive data reports and the recommendations for the responses. The District shows how this will improve transparency and thus communication, but does not answer the question of engagement. The District has described a "one-way" street where all the information and decision making flows down from the top. Again, the final part of the District's response solidifies this top-down unidirectional approach: "Upon review of data reports by the superintendent's cabinet, the Assessment Department distributes reports." The District seems to have missed the spirit of half this question, there is communication, but no engagement. Additionally, there is no discussion about parents or students and the communication or engagement of these very important stakeholders. Because the answer does not address have the question and does not include a discussion about important stakeholders the answer is in the low range. (1/5)

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The question asks the District to pick about 12-14 performance measures and explain its rationale for selecting that measure; how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The District provides much data and information about multiple performance measures. The District explores much of the required performance measures, especially for the Pre-K-3 and 4-8 populations. However, it does not show 9-12 section A. Additionally, for some of the performance measures, the District does not explain exactly what the measures are. The District should be commended for its strong and clear Performance Measures for the 9-12 sections d and e. It focuses on homeless students and incorporating Service Learning among other things.

Though the District does provide many of the performance measures asked for, the District's explanation of how the measures will be reviewed and improved is weak. The District discusses how the performance measures will be used to evaluate performance, but not how the measures themselves will be reviewed and improved. Because of the inconsistent nature of the District's response to all of the information asked for this answer is in the middle range. (3/5)

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

5

4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This question asks the District to create plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the RTTT-D funded activities, to make sure the money is being used well. The District creates a strong and clear evaluation plan for the effectiveness of the funded activities. The District provides a list of the main funded programs, the key people responsible for the program, the information to be collected from the program, the timeline of the specific program and the evaluation measures used to see if the program is working or not. This is a clear, concise, and cogent response to the question. The weakness is that there is little explanation of the use of technology or compensation reform. The details of the modifications for the students is also lacking, and the

programs are not special or high-quality. Examples of the activities are things like tutoring or mentoring, or workshops and field trips. This does not lead toward a new service delivery system or a change in schedule from a traditional school. This section is in the high range because it has a clear method of evaluation, but what it is evaluating is not necessarily what the question asks for. (4/5)

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 question asks the District to provide a budget that includes narratives and tables that identify all the funds that will support the project, that the funding is reasonable and sufficient to support the proposal and that it provides a rationale for the investment. The District does a very good job not only explaining what the funds are, but where they are going, why they are being spent, and how they are going to be spent. Every dollar seems to be accounted for in a thorough and clear way, directly tied to the goals and priorities of the plan. This is a very thoughtful and supported response. However, some pieces are missing for projects 2 and 7. The other weakness is the lack of clarity in describing which funds are for "one-time" investment versus ongoing operational costs, but this can be inferred from the type of funding the monies are going to. This is in the high of the medium range. (7/10)</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Though the District's budget is exceptionally strong and well organized, there is no discussion about how these programs will be supported after the term of the grant. However, because the budget is so strong and because much of the proposed projects are in training and thus it can be implied that this will carry over, it is possible to give the benefit of the doubt to the District. For instance the change to teacher salary schedules can clearly be sustained without extra funding, it is a policy. New evaluation instruments, new databases, new curriculums embedded in the school, and capacity building for the staff of the District are all projects that can continue after the grant without extra significant funding. Thus, even though there is no clear section assigned to answer this question, the District, through inference can be seen as addressing this section in part. The section is graded in the middle range.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no answer to this question in the application. The application only discusses District programs with State support. There is no indication that any public or private partnership exists. This is in the low range (0/10)</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District's application is confusing, poorly organized, and either misses entire sections of the questions asked, or answers the questions in obfuscation or vague ways. When the application is clear and thoughtful and high-quality, such as in the budget section it gives a sense of the proposal at large, but without the supporting documentation throughout the entire application it is very hard to understand what the District is actually proposing and planning to create. The projects planned are very good, from "Developing and Implementing a Comprehensive Preschool through Third Grade Approach," or "Improving</p>		

Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance," but the lack of a cogent proposal is worrying to the Districts ability to make these program come to fruition. Thus, the application does met, but barely, the Absolute Priority, based on the strength of the Budget Narrative that tries to explain the entire program.

Total	210	73
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1289NJ-2 for Patterson School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In reference to (A)(1), the applicant does not offer strong evidence of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support. The applicant summarizes recent efforts in the district to create their "Bright Futures Strategic Action Plan," and then attempts to align the four core educational reform foci of this grant with reform efforts at their state level and with areas of their district's strategic plan.</p> <p>The applicant does include a chart which lists the four core foci of this grant (e.g., adopting standards, building data systems, focusing on effective teachers, and turning around the nation's lowest-achieving areas), but then only offers a list of what activities in the grant they would do for each area. While such alignment with the four core educational reform is an important element of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision, by not providing any additional narrative surrounding their efforts (other than a list of activities), there is no real articulation of a coherent reform vision offered as evidence.</p> <p>Overall the response scores in the low range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In reference to (A)(2)(a), the applicant notes that they want to include all the populations of students and schools serviced throughout the district, with no detail regarding that decision.</p> <p>In reference to (A)(2)(b-c), the applicant includes a list of 47 schools that would be participating, and for each school offered the required enrollment and demographic information. This data reveals plans to serve a total of 24,574 students of which 84% come from low-income families. An earlier section had indicated there were 54 schools in the district, serving 29,400 students, so there is a discrepancy in the data regarding their proposal to include all schools in the grant. This section also included a list of reform activities to be undertaken via this grant, yet this list did not match the list offered in (A)(1).</p> <p>The response scores in the low range.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>For (A)(3), the applicant offers no elements of a high quality plan (e.g., goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, responsible parties) as to how their reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change, nor how it will help the applicant reach its outcome goals. The applicant basically just includes a list of six of the 10</p>		

Dimensions of School Effectiveness as its theory of action to guide their work (as well as a general process diagram), and does not provide information to address the selection criteria.

The response scores in the low range.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (A)(4) (a-d), the applicant proposes goals that include the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJ ASK) in grades 3-8, Language Arts literacy and math, and grades 4 & 8 science; the grade 11 HS proficiency assessment in math and Language Arts literacy, and the state Biology competence test in grades 9-12 (and as need for special populations, the state alternative proficiency assessments and ACCESS for ELLS).

For item a, they propose 5% annual growth in the proficiency status for all grades and subgroups. They do not offer any specific "growth" measures.

For item b, they propose 5% annual proficiency status achievement gap decreases for all grades and subgroups.

For item c, they propose overall annual increases of 2.3% in graduation rates, and varying increases depending upon the subgroup (e.g., 3.5% annual increase for females, 0.7% annual increase for males, 2.3% increase for Asian, yet only 1% annual increases for Blacks).

For item d, they propose overall increases in college enrollment of 3%, and varying increases depending on the subgroup (e.g., 7% annual for Whites, 6% for Blacks, 3% for Hispanics).

Overall, the response offers very ambitious goals which may not be achievable since they offer no narrative to explain any of the proposed targets and the variations (or lack thereof) within subgroups for various measures. They also offer baseline data that 87% of their economically disadvantaged students already go on to attend college which would be amazingly high, raising questions about some of the data offered. The response scored in the lower end of the middle range.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (B)(1), the applicant does provide evidence of extensive reforms undertaken in recent years and significant improvements, and offer specific data for improved high school graduation rates and college acceptance rates (item a). Nothing was specifically noted about closing achievement gaps.

For item b, they offer a list of specific reforms already put into place within for their lowest performing schools, and additional reforms to be undertaken. No mention of specific successes within these schools was offered.

For item c, they note that all of their district assessments are housed within a "Performance Matters" database, giving educators the opportunity to compare various assessments for individual students, classes of students, or the district as a whole. It notes that information "can be" shared with students and parents, and that a parent portal option is currently being explored. It notes that data on student performance is forwarded to parents by mail (although its notes that some schools do have data already accessible to parents and students via electronic means).

Overall, in reference to a prior record of success and conditions for reform, there was evidence of many reform efforts and some evidence of success. The response scores in the middle range.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

For (B)(2)(a-d), as a measure of having a high level of transparency, the applicant provided no evidence at all that they already make available specified categories of school-level expenditures, including no evidence that they make available actual personnel salaries at the school level for all instructional and support staff (item a), nor make available actual personnel

salaries at the school level for instructional staff only (item b), nor make available actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only (item c), nor make available actual non-personnel salaries at the school level (item d).

They did include the total aggregate numbers for their district for each category within the grant (although that was not requested).

The response received no points.

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

10

5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (B)(3), the applicant provided numerous examples of recent state reforms that would assist the applicant in implementing their proposal. These include restructuring the state department of education around the priorities of RTTT, creating seven new field-based Regional Achievement Centers, developing the content of model curriculum and formative assessment, designing an online curriculum and assessment platform, and adopting regulations that provide guidance to districts on principal and teacher evaluations (which must be implemented in all schools during 2013-14).

The applicant also notes that the state affords districts and schools with sufficient autonomy to implement the proposed personalized learning environments, but does not offer any details as to what types of autonomy is actually needed.

Overall, the response scores in the middle range.

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

10

1

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (B)(4)(a), the applicant describes an extensive stakeholder engagement process which had been conducted during Spring 2012 as the district created their strategic plan. The applicant notes that they held meetings with the district and state union on the particulars of the RTTT-D, BUT no evidence was offered to show that other stakeholder groups were engaged in the development of this proposal, nor how the proposal was revised on any such engagement (item a). There was also no evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from the collective bargaining representative (item (a)(i)).

In reference to item b, only three letters of support were included (the Paterson Education Fund, a Pastor & President of the local NAACP, and three state legislators).

Also, the proposal application signature page did not contain the signature of the local teacher's union president, nor the local school board president.

Overall, the response scored in the low range.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (B)(5), the applicant does provide the key elements of a high quality plan (e.g., activities, deliverables, timelines and responsible parties), as to how they plan to address their perceived implementation gaps in the four core educational assurance areas required by the grant. They also offer some detail regarding the logic for proposed reforms based upon their perceived gaps (as described in a narrative for each area).

However, the proposed reforms in this part of their proposal do not completely match the list initially offered in their overall vision, resulting in confusion as to exactly what reforms they were planning to do.

Overall, the response scored in the middle range.

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

	Available	Score

(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In reference to (C)(1)(a), the applicant does not offer any detail as to how they will implement an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners to understand that what they are learning is key to their success (item i); identify and pursue goals linked to college-and career ready standards and how to structure their learning to achieve those goals (item ii); become involved in deep learning experiences (item iii); have access and exposure to diverse culture (item iv); and master critical academic content and other critical skills (item v). Instead, they offer information that students will be assessed more frequently with process monitoring tools, and that such data will be used to help students meet the state core curriculum content standards. They also propose the creation of district-level committees to help interpret school reports and create cluster analysis for target groups.</p> <p>In reference to (C)(1)(b), the applicant does not offer any detail as to how each student would have access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development (item i), a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments (item ii), high-quality content including digital learning (item iii), ongoing and regular feedback (item iv), and accommodations for high-need students (item v). Instead, they offer information on a number of different assessment tools that would be used to gather and provide for teachers better formative data on all students, but only in the math area does the plan mention how such data would be used to modify instruction appropriately for each student.</p> <p>In reference to (C)(1)(c), the applicant does include some detail for both short-term and long range planning regarding the training and support that teachers would be receiving to implement the common core standards, enhanced assessment systems, and the overall alignment of teaching and learning throughout the district. It also notes that academic improvement plans for low performing students will be created. While this information is of value, it does not address what mechanism will be put into place to provide training and support to students in understanding how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.</p> <p>Overall, the response was not a high quality plan to address the selection criteria, and scored in the low range.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	6
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>For (C)(2)(a)(i-iv), the applicant provides only some of the requested information, but not in the form of a high quality plan that includes specific goals, responsible parties, and deliverables for these specific outcomes. The applicant offers information on how teachers' and principals' practice will be improved via the feedback obtained from new evaluation systems being developed (item iv), but no information at all for items i-iii (there was nothing offered regarding support for the effective implementation of personalized learning environments (item i), adapting content and instruction (item ii), nor frequently measuring student progress toward meeting college and career-ready standards (item iii)).</p> <p>For (C)(2)(b)(i-iii), the applicant does address some of the requested information, but not in the form of a high quality plan that includes specific goals, responsible parties, and deliverables for these specific outcomes. The applicant noted that the new teacher evaluation system will provide more on-going information on teacher effectiveness, and a new dynamic and robust data management system will support the principals in identifying challenging areas that need professional development. Missing is information which details plans to help educators obtain actionable information to help identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student needs (item i), access to high-quality learning resources (item ii), and the process tools to match student needs with specific resources (item iii).</p> <p>For (C)(2)(c), the applicant does address some of the requested information, but not in the form of a high quality plan that includes specific goals, responsible parties, and deliverables for these specific outcomes. They provide information on the new teacher evaluation system being developed, and a previous section included a listing of various professional development opportunities being made available to teachers depending on identified need. They do not address how all participating school leaders and school leadership teams will have information that helps them assess and take steps to improve individual and collective educator effectiveness (item i), nor offer details regarding any training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress (item ii).</p> <p>For (C)(2)(d), the applicant does not directly offer any information on how they will increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers. Instead, they offer detail regarding the implementation of their new teacher evaluation system.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant's responses in this section provides some details on how this district plans to create and implement a new teacher evaluation system and the new common core standards and assessment systems. Absent was any connection as to how this would help educators implement personalized learning and teaching for all students, and information for many of the selection sub-criteria was missing. The response scores in the lower middle range.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	0
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In reference to (D)(1)(a-e), the applicant basically offered no information to address any of the selection criteria for this section. Instead it simply notes that it is the responsibility of the state and city to ensure that every child has access to a quality education, and that through existing policies they are able to conduct business related to the wellbeing of students and promoting a high education standards for all.</p> <p>The applicant did not offer any evidence for organizing their LEA central office to provide support and service to all participating schools (item a).</p> <p>The applicant did not offer any evidence for providing school leadership teams with sufficient flexibility and autonomy (item b).</p> <p>The applicant did not offer any evidence for giving student the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery (item c).</p> <p>The applicant did not offer any evidence for giving student the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple time and in multiple comparable way (item d).</p> <p>The applicant did not offer any evidence for providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students (item e).</p> <p>The response received no points.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	0
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In reference to (D)(2), the applicant basically offered no information to address any of the selection criteria for this section, which needed to depict how the LEA and school infrastructure will support personalized learning. Instead they simply included a process diagram for a district planning and implementation process and no additional narrative.</p> <p>The applicant provided no evidence to address how they will ensure that all stakeholders will have access to necessary content, tools and other learning resources (item a).</p> <p>The applicant provided no evidence to address how they will ensure that all stakeholders will have appropriate levels of technical support (item b).</p> <p>The applicant provided no evidence to address how they will ensure that they will be using technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format (item c).</p> <p>The applicant provided no evidence to address how they will ensure that all LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems (item d).</p> <p>The response received no points.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In reference to (E)(1), the applicant does not offer information to clearly address the selection criteria of describing a continuous improvement process providing for timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections. Instead, they describe a process of using locally developed assessment tools to internally assess its performance on 10 dimensions of school effectiveness, including the attitudes and impressions of school faculty, parents and students, with such results used in the development of individual school improvement plans and to inform the performance</p>		

appraisals of principals. Yet this process is not connected back to the specific project goals.

Overall the response scores in the low range.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (E)(2), the applicant provides some details as to how the district leaders will communicate information regarding the implementation of instructional decisions and programmatic changes with key stakeholders. However, no details as to how such groups will actually be engaged were offered.

The response scored in the middle range.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (E)(2)(a-c), the applicant does offer a list of ambitious performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed measures. The exception is that no data or annual targets for subgroups was offered for the effective and highly effective teacher measure. They propose to use the same outcome measures as noted in (A)(4), and to also add STAR literacy, reading, and math for grades K-3, homelessness, service learning, # of full service community schools, # using after school programming, and reduced suspensions.

The applicant does not provide information regarding the rationale for selecting their various performance measures (item a), nor how it would review and improve the measure over time if it was insufficient to gage implementation process (item c). The response scores in the middle range.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (E)(4), the applicant includes the elements of a high quality plan (e.g., activities, responsible parties, information collected, timeline, and evaluation measurement) to summarize their overall evaluation plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the RTT-D grant. While this information does meet part of the selection criteria, the information offered is confusing in that it lists some grant activities which had not appeared anywhere else in the grant. Nor does the applicant address the selection criteria of how the applicant will more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results.

The response scores in the middle range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (F)(1), the applicant offers a narrative description (including action steps and person(s) responsible) and a budget table for seven projects. The amounts for each project appear reasonable and sufficient (item b), but they do not identify all funds that would be used to support each project (item a), nor whether any given funds were one-time investments vs on-going operational costs (item c-ii). Indeed, none of the seven projects included any funds from other sources used to support the project (item c-i), nor did the budget sheets include the requested primary and additional associated criteria and location in application.

Overall the response is scored in the low range.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (F)(2), the applicant offered no information regarding their sustainability of project goals. The response received no points.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant contained no specific information as to how the district proposes to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students.

The applicant received no points for this section.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

In reference to the Absolute Priority 1, this applicant has not provided adequate evidence of how they would coherently and comprehensively address the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

As demonstrated by having received scores in the low range for 15 of 20 selection criteria categories (in the the lower middle range for the remaining five categories), this applicant has not provided evidence of a coherent and comprehensive plan. This is not to say that their district's strategic plan and many of their proposed reforms may not be of value, but that these pieces have not been comprehensively pulled together to meet the overall absolute priority for this grant competition.

Total	210	46
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1289NJ-3 for Patterson School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the low medium range as the narrative provides a clearly articulated initiative with strong connections to the priority areas and goals of the RTTT3 state initiative. The vision sets out to immediately establish the transformation of all traditional high schools into smaller thematic/career technical education programs and schools of choice. The PPS *Bright Futures* Strategic Plan has demonstrated a proven record of action and results as achievement data on standardized tests are showing improvement.

The vision however, is not explicit in how the proposed plan(s) will lead to the creation of personalized student learning environments grounded in common and individual tasks. The narrative provides an example of how the district's high schools have been reorganized into smaller learning communities, but does not indicate how this reorganization directly supports, or will be scaled as a model for personalized learning environments.

Another area of weakness in the applicants' vision is the lack of clear indicators for comprehensive attention toward developing academic achievement among the English Learner subgroup, which represents over 50% of the district's student population.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the medium range as the narrative describes how the RTTT-D proposal complements the work initiated two years earlier under the Paterson Effective Schools Initiative, "Bright Futures Strategic Action Plan". While the RTTT-D proposal looks to continue the Bright Futures transformation agenda, there is no clear connection made to how previous reform efforts will be expanded upon to impact the entire district. The four strategies listed as contributing to previous reform efforts which have led to greater student achievement, are not outlined in any great detail in the body of the proposal, yet they are presented here as significant contributors to the district's implementation model.

No specific process was used to select schools, as all district schools qualify and have been included as participants in the RTTT-D proposal.

(A)(2)(b)

The listing of district schools is confusing. This reader was only able to identify 47 district schools in Table (A)(2) of the 54 district schools as indicated in section (A)(1). One school is identified in Table (A)(2) but the narrative indicates that it is not yet in existence (School 28/Gifted & Talented Academy), and School 4 (a K-8 school created during reconfiguration) is not found in Table (A)(2).

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low range as the narrative for this section provides a theory of action based on improving teacher effectiveness through the implementation of ten dimensions of school effectiveness. The "plan" is based on the premise that instructional change and improvement stem from a thorough review of educator effectiveness.

However, the narrative does not set forth a high-quality plan by which to execute said theory of action. While the narrative states these ten dimensions are set forth as support structures for realizing high-quality instruction, there is no plan to realize these structures.

This reader was only able to ascertain in the delineation of performance measures in section (E)(3) an indication of scaling up of the reform measures, or how these measures would translate to support district-wide change, but there is no high-quality plan with timeframes, deliverables, or parties responsible.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low medium range. Tables 4a-c provide total points possible on NJ ASK 3-8 by Content Area Cluster and Grades for Language Arts Literacy (LAL), Mathematics, and Science. It was not clear as to the reason for including this information, as the narrative makes mention only of scaled score reporting, and provides no correlation of scaled

scores to the points possible information (performance bands/levels). Additionally, the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA), the New Jersey Biology Competency Test (NJBCT), and ACCESS for ELLS are all listed as summative measures being used by the District, with the HSPA and NJBCT being reported as giving scaled scores, but district data are not made available for these measures. The Alternative Proficiency Assessment is also listed as a summative measure, with explanation as to how it is scored. Again, District data for this measure was not included as evidence.

(A)(4)(a)

Evidence included tables for applicable populations, showing methodology as STATE NJ ASK. All delineated subgroup targets show a consistent 25 percentage point (+25% pt) gain by post grant year 2016-17, which given the lack of focused or articulated action plans, do not seem reasonable nor do they seem achievable.

(A)(4)(b)

While all delineated subgroup targets show a consistent 25 percentage point (+25% pt) gain by post grant year 2016-17, this growth pattern does not actually translate into narrowing achievement gaps, and is therefore not reasonable. Gap amounts remain constant from Baseline SY 2011-12 to Post-Grant SY 2016-17 for all identified subgroups and comparison groups for each goal area listed.

(A)(4)(c)

Demographic make-up of the District given in section (A)(1) as follows: 62% Hispanic, 28% Black, and 10% White & Other. Table provided for (A)(4)(c) shows low improvement to graduation rates for the following subgroups: Male (4% pts, or 7.2% change); Black (6% pts, or 9% change); White (5% pts, or 7.7% change); and Special Ed (4% pts, 5.6% change). Subgroup for *Not ELL* appears inaccurate, as values given reflect a 70% point increase, which translates to a 1,114% change in scores from baseline to post-grant. Each low target does not seem reasonable nor appropriate given the scope of this notice.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low medium range as the evidence provided shows progress toward the PPS *Bright Futures* Strategic Plan and an attempt at alignment with the four core educational assurance areas under the RTTT-D initiative.

(B)(1)(a)

Accomplishments toward the PPS Strategic Plan are listed and matched to an applicable RTTT-D Core Area. This reader was unclear as to why the accomplishments listed under Effective Academic Programs (Restructured and re-staffed the lowest performing elementary and high schools; Converted all high schools into "thematic schools of choice.") were tied exclusively to Core Area #1 (Adopting Standards and Assessments) when they seem better matched with Core Area #4 (Turning Around Nation's Lowest-Achieving Schools). Moreover, several of the accomplishments listed were not immediately clear or understandable, as definitions and/or explanations about the program-process are not readily apparent.

The accomplishments listed under Family and Community Engagement, which are shown to be aligned to Core Area #4, include reference to the creation of three full service community schools (Schools 4,5, and New Roberto Clemente). This reader was unable to locate School #4 in the chart of participating schools provided in (A)(2), nor a clear definition of what is meant by "full service community school."

The proposal narrative does not provide any activities or programs given in the table of PPS Strategic Plan Accomplishments specifically associated with raising graduation rates or closing achievement gaps.

(B)(1)(b)

The narrative provides evidence of PPS's closing and restarting four underperforming schools and reconfiguring others and includes this example as a means of pursuing ambitious reforms in persistently low-performing schools. The new middle schools will focus on SLCs, character education, positive behavior supports, and problem-based learning. The narrative is unclear however, as to which schools are scheduled for closure. It was also not readily clear which of the four closed-restarted schools will become a middle school or if the target is only the one mentioned, School 15.

(B)(1)(c)

Narrative contains adequate details as to its ability to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents. The district has also established parent organizations such as PTO/HSC/PTA in 48 of the 54 its schools, instituting a Parent Organization Leadership training program to support parent participation.

District assessment data is housed in Performance Matters database, which includes a parent portal. District personnel can facilitate conversations with students and parents by accessing multiple data measures to determine areas of strength and growth. While the district has trained all staff in the utilization of data to improve instruction, the narrative lacks mention of accountability mechanisms to ensure the use of data to inform instructional decisions and practice.

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

5

2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low medium range as the narrative provides delineation of the actual personnel salaries for all school level instructional and support staff as well as non-personnel expenditures, but does not provide clear description as to the extent PPS makes public any of the information related to the four categories of school-level expenditures required.

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

10

9

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range as the narrative provides strong evidence there is also sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements, and, PPS has demonstrated the successful conditions to implement the personalized learning environments described in its proposal. The narrative reflects strong connections between state-level initiatives supporting the work done at the local level:

- PPS selected to participate in a principal evaluation pilot launched by NJDOE. This is a mirror to the NJDOE teacher evaluation pilot in 2012-13, with full state implementation in 2012-13.
- The NJDOE has organized seven Regional Achievement Centers (RACs) that drive academic achievement and high-quality delivery of NJDOE initiatives to leverage State and local funding to reach performance targets. These initiatives include full implementation of CCSS, development and adoption of a model curriculum that all districts can use to guide their own implementations of the standards to prepare students for college and career, and develop an online curriculum and assessment platform.
- Use of RTTTe funds will enable the State to cover costs of building the infrastructure needed to accomplish the new initiatives.

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

10

4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low medium range as the narrative states that a comprehensive needs assessment was conducted as well as extensive stakeholder engagement for earlier grant opportunities. Feedback was sought and used to revise the mission and vision of the District's Strategic Plan. A Transformation Committee was convened, where the feedback was used to generate the Bright Futures Transformation Plan. Community forums were held to present the Plan to parents, students, teachers and school & district administrators. Students were also involved via the community schools initiative in completing evaluations three times annually. No evidence is provided to verify these statements. Included in the appendix are only three letters of support from key stakeholders (one civil rights organization, one collaborative partner, and one letter from three elected state officials). Given the "extensive" stakeholder engagement mentioned, more evidence is warranted to validate such claims.

Missing in the narrative and in the body of evidence presented, are any indications of approval by collective bargaining representation, or evidence of direct engagement with, or support for, the proposals from teachers in participating schools.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the medium range as the narrative provides a detailed analysis of needs and gaps delineated by the Strategic Plan Needs and Gaps and aligned to the four Core Assurance Areas. The analysis contains activities, deliverables, timeline, and person(s) responsible for the activities.</p> <p>This reader was unclear as to why certain deliverables are located under Core Area #2, Building Data Systems, when the deliverable 2.2 appears more aligned to Core Area #3, Recruiting, Developing & Retaining Teachers & Principals. Deliverable 2.2, Implementation of educator and administrator evaluation system, makes no mention of data or using data systems to capture information.</p> <p>This reader is unclear as to the explicit connections of the activities and deliverables to the stated Strategic Plan Needs & Gaps for #4 (Family and community engagement). The activities and deliverables are in line with Core Area #4, but do not seem aligned to Family and community engagement.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	5

<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the low range as there is no clear indication that a high quality plan has been crafted to frame the projects, programs, and initiatives mentioned in this section. The narrative begins by stating the District will "prioritize standards and benchmarks in a context of endurance, leverage, and readiness for the next level of instruction time, local, and state assessment periods. While the initiatives and programs listed provide group or grade-level focus, there are no indications that attempts will be made to leverage this work across the mentioned initiatives or plans.</p> <p>The narrative proceeds to delineate how a student not at grade level will be assessed more frequently with progress monitoring tools. This reader is unable to determine how more frequent testing will lead to improved achievement, or how the listed diagnostic/formative assessments will be used o support personalized learning environments.</p> <p>An Intervention Committee (IC) will be convened for each content area to analyze common benchmark data and to foster articulation and collaboration among teaching staff. No explicit indications that the IC will develop protocols supporting personalized learning environments, or that the student will be actively engaged in designing his/her learning goals and measuring progress toward achieving those goals.</p> <p>(C)(1)(a)</p> <p>The narrative does not address how students will better understand that what they learn is key to their success. There is no indication that students will understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals and measure progress toward those goals. No indication that students will master critical academic content and develop skills such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving.</p> <p>(C)(1)(b)</p> <p>The narrative provides evidence of several programs to provide high-quality learning strategies in these areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-K: GOLD teaching strategies • LAL: Interim Assessment, Teacher-made Assesments and Demonstrations of Learning (DLs); DIBELS; Read Above Monitoring Progress Reports • Mathematics: Success Maker Enterprise; Renaissance Learning - STAR Math Enterprise; Algebra Readiness Assessment; High School Action Plan (HSPA) • Secondary Science: PSI-designed lesson plans • Educator Professional Development to address teachers' areas of need 		
--	--	--

(C)(1)(c)

The Intervention Committee IC will develop Academic Improvement Plans for low performing students. A table focused on the Student Learning Component is provided, giving short range implementation planning and long range planning activities, yet the information is almost exclusively focused on the teacher and teaching. The reader is unable to ascertain how these programs and their implementation will help develop the depth and scope of personalized learning and/or personalization of the learning environment for students as defined by this notice.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	6
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the medium range as the narrative provides a general plan for improving learning and teaching, but does not explicitly outline how the plan will personalize the learning environment, nor is it presented in a manner supporting a high-quality plan delineating specific goals/activities, deliverables, timelines, and responsible parties.

(C)(2)(a)

Evidence shows the District will seek to support educator capacity with the implementation of an evaluation system that weighs 50% on performance and professional practice indicators, and 50% for student assessment data. An extensive RFP is outlined for development of a Web-based performance management system. Generalized statements given that all teachers will be trained in practice components including: Using Data to Inform Instruction, Quality Instruction, Interventions to Meet Diverse Needs, Classroom Environment, and Leadership. No explicit connections made to supporting implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies, nor to adapting to provide opportunities for students to engage in common and/or individual tasks.

(C)(2)(b)

The narrative states the District will seek to develop educator tools and resources. District will continue with pre- and post-conferences with formal classroom observation. They will also use the "train the trainer" model with the instructional coaches to build capacity for delivering job-embedded professional development. The District will also provide opportunities for PLCs. The proposal, however, does not support these statements within the structure of a high-quality plan by which to realize these activities and initiatives.

(C)(2)(c)

The narrative provides evidence the District has created an Evaluation Support Plan linked to observations and evaluation results. The plan outlines expectations, needs, tools for support, and how to measure outcomes. Mention made of the creation of a web-based repository for all things related to assessment.

(C)(2)(d)

The proposed plan to increase the number of effective and highly effective educators appears somewhat in conflict with earlier statement in (C)(2)(a). There it was stated that the evaluation system would be weighted 50% on performance and professional practice indicators, and 50% for student assessment data. Here the plan is to create an evaluation protocol on a sliding scale with shifts in the two categories changing over the first years' of implementation. The narrative also provides for the work of the DEPAC, or Evaluation Pilot Advisory, that has appointed an evaluation liaison to the NJDOE EPAC team. All initial data being used to connect professional learning to the evaluation framework and instructional expectations.

A table focused on the Teaching & Leading Component is provided, showing short range implementation planning and long range planning activities. Progression Plan targets are set forth as work to be accomplished to help staff and parents identify academic readiness and needed support in alignment to CCSS and the district curriculum maps.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	0

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low range as the narrative does not delineate how the policies, practices, and rules facilitate personalized learning by giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credits based on mastery or to demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in multiple ways.

This reader was unable to determine how "systematic" the stated areas of policies and procedures are in aligning district functions to the "foci" of RTTT-D. This reader is also unable to determine the precise meaning behind the statement, "patterns in education policies must be constructed to reflect 21st century learning expectations and outcomes".

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

10

2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the low range as the only evidence provided for this section is a diagram representing a schematic of the District's Planning and Implementation Process.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low middle range as the narrative does not clearly connect its PPS Effective Schools Initiative (grounded in the Ten Dimensions of School Effectiveness research) with indicators and practices that operationalize a continuous improvement process. There is no clear indication that a process is in place by which to gather timely and/or regular feedback. The narrative in section (A)(3) outlines the plan's Theory of Action and lists six of the ten dimensions critical to school and/or student improvement. This reader was unable to identify specific targets and indicators alluded to that must be implemented and monitored. Furthermore, the narrative does not provide indication as to how the district will monitor, measure, or publically share information on the quality of its investments (e.g., professional development, technology, and staffing).

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

5

2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low medium range as the narrative provides only general statements regarding the sharing of information and decisions, and then moves to explain how an expanded accountability system will ensure transparency. The logic here is that this transparency and subsequent "unified involvement" will in turn increase the likelihood of impacting student achievement. This reader is not clear as to how this will be explicitly made operational for teachers or for students and their parents. The narrative does not clearly reference how stakeholders will actually be engaged within the information-sharing process, other than to simply receive directives or pass along data and information received from central office administration.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the medium range with the proposal showing 17 performance measures identified within the PPS initiative. The narrative and data tables present attainable goals for student achievement. However, the targets established over the life of the grant show trends that do not close achievement gaps for identified subgroups.

Grades PreK-3-a: While the data shows growth from baseline to post-grant, the level is a constant amount of increase of 25% points to all subgroup categories. The blanket improvement amount does not address achievement gaps between subgroups and the overall population.

Grades PreK-3-b: Unable to determine which, if any, of the given measures fulfil the required (b) Non-cognitive indicator of growth.

Grades 4-8-a: While the data is projected to show achievement improvements in all subgroups, the achievement gaps will not close using the data projections provided here, and in some instances the gap is widening. Especially concerning are the expected targets for Special Education, English Language Learners, and Hispanic students.

Grades 9-12-b: Same as above. While the data is projected to show achievement improvements in all subgroups, the achievement gaps will not close using the data projections provided here, and in some instances the gap is widening. Especially concerning are the expected targets for Special Education, English Language Learners, and Hispanic students, although the gap is slightly less for Hispanic students for Grade 11 HSPA LAL.

Grades 9-12-d,e: Unable to ascertain whether the measure entitled, Homeless, will be based on the quantifier of being able to exit being homeless, or a health & social-emotional indicator. Unable to determine how the performance measure entitled Service Learning meets the criteria for (d) or (e).

Performance Measure (All Applicants - c): No description of the methodology for calculating the measure(s). This reader not clear if the assumption should be made that the methodology for all remaining performance measures under this heading is the same as that for Grade 3 LA (STATE NS ASK).

Grades 9-12-c: Unable to determine what was specifically measured, or what was used as the methodology for selection.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low high range as the narrative supports a detailed listing of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Data will be gathered and stored electronically. The PPS will include quarterly reports, use of the USDOE APR for both progress monitoring and for summative end of project reporting. Unclear as to the meaning of the following statement: "*Evaluating these data sets will bolster our understanding of how our RTT-D students **compare to others from Paterson Schools**.* Earlier charts in (A)(2) indicate 100% participation among all schools listed (47 of 54). Unable to account for the discrepancy.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the medium range as budget narratives

- Budget narratives not found for Project #2 (PreK-3 Approach) and Project #7 (Accountability, Feedback, and Sustainability).
- None of the budget tables provided reflect Funds from other sources used to support the project.
- Budget narratives do not clearly indicate if funds to be used for one-time investments versus those for ongoing operational costs.
- Budget for Project #1 (Data Management System) only includes contractual costs. Unclear if there are any personnel or other local costs.
- Budget for Project #3 (Improving Teacher & Principal Effectiveness based on Performance) includes only personnel costs.
- Budget for Project #4 (Continuum of Sustained Professional Growth) accounts for the training of 1,400 teachers. According to data provided in section (A)(1), there are 2,526 certificated teachers on staff. This budget accounts for approximately 55.4% of teachers receiving the profession development supported by this project budget. Unable to account for the remaining staff with regard to PD.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high medium range as the narrative shows alignment with RTTT-D Core Educational Assurance Areas,

indicating portions from the PPS initiative that promote each core area and support sustainability after the term of the grant.

- Create Learning Environments: Support expansion of the PreK program through PreK certification priority
- Personalization of Strategies: District curricula that supports authentic tasks, real-world scenarios, and problem-solving and interdisciplinary teaching. eLearning to be used for Intervention, via Plato Learning for credit recovery and academic intervention.
 - Unclear if Plato Learning provides real-world scenarios, authentic tasks, or interdisciplinary teaching as found in the regular program. Also unclear why Plato Learning not included in earlier portions of the proposal as influencing/supporting (C)(1) Learning and/or (C)(2) Teaching and Leading.
- College and Career Ready Graduation: Career clusters and pathways. These are off-site career academy programs. CTE program provide industry certification and college credits.
- Accelerate Student Achievement: PPS to offer magnet schools in future. One currently in planning stage (Academy for Gifted & Talented).
- Increase Rate of Grad from High School: Dual Enrollment and Early College Access program

This reader unable to clearly discern support given from local government leaders and financial support.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the low medium range as the narrative provides some evidence of additional supports to the system, based in the ten Project profiles provided, but lacks indicators for partnerships throughout the ten projects.

- Project #1-Comprehensive Instructional Data Management System: partnering with the NJDOE in the Excellent Educators for New Jersey Pilot Program (EE4NJ). Unclear as to specific partners within this pilot program.
- Project #2-Developing and Implementing a Comprehensive Preschool through Third Grade Approach: use of NJ Teaching and Learning Preschool Expectations, and use of Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System. Vague references with no specificity as to partnering with RACs, DOE, and Local University partnerships and consultants. Listed under Resources is The Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning with no additional information regarding a working partnership or other relationship to the initiative.
- Project #3-Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance: Initiative involved with NJDOE with Principal Evaluation pilot program, but NJDOE is not listed as a Resource or partner under this project.
- Project #4-Continuum of Sustained Professional Growth: narrative references work done by RACs at Priority and Focus schools. Unclear as to the number of Priority or Focus schools in the district.
- Project #5-Intensive Intervention Structure to Support Student Achievement: Vague reference made to partnering with colleges and universities with no specific IHEs listed.
- Project #6-School Choice: Unable to locate specific details of partnerships to be formed or continued.
- Project #7-Accountability, Feedback, and Sustainability: Resource lists show vague reference to community organizations, with no specificity as to which organizations other than a reference to the Funders Council.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The Paterson Public Schools RTTT-D application does not meet Absolute Priority 1. PPS has not developed a comprehensive and cohesive plan that builds on the core assurance areas as they align to the state's existing RTTT3 grant.

The proposal, while ambitious in theory, fails to clearly establish a personalized learning environment as defined by this RTTT-D, nor does it provide a coherent plan by which to assess how the strategies, tools, and supports presented will significantly improve learning. While the analysis of needs and gaps listed in section (B)(5) initiates a framework for a high-quality plan, the activities and deliverables are not fully incorporated into the other sections of the proposal and therefore contribute to the lack of cohesiveness and comprehensiveness in the overall proposal. For example, under Core Assurance Area #1, the deliverable listed under 1.1 (student progression system for promotion and graduation) is not expanded upon in the sections of the proposal that warrant discussion of such strategies (i.e., sections B and C). While the district should be commended for stitching together a proposal to meet the RTTT-D requirements, the pieces have not come together as a high-quality plan.

Total	210	79
-------	-----	----