



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0607TX-1 for San Benito Conolidated Independent School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative lacked information about how this grant will fit with work already done in three of the four core assurance areas. Missing was information related to building the data system; recruiting, developing and rewarding teachers and turning around the lowest performing schools.</p> <p>The vision describes creating a holistic approach to instruction by identifying student interests to create an Individual Graduation Plan. Teachers then deliver Personalize Learning Support via the "Holistic Education Cloud." The interest based approach is sound and the material delivered is state-standard-aligned curriculum.</p> <p>Poverty was another theme in the narrative. Missing was information about the consortium, the schools and how this is a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement--missing to mention how the plan builds on its work in the four core assurance areas.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The grant is large in scope with student participants of over 30,000. Evidence describes the faculty support and poverty qualification requirements.</p> <p>The process to select schools was described as those who wanted to implement the initiative.</p> <p>Charts listed the schools, student numbers, grade levels and subject areas that will be part of the initiative. The rationale for selecting the subject areas that are to be part of the grant was not clear. Implementation options for the LEA's was not discussed.</p> <p>Data was available showing the poverty rates and the number of educators that will be part of the project.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan is expansive in its vision for change. It talks about a PK-21 plan which is not described. It is unclear if the plan is to age 21 or some other unidentified subject.</p> <p>The narrative talked about basing the project on the Harlem Children's Zone strategies. The appendix did not list a specific strategy with that title. Based on the statistics about the consortium, a link to a Harlem-based project is appropriate. There was limited information available.</p> <p>The focus of the change is support to the community as opposed to the school districts.</p> <p>There is a disconnect between district-wide change and the goals specified in the grant.</p> <p>It is unclear how the American Dream Center functions in relationship to the LEA's and it's impact on standards and assessment, teacher recruitment and how it turns around the lowest achieving schools.</p> <p>The scope of the grant and what it claims to provide is commendable. The ADC zone of providing educational, social and</p>		

medical services to needy and impoverished communities is ambitious.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This part of the vision statement describes Texas achievement tests and lists goals over the course of the grant. There is no discussion in this section as to how implementation of the vision will improve test scores.

The charts were confusing for readers who are not familiar with Texas assessment data.

The graduation rates were listed and goals were set over the term of the grant. The formula for calculating the graduation rate was not specified. The data indicated that most of the graduation rates were 90% or more, yet the narrative talks about one half of Hispanic children dropping out of school by 8th grade. The data and the narrative are inconsistent.

College enrollment data is available. Data shows that nearly 60 percent of the graduates go to some sort of post secondary facility. The narrative describing poor communities and the data on college enrollment seem to be in conflict.

Data is available for post secondary degree attainment from the state of Texas. Baseline data is below 20% for the school districts.

All of these goals are important. A link between a personalized learning system and these goals was not addressed. It would be hard to determine the value of a personalized system because of the scope of the proposal.

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:

This section of the grant provided a brief summary of some of the clear track records of success at the LEA level. A detailed report list by school provided evidence of the LEA's success in gaining grants such as Safe Schools, Counseling TRIO, ACE, Community schools, Improving Schools and Reading First.

The narrative gives evidence of 82% the LEA schools moving from needing corrective action or restructuring to being removed from the state list. Only three of twenty-one schools now qualify for additional support because of improvement in AYP.

Targeted consortium schools used the transformation model to improve. This includes replacing the principal and creating a teacher evaluation system that links achievement with teacher performance. This, tied with increasing learning time, reviewing data and professional development allowed them to move out of targeted assistance.

The ADC wants to increase learning time and create community oriented schools to continue the reform effort. The LEA's have committed a facility to meet this challenge.

All the noted records of success are related to school-wide improvement efforts. Specific data on student achievement rates was not specified.

The narrative describes the data that will be available for students, educators and parents. The data will be available in English and Spanish and available on the Community Cloud.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative included some sample reports of data that is available. It was unclear how the public can assess the information. There was no evidence to support that salary information is available online either at the federal level (F-33 survey) or at the district level.

The assumption that data is available can be drawn from the sample reports and the information listed in the appendix but where and how you can access the data was not described.

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

10

7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Most of this narrative reflected a vision statement. MOU's covering the legal aspects of the consortium were included.

This section did include the commitment of the LEA's to implement a teacher evaluation system, principal evaluation system, preparing student for college and/or careers and developing a robust data system.

Although, accreditation and leadership was discussed issues relating to seat-time, offering credits via mastery instead of seat time and the ability to work with the state to get waivers was not addressed. In that manner the point of this section was missed.

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

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal talks about a robust stakeholder engagement process with ongoing meetings, surveys and representation from many community stakeholders.

Discussions on sustainability, planning and developing needs priority lists have been accomplished.

Mayors attended the planning meetings. Three mayors had letters of support in the appendix. The assumption can be made that through their attendance at the planning meetings, they had ample time to comment on the application.

The state department of education was given the opportunity to comment on the grant with plenty of notice but chose to not respond with remarks.

A design team, which includes parents, students, educators, business members, college representatives, government officials, nonprofit agencies, church groups and others continues to work on implementation issues. This is a strong engagement piece and would have been stronger if sample surveys, minutes and the list of attendees had been part of the appendix.

The top ten needs were identified. These are barriers that hinder academic success. It is unclear how a personalized learning system will fit into the the overall plan and address the barriers that were listed.

Since collective bargaining is not an issue, the ADC has gathered 70% or more support of the teaching staff in the affected LEA's

The appendix has letters of support from numerous community members as well as mayors.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presented a need and gap chart for College and Career Schools and effective and personalized learning environments. The use of a personalized learning system was unclear and lacked details on implementation.

The first element is college and Career Bound Schools. The needs and gaps are listed as creation of positive behavior supports, reduction of criminal mischief and providing after school options. Research is identified for each area as are activities partners and outcomes. Detail about some of the activities and partner roles would help make the element stronger. For instance describing the creation of a Cloud and the link to a positive behavioral system would be very helpful.

Element 2 is an effective personalized learning system. Here they want to align early childhood programs, increase identification procedures for at-risk youth, provide professional development for staff on best practices and eliminate and identify technology barriers, engage the community in academic success and accelerate achievement through grade and credit recovery. The alignment of early childhood social and emotional learning is unclear. The cloud is mentioned throughout this section and a better explanation of its function, capability and how it will be used to address the need would eliminate many questions. Acceleration of learning does not describe the issue of mastery versus seat time.

The current status of personalized learning environments is lacking.

The logic model was not detailed enough to fully comprehend how a PLE addresses the needs presented.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The holistic approach to learning is described in the narrative. It clearly focuses on the student and family and provides one on one tutoring 24/7, technology at home, field trips, mentors and a personalized sequence of instruction. The importance of homework is discussed but research is mixed on its use. No data or research was presented to support the importance of homework.

Data is provided on the importance of field trips, with parent/mentors to college to help students prepare for college.

There was not data to support the acceleration of student learning. There was no data to support a change or acceleration in the traditional K-12 school track.

The approach to implementing instruction strategies was minimal and lacked details on how the home technology system would work, the training of the teaching staff, the development of cloud instructional units and specifics on the PLE implementation.

The involvement of parents is a part of the program design. The extension to include lessons for parents is ambitious. Data was not presented that evaluated the effectiveness of similar programs in other educational communities. Details of how this would work were minimal.

The narrative specified many ways the student would receive feedback especially in regards to individual graduation plans. The PHD program is a personalized sequence of content to enable the student to achieve leaning goals. This program helps track student progress. Visiting colleges with family members was described as a way of building college interest. This is part of the PHD program. Some data was provided to support the effectiveness of the program--however it was hard to judge since it only provided one statistic on the percentage of students who earned a degree and did not take the course.

The promotion of a 24/7 community facility to support families that work during normal school hours is identified. Their holistic approach to provide various resources to students and families is reasonable. The cloud curator will ensure that the material is of high quality. These are wonderful resources, however details and specifics were sketchy.

Development of a college ready student is discussed throughout this section. Resources that the ADC will provide students and families are listed.

The specifics of this program are not described.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section of the narrative is comprehensive in scope but lacks details on how the various components will be implemented. Baseline data was lacking on the teachers current use of technology, their experience with online coursework and their knowledge of creating quality online lessons. Professional development was mentioned but their expertise (a Regional ESC and Master Teacher lessons) in the creation of online delivery lessons was missing. There is limited discussion on how the consortium will improve the teaching process. This is limited to resources available in the cloud and tutoring available for an extended period of time. Lessons can be posted in the cloud, but there is no information on quality design of the material or the professional development that would be part of the program.

The acceleration and deepening of student learning was undocumented. These are great concepts but how this will be accomplished was lacking.

The details of how to adapt content and instruction was limited. The processes, change in schedules, common planing time

arrangements, numbers of staff and lesson evaluation was not presented.

Student tracking information was inadequate. The specific tools, measures, timing, and data for measuring student progress was undocumented. Detailed data is an important part of tracking progress for the grant, the students and the teachers.

The evaluation system section was confusing. The relationship of the American Dream Center to the home schools was unclear, especially in regards to evaluation of teachers. Matching teachers with students to measure academic gains was not part of the plan. A principal evaluation system was mentioned but undocumented.

As with the other sections there is mention of teachers having access to tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress but the narrative is vague and insufficient. The use of Master Teacher Resource Tools is described as a major resource for PD plans. There is no documentation describing how that initiative will meet the needs of the grant.

The "cloud" resources is presented as one of the major resources that will make the goals possible. The work to develop, maintain, expand, and feed the cloud is obscure. "The Cloud" is touted as "effectively teaching all children." Evidence is not clear on how the cloud will be an effective instructional tool. Research information was not provided.

Leadership development is sparse in content. The details of the teacher evaluation system process are lacking. Blue Ribbon School categories are discussed for improving the school culture and climate. This needs to be expanded especially in light of the relationships between school climate, reform and academic achievement.

Professional Learning communities are also important in the context of school reform. The relationship between the ADC and the individual schools is unclear. Therefore the responsibility for PLC's is ambiguous. Evaluation data will be used to identify desirable and undesirable innovations. This evaluation is not described nor is what data will be gathered to make the determination.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: A chart documented the organizational structure and shows the relationship between all participants. The policies or rules of the consortium was not presented. It was not clear how the system related to with governments, schools and agencies that are part of the project. The executive summary format of this area does not lend itself to describing in detail how professional learning communities operate in the school and consortium environment. The PLC is described as having autonomy over factors such as school schedules, staffing, calendars and budgets. It is unclear as to how their autonomy relates to the building principal, school policies or state law. Mastery credit is given a cursory mention without describing the mechanism and barriers to earning credit based on mastery instead of seat time. A discussion of the Carnegie Unit and possible flexibility in implementation is not described. Demonstration of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways is based on existing methods - test schedules and quarterly assessments. The grant is covers the importance of 24/7 access for all students to school resources in the cloud via home technology. The proposal is ambitious but is sketch on implementation details.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: The proposal has been clear about offering content and access to all participating students and parents. There is a need for such a project and the conceptual design is feasible. Project support is described using online, staff and peer resources to assist with technical issues. The ADC will hire two employees per district along with a technology coach. The technology coach will develop cloud resources. The other		

employees function was not described.

The cloud will have commercial resources available such as Compass Learning. The assumption is that students will have access to these resources based on teacher recommendations.

The technology system is described as allowing parents to export information in an open data format.

An interoperable data system was described. A schematic drawing was included to show the relationships in the various parts of the technology plan.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium will be using a Continuous Improvement Response System for its improvement process. The consortium uses the CIRS system but the details on staffing, links to schools, monitoring tools and data elements are not specified. Regular feedback is part of the system design as the consortium will meet quarterly to monitor the program and make adjustments. The details of the plan is limited and at times confusing. A comment that the ideas and initiatives are driven by research was made, yet the supportive research in many cases was not specified.

Part of this section discussed how evaluations of the superintendents, principals and teachers would be used to ensure effectiveness. Student performance levels including student growth will be used to rate teachers. Quarterly analysis using a Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats will be used to target professional development needs.

School Implementation Teams will provide data to an external facilitator. This information will be used to guide improvements.

A Continuous Improvement Response System chart was included. The information included two goal areas: one was student growth, college and career readiness, and teacher assessments.; and the other included the personalized learning system, and teacher development, rewards and retainment. Monitor, measurements, measurement frequency, responsible staff, resources and transparency were areas under the goals that are being addressed by the improvement plan. One issue that stood out was the publicly sharing information section including Administrative/Teacher corrective action plans. The chart calls for them to be made public via the cloud, email or text. This is an area that needs more detail and justification. There was no information on whether investments in professional development, technology or staff would be reported.

Overall continuous improvement is considered in this proposal but some specific details and the concern about making action plans public were considered in the score.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A structure for internal communication was described including face to face meetings, newsletters and technology-related communication strategies. Quarterly meetings, monthly ADC reports to the consortium school boards, weekly staff meetings and daily communication between the partners was described.

Anonymous communication is an option open for external stakeholders, although identifiable communication will be encouraged. Email, cloud forums, a cloud suggestion/feedback box and newsletters are part of the communication plan.

The narrative describes a research study that lists factors for engaging Latino parents and a study showing how Hispanic parents value education. Longer working hours and less flexibility with work time are barriers for those parents to attend school events. An assumption has to be made that the engagement strategies will be used by ADC to involve the school community.

The section talks about a massive digital curriculum "overhaul" that will allow teachers to see content vertically. This is the first indication that the work will be extensive in scale. A horizontal system will allow teachers to rank lessons and share.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium will be measuring Highly Effective Teachers and Principals, Effective Teachers and Principals, and Extended Personalized Learning Environment/Parent Monitoring. The rationale on teachers and principals is to show teacher weakness and then address that through refining the PLE and professional development. This will be measured by a new state level system coming on line. The PLE rationale is to accelerate student achievement and deepen learning. Involving parents is also a part of this. Middle school 5th grades will be measured by having them go through a STARR-aligned curriculum and gaining units. Parental monitoring will be monitored in a similar fashion. Baseline information was provided for all of these areas.</p> <p>Grades Pre-K to 3 will be measured for growth by getting a parent monitor, supporting them with cloud services and exposing them to higher education. Other measurements will be screening assessments (that were not listed), and family participation in Early Reading Programs. Goals were set for all areas.</p> <p>Grades 4-8 had an at-Risk measure. They describe that is a critical time when at risk indicators pile up. A number of criteria will be used to determine if a child is at-risk. All of them are appropriate evidence for at-risk children. Another measure in this grade band is community service learning projects and standard state test data in the areas of reading, math, science and social studies. Baseline data with subgroups were noted.</p> <p>Grades 9-12 used FAFSA form completion, dual course enrollment, distinguished achievement program (Advanced courses), college ready graduates (by mastery in Language Arts and Math and a Community Service Project.</p> <p>State transitions in testing and staff evaluations make it crucial that the targets be adjusted over the term of the grant. The consortium is aware of this and commented on the need to adjust.</p> <p>Some of the performance measures such as the Pre K-3, parent role model - the higher-education advocate was unique.</p> <p>The growth target percentages were not justified. The state proficiency levels were not stated. Correlation between state testing levels and baseline data was not described.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative covers all the points required but minimally. Examples of measures, teacher evaluation systems, surveys could have been placed in the appendix to provide additional details.</p> <p>An internal team and external evaluator will be used.</p> <p>It is possible that some of the narrative was missing.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget was skeleton in nature and the traditional itemized budget narratives was in the next section of the grant.</p> <p>A yearly cost per participation of \$541 is vague. It is unclear if that relates to students, schools, school districts and/or community partners.</p> <p>The ADC makes it clear that few families have internet connections and the tablets will be given to the students to provide access to the cloud at home. A connection to the cloud must be made through some sort of system whether it be the internet or a propriety network. These costs were not clear in the budget.</p>		

Rewarding principals and teachers for student performance is part of the budget.

The ADC will use funds from city, county, private, community, state, and federal sources. There is a limited discussion on how this all comes together but the information is very sparse. The city has donated a facility for the project.

The thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities was inadequate. Little information was provided on the detail of how the money will be spent. One time costs versus ongoing costs was inadequate. There was not enough detail to see where the money flows.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

External, short term and long term funds were listed. Some thought has gone into sustainability although the comment that "ADC will work diligently years 1-4 to demonstrate such a great community integrated program that closing its doors will not not a specific action plan.

A chart titled ADC - Years beyond Grant Cycle Funding shows how ADC plans to gather funds and from what organizations. Details on this are limited. Ongoing meetings will be held to discuss this problem.

A plan does exist to charge agencies for costs past the term of the grant. There is still speculation that monies will flow in to keep the project alive. The letters from mayors were not clear about supporting the ADC at the conclusion of the grant period.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This is an ambitious grant proposal that is large in scope and innovative in the approach to the difficult problems the consortium faces. Providing access to technology, creating community centers, hiring social workers and creating college mentorship opportunities are some of the tools the ADC will use.

It describes partnerships and listed the participants involved with the Dream Team. There was evidence that the design group was community based.

The engagement of parents was discussed throughout the grant. This takes place with the technology and face-to-face meetings. Since the cloud will use English and Spanish, language barriers should not be an issue.

The proposal lists target areas that are barriers to learning. The approach is comprehensive but lacks details on actual implementation. These are mentioned throughout the review.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This grant has a huge scope and has the potential to impact many students in the area. Some of the community based concepts and overall personalized learning design of the project was commendable.

Some of the section requirements were not evident which lowered the overall score of the proposal.

The grant mentioned appropriate strategies to improve schools but detail was lacking in many instances.

Total	210	125
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0607TX-2 for San Benito Conolidated Independent School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant proposes the American Dream Center (ADC) as a comprehensive and coherent anti-poverty vision that embraces the Public Education from Home to Doctorate (PHD) concept and will create a PK-21 Community Cloud, a first of its kind in the applicant's region, that will use the one-to-one technology framework to customize school and life curricula. The applicant's holistic, research-based approach incorporates Maslow's hierarchy of needs throughout its vision to improve the educational outcomes for a target population that is 83.9% economically disadvantaged and struggling daily with basic needs. The Community Cloud presents an innovative solution for delivering standards-based curriculum and educator, student, and family support via 24/7 access to appropriate resources.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (A)(2) (a) The applicant states that, based on a high community poverty rate (43.1%) and consistent with the requirement for campuses to ensure equity for all students, every campus in the committed districts who met the criteria and a focused commitment to implementing bold reform strategies were invited to participate in the reform initiative. Three LEAs comprised of 22 schools (13 elementary schools, five middle schools, one 9th grade center, three high schools) met eligibility requirements and were selected for participation. The American Dream Center (ADC) targeted population selected were already participating in smaller scale PHD Vision strategies. (b) The applicant has provided the list of participating schools that will participate in grant activities. (c) The applicant provided the number of participating students (13,860), the number of participating students from low-income families (11,535), and the number of participating students who are high-need students ((8,186). The applicant provided the number of participating educators (897) and provided signed letters of support from participating schools.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:		

(A)(3)

The applicant's logic model is based on Harlem Children's Zone strategies and the PHD Vision and includes a comprehensive, innovative, research-based two-element approach to holistic school improvement: College and Career Bound Schools and Effective Personalized Learning Environments. Each element includes a) Needs and Gaps; b) Research supporting the logic model; c) Goals and Objectives; d) Activities, Curricula, and Services; e) Long-term Outcomes; and f) Interim Measurable Outcomes to impact students, families, and the broader community.

College and Career Bound Schools

The applicant identified three needs/gaps for element one- College and Career Bound Schools:

- Create Positive Behavioral Intervention Systems (PBIS) to eliminate negative behavioral activities and encourage college, career, and graduation success as 50% of the targeted county population has not earned a high school diploma or GED
- Reduce criminal mischief in schools by increasing responsible decision-making as 10% of the targeted county population has an incarcerated adult or parent, creating single parents and increasing rates of child abuse
- Provide options for afterschool and weekend programs such as chess and sports for students and their families in order to boost self esteem and confidence as 63% of students do not have an adult present during after school hours. In addition, limited adult education and parenting programs are available to families.

Effective Personalized Learning Environments

The applicant identified five needs/gaps for element two- Effective Personalized Learning Environments:

- Coherent alignment with district's early childhood social and emotional learning full day programs for struggling families as approximately 85% of students would be considered first generation college student
- Increase identification procedures for at struggling at risk youth as 65% of students did not meet standard on all State exams while only 6% exceeded standards. In addition, approximately 50% of 9th graders do not complete a high school diploma in 4 years
- Educate teachers and leaders on successful academic attainment and best practices for PLA schools as 70% of the campuses did not meet AYP for 2011-2012
- Identify and eliminate technology barriers with one on one solutions that do not require the internet at home as 80% of targeted homes are not connected to the Internet
- Increase in community engagement for academic success as schools currently have limited holistic support. Accelerate student achievement through grade and credit recovery, dual and co-enrollment college courses, and summer bridge programs as less than 50% of students pursue college immediately upon graduation

The applicant's high-quality plan envisions scaling up the model throughout its respective communities and potentially replicating it in similar impoverished U.S.-Mexico border LEAs. The applicant's scale up model includes providing fundamental community strategies to address the digital divide through a unique technological framework for a historically underserved Spanish-speaking population and "re-engage the American Dream that seemed far beyond the grasp for struggling families living on the U.S.-Mexico border." Equally important, the scale up model would provide accessible and comprehensive educational, medical, and social services for the communities served.

The applicant's two-element approach is ambitious and bold, yet the interconnected and comprehensive scope of the components to support the reform agenda holds credible promise that the outcome goals can be achieved.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(4) The applicant's vision is highly likely to result in improved student learning performance and increased equity. The applicant's reform agenda is innovative, bold, and ambitious and includes exceptional considerations for fully engaging the school community-- students, families, educators, and external stakeholders- in short- and long-term goals for student achievement and college- and career-readiness. The applicant's vision for the Community Cloud as a vehicle to increase equity for a historically underserved population is supported by thoughtful and connected planning and preparation, budgeting, and programmatic effectiveness during and post grant implementation. Planned activities, curricular improvements, and actions demonstrate a highly interconnected focus on improving student and community outcomes.

(a) The applicant proposes sustained and systematic incremental increases in student achievement for all subgroups and content areas and provides an intentional and actionable plan to support its goals.

(b) The applicant states that the target population is deficient in nearly all categories as compared to the State, with deficiencies ranging from a nominal 1% to a high of 29% and provides an ambitious but achievable research- and data-

supported plan to systematically decrease the achievement gap.

(c) The applicant states that more than 1 in 4 Hispanic students drop out of high school, with nearly half leaving by 8th grade. The applicant proposes to increase the local standard by more than 14% by SY 2016-2017. The applicant's reform agenda demonstrates a thoughtful and convincing approach to creating a shared vision and culture for success.

(d) The applicant indicates a consortium rate of college enrollment of 52.6% and a 63.8% post grant enrollment goal. The applicant has demonstrated a systematic and embedded approach for making college enrollment accessible and attainable for the target population.

(e) The applicant indicates a consortium postsecondary degree attainment rate of 15% and a 22% attainment rate goal for SY 2016-2017. Baseline data indicate a 1% increase from SY 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. The applicant has demonstrated a systematic and embedded approach for making postsecondary degree attainment a reality for the targeted population. The applicant's reform measure, if implemented with the fidelity indicated in the reform agenda, is highly likely to be a successful national model.

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	12
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(1) The applicant has demonstrated prior grant implementation success, such as Safe Schools, Counseling, TRIO, ACE, Reading First, Community in Schools and Improving Schools. The applicant lists approximately 30 grant initiatives and indicates that the goals and objectives to advance student learning for each grant were met. The applicant has demonstrated success over the past four years in advancing student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps, advancing high school graduation rates, and implementing significant reforms in its persistently lowest achieving schools. How the applicant has made individual student performance data available to students, educators, and parents over the last four years requires additional substantiation.</p> <p>(a) The applicant has demonstrated a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Student Learning Outcomes, Achievement Gaps, and Graduation Rates:</u> In SY 2009-2010, 11 (52%) of the 21 targeted campuses were Title I Priority Schools or Persistent Low Achieving Schools, with approximately 50% of the targeted campuses deemed Priority School Improvement Campuses by the TEA and eligible for SIG 1003(g) funding. Within the past four years, 82% of the schools were removed from the State TIPPS listing; only two of the 21 current campuses targeted receive TIPPS funding and only three were eligible for Tier III SIG funding in SY 2011-2012- and increase of 86% of schools meeting AYP performance measures including student achievement and graduation rates.: • <u>College Enrollment Rates:</u> The applicant has increased the college enrollment and matriculation rates to 46-55% immediately after high school graduation, with an average increase of 15% in the past four years. Each LEA in the consortium was recognized for high degree attainment (11-19%) in their respective counties. <p>(b) The applicant has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools and in low performing schools as described in criterion (a) above. Under the Transformational Model, the applicant has demonstrated success in developing and increasing teacher and leader effectiveness, implementing comprehensive instructional reform strategies, and increasing learning time and creating community-oriented goals.</p> <p>(c) The applicant will make student performance data available via PEIMS and TEA Snapshots in accordance with federal regulations. Individual student data will be made available in bilingual formats. Campuses will provide online access to appropriate reports for external stakeholders and provide bilingual data reports for home use on the Community Cloud. Campus Improvement Planning and District Improvement Planning will inform students, parents, educators and community members of student achievement as appropriate. All Cloud applications for student Personalized Learning Environments are planned to be organized accordingly [applicant refers to "as with illustration on the left" but no illustration is evident].</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

(B)(2) The applicant demonstrates a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments. The applicant's financial information is included in PEIMS and Snapshot reports -TEA AEIS/Snapshots SBCISD LEA Reports. In addition to current transparent practices and policies, the applicant plans disclosure of summative and formative grant evaluation with full expenditure reports to be made to each participating LEA and quarterly presentations made by project staff to local Boards of Education. All public stakeholders will participate in ADC functions and public meetings, and Boards of Education will allow for open comments at all official meetings.

(a) The applicant has provided actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff.

(b) The applicant has provided actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only.

(c) The applicant has provided actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only.

(D) The applicant has provided actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level including student transportation, food service, co-curricular activities, central administration, plant maintenance and operations, security and monitoring devices, data processing services, community services, and equity transfers.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(3) The applicant has demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement its reform agenda.

- The applicant submitted the reform proposal to the Texas Education Agency within the required comment period timeframe. The Agency declined to comment on the reform proposal.
- The applicant has met accreditation requirements for 2011-2012 in accordance with State statutes, policies, and regulations and cites the attendant parameters for meeting the compliance standards.
- The applicant agrees to implement no later than SY 2014-2015 a teacher evaluation system, a principal evaluation system, and a superintendent evaluation system as defined in this notice.
- The applicant has district superintendents with quantifiable educational success and experience and has demonstrated prior success in implementing, via compliance, student achievement advancement, and other measures, comprehensive school improvement initiatives with appropriate fidelity and oversight.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(4) The applicant has demonstrated exceptional key stakeholder support from key stakeholders. The community not only has pledged support, it has identified specific and actionable levels of support. School leadership and the instructional workforce have indicated their unequivocal support for the reform proposal. While it is highly evident that the applicant engaged stakeholders in the reform proposal development, information on how students and families were engaged in the development of the proposal. The applicant states that the reform proposal was revised based on stakeholder input, but supporting evidence is not provided.

(a) The applicant partnered with PHD Vision, a grant consulting entity with over 20 years of successful grant experience. The applicant states that there is meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development, implementation, and sustainability of the reform proposal consisting of community surveys and design team meetings for students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools. This design team met consistently over a three month period to prepare the reform proposal. Each consortium partner presented their work to their respective school boards and city commissioners for approval and coordination, and these meetings were attended by each consortium partner's superintendent and mayor. The applicant plans to continue the design team meetings (20 participants for each consortium partner) at least quarterly. Currently, the design team meets bi-weekly to collaborate on major strategies and activities in the reform proposal. The applicant states that design team consists of parents, students, educators, business members, college representatives, city government, community non-profits and faith-based churches. The document referenced *Table B5-ADC Design Team Representatives*, but the document was not located, and current composition of the design team cannot be verified.

The applicant's design team was divided into ten groups and challenged to identify the greatest top ten community needs. Design team notes are included in *Appendix Table B6-Design Team Notes*. The top ten issues identified were 1) nationally recognized teen pregnancy rates; 2) 50% dropout population; 3) severe health and mental issues such as diabetes, obesity, and child abuse and neglect; 4) low technology usage and less than 65% of homes with Internet connectivity; 5) inadequate readiness for college; 6) early childhood developmental needs and low school and reading readiness due to Spanish language deficits; 7) high rates of drug dependency and "Borderland" associated criminal behavior; 8) low parent engagement and language barriers; 9) workforce development; and 10) low community alignment to family needs and no coordinated community

response team. The reform proposal was revised based on the feedback provided and the proposal was developed alongside input, with team members taking home sections of the draft for refinement, however evidence to that effect was not included.

(a)(i) not applicable

(a)(ii) The participant has demonstrated school leadership support and, at minimum, a 70% teacher support rate as evidenced by campus letters of support and signature pages (teachers and principals).

(b) Mayoral letters of support are included as follows: City of Lyford (Mayor and Commissioners); City of Santa Rosa (Mayor and Aldermen); and City of San Benito (Mayor). Additionally, 40 letters of support from key stakeholders including parents and school PTOs, the business community (diverse groups including home health care, legal, culinary, service and retail industries), faith based organizations, Texas State Technical College, and at least one Community Development Center. A unique feature to the stakeholder letters of support is a commitment to the services or goods that each entity will provide, including but not limited to the use of a 25,000 SF community building, tutoring, job shadowing, career job training, parent workshops, mentoring, and academic, financial, career, or personal counseling. The Mayor of Lyford has pledged coordination with economic development projects and micro enterprise workshops, Community Cloud support and programming, coordination of public transportation, and joint events at community venues. The Mayor of the City of Santa Rosa has pledged academic, financial, career, or personal counseling including advice on entry or re-entry to secondary and postsecondary education, tutorial services, career job trainings, assistance in completing college admissions and financial aid applications, mentoring programs, and workshops for families of participants.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(5)

The applicant's logic model is based on Harlem Children's Zone strategies and the PHD Vision and includes a comprehensive, innovative, research-based two-element approach to holistic school improvement: College and Career Bound Schools and Effective Personalized Learning Environments. Each element includes a) Needs and Gaps; b) Research supporting the logic model; c) Goals and Objectives; d) Activities, Curricula, and Services; e) Long-term Outcomes; and f) Interim Measurable Outcomes to impact students, families, and the broader community. As evidenced in the applicant's response to selection criterion (B)(4) and elsewhere in the reform proposal, the applicant has taken a comprehensive and thoughtful approach to analysis of its current status in implementing PLEs.

College and Career Bound Schools

The applicant identified three needs/gaps for its current status in implementing PLEs for element one- College and Career Bound Schools:

- Create Positive Behavioral Intervention Systems (PBIS) to eliminate negative behavioral activities and encourage college, career, and graduation success as 50% of the targeted county population has not earned a high school diploma or GED
- Reduce criminal mischief in schools by increasing responsible decision-making as 10% of the targeted county population has an incarcerated adult or parent, creating single parents and increasing rates of child abuse
- Provide options for afterschool and weekend programs such as chess and sports for students and their families in order to boost self esteem and confidence as 63% of students do not have an adult present during after school hours. In addition, limited adult education and parenting programs are available to families.

Effective Personalized Learning Environments

The applicant identified five needs/gaps in its current status in implementing PLEs for element two- Effective Personalized Learning Environments:

- Coherent alignment with district's early childhood social and emotional learning full day programs for struggling families as approximately 85% of students would be considered first generation college student
- Increase identification procedures for at struggling at risk youth as 65% of students did not meet standard on all State exams while only 6% exceeded standards. In addition, approximately 50% of 9th graders do not complete a high school diploma in 4 years
- Educate teachers and leaders on successful academic attainment and best practices for PLA schools as 70% of the campuses did not meet AYP for 2011-2012
- Identify and eliminate technology barriers with one on one solutions that do not require the internet at home as 80% of targeted homes are not connected to the Internet
- Increase in community engagement for academic success as schools currently have limited holistic support. Accelerate student achievement through grade and credit recovery, dual and co-enrollment college courses, and summer bridge programs as less than

50% of students pursue college immediately upon graduation

The applicant's two-element approach is ambitious and bold, yet the interconnected and comprehensive scope of the components to support the reform agenda holds credible promise that the outcome goals can be achieved.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(1) The applicant has 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. The applicant's plan is thoughtful, comprehensive, ambitious and attainable. While the applicant's reform agenda takes a credible holistic approach for implementing PLEs, strategies for students receiving special education and ELL services are not specified. Additionally, substantive information regarding Cloud design and implementation is not provided.

(a) (i) The applicant proposes to implement the PHD Counseling Degree Plan (Public Education from the Home to the Doctorate), a personalized and sequential content and skill development program that provides families and educators the specific information and benchmarks required at each grade level to achieve a college diploma. With the support of families and educators, students will have develop Individual Graduation Plans and have access to a personalized sequence of instructional content including e-content on the Community Cloud and ongoing and regular feedback via monthly data tracking that will be shared with students and families. The applicant proposes to ensure a well-populated Community Cloud to include the American educational system advantages to utilizing education as the essential key to overcoming poverty. Through videos of successful poor immigrants and migrant and challenged students overcoming a world of poverty, families will explore together obstacles to success. Implementation of the Positive Behavior Support Intervention System (PBIS) will include Challenge Days for Leadership Development, Positive Peer Pressure (PPP) delivered by college mentors, *ReBrilliance* goal setting journals, and K-12 college exposure beginning in kindergarten.

(a)(ii) The applicant proposes to identify and implement learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements so that 95% of the targeted population will pursue a rigorous high school diploma and understand how to structure their learning and measure progress toward their goals. The reevaluation of current courses, syllabi, and lesson plans will ensure alignment to college-oriented content. College work-studies will lead goal-setting workshops and students will develop Individual Graduation Plans and use *ReBrilliance* goal setting journals. Personal goal-setting skills will be accomplished through the *ReBrilliance* research-based program for teaching topics such as High Expectation; Dreams and Aspirations; Positive Orientation to Challenge and Adversity; Internal Locus of Control; and Personal Affirmation Derived from at Least One Relationship with a Positive Adult Role Model. Career-focused academic experiences will be linked to academics including, but not limited to, K-12 summer camps, career days, and interest inventories and job experiences. Mathematics and science majors will have hands-on mentoring support embedded in academic and after-school experiences, and STEMS camps offered through Texas State Technical College. The applicant proposes to ensure a well-populated Community Cloud to include the American educational system advantages to utilizing education as the essential key to overcoming poverty.(a)

(iii) The applicant indicates that mathematics and science majors will have hands-on mentoring support embedded in academic and after-school experiences, and STEMS camps offered through Texas State Technical College and families will have access to 24/7 Brainfuse tutoring at ADC sites and online chalkboards at home through the use of KUNO tablets. Career exploration will be intricately linked to academics "to create a spark for learning life values and making academics pertinent for anti-poverty strategies." These strategies include, but are not limited to, K-12 summer camps, career days, and interest inventories and job experiences.

(a)(iv) The applicant indicates that ADC targeted communities will have access and exposure to diverse cultures through K-12 college trips, cultural awareness experiences, project-based summer contexts, and motivational guest speakers who will provide divers perspectives and deepen individual student learning. Additionally, ADC will host 12 different, career-themed college tours, virtual thematic units, and cultural exposure not readily available to students such as theater, museum, or symphony. Planned college exposure experiences will include career content, college mentors, college professors, and TRIO programs for all grade levels to help ensure that motivation for learning is high and that teachers include college bound terminology and expectations early in each student's life.

(a)(v) Successful PLE plans will include personal mentoring for one-on-one services by teachers, college work-study students, program assistants, career professionals, parents, alumni, and peers. ADC students will master critical academic

content, as specified throughout the applicant's reform agenda, and develop skills and traits such as goal setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem solving to create the new college bound cultural change of *college as an expectation*.

(b)(i) The applicant's reform agenda includes effective strategies to ensure that targeted students receive unlimited access to resources and services such as Individualized Graduation Plans, a personalized sequence of instructional content including e-content available to families via the Community Cloud, appropriate skill development, a sequential and comprehensive plan that will guide college-bound services, a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments with accommodations as appropriate, and on-going and regular feedback through monthly data tracking. Additionally, individual student data will be frequently updated and will include personalized learning recommendations and file comments from mentors. The PHD personalized sequence of instructional content will and skill development, described earlier in this section, will be utilized.

(b)(ii) The applicant's reform agenda includes plans to create a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments to include a supportive community center with 24/7 access and ADC resources at each LEA that provides families comprehensive services for the "mind, body, and soul." The applicant's vision for instructional approach includes high expectations in rigorous courses that will positively impact student learning. This approach includes high-level college-oriented content, qualified and experienced teachers, responsive and flexible teaching and extra support for students as appropriate. ADC LEAs will reevaluate the content of college-oriented curricula, course syllabi, and course descriptions so that instruction serves as college prep coursework. In addition, the Curriculum Cloud Curator will ensure that all lessons, textbooks, and curricular materials are high-level.

(b)(iii) The applicant will create high-quality content, including digital learning, that is aligned with college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements. The applicant's core element of design is a Community Cloud that contains customized curricula and attendant supports such as Word documents and PowerPoint, videos, websites, online subscriptions, assessments, lesson plans, study guides, and social service materials for teaching antipoverty workshops, seminars and lessons. The Cloud allows teachers to pool their instructional resources and build customized, media-rich, standards-based curriculum. Digital resources will be organized by grade or department, course, and unit of study and will be accessible through a single, uncomplicated platform for ease of use by educators, students, parents, and community. The Community Cloud will become the central repository for all digital LEA and city content.

(b)(iv)

(A) The ADC College and Career Tracking will include ongoing and regular feedback to students and parents. Participants will be assessed in four areas: academics, personal, career, and financial, and staff will review each area and assist students in setting goals. Follow-up contacts will be documented electronically and weekly staff meetings will be held to discuss student progress. Progressive student data will be updated daily in students' IGP and PHD plans and assessed to determine progress toward goals. Monitoring will occur to ensure student's are on college- and career-ready trajectory and, beginning in upper elementary school, interventions for students not on trajectory will be implemented.

(B) Personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements, and available content, instructional approaches, and supports in three key areas: motivation, preparation, and graduation. The following recommendations will be targeted for each family: 1) academic support; 2) college admission and financial aid support; 3) preparation for State college exams; 4) personal and career counseling; 5) career exploration; 6) tutoring services; 7) exposure to college campuses and cultural events; 8) mentoring; 9) activities for at-risk students; and 10) college-bound activities for K-12 students.

(b)(v) The applicant's reform agenda includes accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards graduation requirements. These strategies place a major focus on parents and families outlined in three Competency components. Competency 1: Parents will make college-bound strategies a lifestyle through support in developing an understanding of the importance of student proficiency and training for home strategies to help their children develop competencies; Competency 2: Parents will receive support in understanding the importance of collaboration between home and school; and Competency 3: Parents will receive support in making homework a part of the daily home routine and understanding of the importance of homework. This competency will be supported by home Cloud strategies and personalized 24/7 tutors.

The applicant does not address specific strategies for students receiving special education or ELL services.

(c) The applicant's reform agenda includes mechanisms that are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning such as year-round monthly weekend activities to include regular and after school services, summer programming, comprehensive guidance and personal development, college tours, Saturday academies, and evening workshops and GED/ESL courses for parents. Additionally, the PHD plan has been designed to mimic college terms and structures to demystify the college process. The Plan of Services will provide sequential, comprehensive units of services to middle and

high school students. A unique strategy for college work studies has been developed using a team of alumni mentors from Texas State Technical College, University of Texas at Brownsville, and University of Texas Pan America.

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

20

18

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(2) The applicant has 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.

(a) (i) The applicant's reform plan includes ongoing support and professional development to effectively implement PLEs and strategies that meet each student's academic needs. Identified leader development and support strategies include topics such as increasing community support and community relations, augmenting board member relations, and leading through change and turbulent times. Identified teacher development and support include developing the Whole Teacher, assistance in incorporating CCSS into the classroom, and comprehensive and flexible professional development delivered by master teachers and Regional ESC 1. Additionally, online courses, publications, turn-key workshops, books, and DVDs will provide opportunities for sustained and collaborative professional development for all educators.

It is not clear how professional development opportunities that specifically address implementing PLEs will be provided.

(a)(ii) The applicants's reform agenda includes building on lessons learned and the progress of states and districts in implementing reforms in the RTT four core educational assurance areas. The applicant will have the policies, systems, infrastructure, capacity and culture to enable teachers, teacher teams, and school leaders to continuously focus on individual student improvement and close achievement gaps. Educators will create PLEs and use strategies that involve such elements as technology, virtual and blended learning, individual and group tasks, partnering with parents, and aligning non-school hours with the educational needs of students. A blended collaborative e-learning program will balance learning and performance through interactive online family activities;a physical classroom kick-off event for acculturation and teambuilding; a series of self-paced, online tutorials to inform about the Cloud and ADC; an asynchronous, online discussion forum to allow participants to share studies or scenarios; a series of live, collaborative coaching sessions that allows parents to talk with teachers and leaders of their child's team; an online, web-based post-test that certifies the competency of student core subject ares; and an online survey that allows participants to provide feedback about the learning program for future improvements.

Educator training in specific strategies to adapt content and instruction, provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks in response to their academic needs, academic interests and optimal learning approaches is not fully addressed.

(a)(iii) The applicant's reform agenda includes frequent progress monitoring of the student's current level of performance (weekly or monthly) and comparing expected rates of learning to actual rates of learning. Results will be used to inform and adjust instruction. Expected benefits of this process include accelerated learning, more informed instructional decisions, documentation of student progress toward goals, efficient communication with families and school/other professionals about student progress, higher expectations for students, and fewer special education referrals.

(a)(iv) The applicant's reform agenda includes educator evaluations that will include formative and summative feedback on individual and collective effectiveness and provide instant recommendations, supports, and interventions as applicable. The components of the evaluation system include BOY, MOY, and EOY reviews that include formative and summative information. The applicant proposes the use of technological tools that will allow leaders to instantly evaluate a teacher for specific strategies and provide immediate feedback and recommendations. Six standards will be included for teacher evaluation: 1) annual process; 2) clear, rigorous expectations; 3) multiple measures; 4) multiple ratings; 5) regular feedback; and 6) significance for retention or promotion.

(b)(i) Educators will have access to and support for the Community Cloud for instant professional learning recommendations, supports, and interventions needed for improvement . The classroom assessment tools provide data regarding teachers teaching at the highest levels, training that has been provided, and the length of time for improvements to occur. The 24/7 Cloud will include access for teacher assistants, leadership modules for principals, attendant print materials, and a variety of topics ranging from classroom management to Bloom's Taxonomy. Because several teachers are responsible for a single student's learning, teachers will collaborate on a regular basis to discuss a variety of student issues from grades to lesson plans.

The applicant cites key attributes that comprise PLE such as a strong emphasis on parental involvement, smaller class size, more one-on-one student and teacher interaction, attention to differences in learning styles, student-driven participation in developing the learning process, technology access, varied learning environments, teacher and parent development programs, and choices in curricular programs, and states that the same information can be presented in different ways within a Cloud for additional resources. The applicant states that the personal learning approach proposed will integrate proven educational research results in an in-depth and comprehensive manner. However, specific information regarding how the Cloud will

present information in different ways as related to smaller class size and student participation in developing the learning process.

(b)(ii) The Cloud will have instructional content, assessments, digital resources, and diverse family resources, and the capacity to allow teachers to create and share new resources. Additionally, the Cloud will share, organize, and offer free resources unique to the region to targeted families. Aligned with state standards, the resources will offer immediate support for challenging student issues such as pregnancy, suicide, drug use, nutrition, and workforce and family development. The applicant's reform vision includes eventual enhancements such as enterprise applications, library management systems, email, educator portals, mobile strategies, audio visual infrastructure, security management, etc.

(b)(iii) The applicant cites the specific resources and approaches:

- RTI
- early intervention
- multi-tiered service delivery models
- problem solving models to make decisions between tiers
- research-based interventions
- progress monitoring to inform instruction
- data to drive instruction
- Cloud and KUNO tablets for an Internet-deficient region for improving instructional practices and student outcomes
- Classroom tools such as weblogs, wikis, RSS aggregators, social bookmarking, online photo galleries, AV casting, Twitter and social networking sites
- Marzano's strategies from Classroom Instruction that Works
- basic literacy instruction (phonics, alphabetic principle, word recognition, alliteration and comprehension through Cloud applications
- e-books
- student portability and access to instructional resources

(c) (i) The applicant's reform agenda indicates that data driven training, policies, data and resources will stem from quality teacher evaluations and training excellence through the design, implementation, and sustainability of the grant. ADC schools will model Blue Ribbon qualities for improving culture and climate, and each school will be asked to rise to standards and the five core propositions that form the basis of for highly effective educators. The evaluation process and results will be data-driven, provide useful feedback on classroom needs, provide educators the opportunity to learn new techniques and receive counsel from principals and peers on how to make instructional changes, and will be linked to professional development.

(c)(ii) The applicant's reform agenda includes plans to conduct ongoing evaluation of the impact of implemented reforms on student achievement and the fidelity of implementation, the use of evaluation data to identify desirable and undesirable innovations, refining implementation plans, guidance, procedures and polices based on evaluations, provide ongoing professional development, and monitor and address changes to ensure programmatic sustainability.

(d) The applicant's reform agenda includes partnerships with TFA and businesses, exploring housing and moving expenses to address out-of-school issues that impact recruitment and retention, improving HR practices to enable early hiring and decrease competition against other LEAs, partnerships with teacher preparation programs and alternative education programs, improving teacher working conditions (high induction, mentoring, PLC, career ladders), incentives and policies to redistribute the teacher workforce (incentive pay, forgivable loans, cohort performance pay, and sign on bonuses for high needs areas), and incentives to attract and retain highly effective teachers in the neediest schools.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

The applicant has a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed as indicated in this section and elsewhere in the proposal, including the Consortium MOU.

(a) The applicant has organized the consortium governance structure to provide support and services to all participating schools, as evidenced in Table D1: ADC Organizational Chart, a traditional model with division of labor and departmentalization that includes typical components of school district organization, headed by the ADC superintendents. Key and essential is the inclusion of social agencies, city government, local businesses, and parent groups and the input from the design team meetings in organizational structure development. Target schools have made a significant commitment to the reform proposal and have made great preliminary strides in developing community partnerships to support the project such as initial communication with various associations, community organizations and after school programs and entering into articulation agreements with IHEs for P-16 STEM, ABE/Dropout Recovery, HEP, UB, EOC, CAMP, and dual enrollment.

(b) The applicant's reform agenda will include the flexible use of data to identify and implement a vertically aligned, standards- and research-based instructional program. The ADC schools will have adequate operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to fully implement the reform agenda. The applicant states that the plan ensures that schools receive ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from external and internal stakeholders, educational providers, and quality face-to-face leadership mentoring for each school leader.

(c) The applicant's reform agenda includes a plan to create mastery credit by giving students the opportunity to progress their education based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on the topic. Students have options for taking credit by exam such as college credit courses for dual enrollment and credit and advanced modules for earning credit to expedite graduation. Additionally, dropout prevention and intervention allows flexibility to select alternative paths to graduation with flexible schedules, student support for passing state examinations, and extra credits to advance graduation. Programs are available through online support and will be expanded with the Cloud.

(d) The applicant's reform agenda includes the opportunity for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple, similar ways as the state mandated examinations are offered on three different examination dates, including during the summer. The applicant also identifies quarterly benchmarking with customized exams.

(e) The applicant's reform agenda includes plan for 24/7 support, learning resources, and instructional practices that are adaptable and accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English language learners. Additional supports and professional development will be provided to educators to support students with disabilities in the LRE and ensure that ELL students acquire the language skills to master content. Technology-based supports through the Cloud and other interventions are components of this plan. Additionally, supports to ensure that low-achieving students take advantage of AP and STEM opportunities (credit recovery, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency- based instruction, performance- based assessments, and basic skill acceleration) will be included. Early warning systems will identify students who may be at risk of failure, and students' progress toward goals will be monitored via their PLP. Accessible resources will also be provided to parents, students and families through parent organizations, faith- based organizations, community- based organizations, health clinics, and others to creates environments that meet students' social, emotional and health needs.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(D)(2) The applicant has a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive infrastructure including a District Connections Database (DCD) that allows student-level data generated by source systems to be uploaded regularly from independent district source application or from the state-sponsored SIS in a FERPA-compliant manner. The DCD will facilitate the use of district operational data for local reporting, analysis, and actions. Data uploads can be conducted at any time and address the need for timely, actionable student-level data to inform student, classroom, campus, and district decisions.

(a) The applicant's reform agenda indicates that 24/7 services will be provided through online and lab support. Through the Cloud, all families will have access to learning resources via the KUNO platform in English and Spanish. This strategy format will connect all families to customized lessons and bridge the Internet connectivity divide. Additional information regarding the delivery of 24/7 services and lab support is required. More substantive and specific information regarding the Cloud is required, inclusive of development, content, implementation, management, and monitoring for effectiveness.

(b) The applicant indicates that a technical support coach will be deployed to each campus with the responsibility of

training teachers, parents, and students on the Cloud support structure through a range of strategies including peer support, online support, and local lab support. The ADC will be open 24/7 to ensure that support is available at all times and onsite or remotely. Campus sites will provide before and after school hours for learning support. Additionally, the ADC will employ two full-time employees per LEA to provide ongoing technical support and resource development- a Technology Coach and a Curriculum Cloud Curator. More substantive and specific information regarding the Cloud is required, inclusive of development, content, implementation, management, and monitoring for effectiveness. It is unclear as to whether the technical support coach is the same as the Technology Coach.

(c) The applicant indicates that information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems for additional learning supports. The Community Cloud will host software securely to store student records, student work, and teacher data. Shared diagnostic and prescriptive student data will enable educators to access the online tutorials, such as Brainfuse, and online academic software programs such as Compass Learning. More substantive and specific information regarding the Cloud is required, inclusive of development, content, implementation, management, and monitoring for effectiveness.

(d) The applicant assures that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems to include HR data, SIS data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data. The District Connections Database (DCD) includes a certified PEIMS data store that will serve as the repository for certified data utilized for state and federal compliance reporting, funding, program evaluation, and education research. The SEA populates the PEIMS data store through automated periodic data extracts (snapshots) from the DCD for specific compliance, accountability, and funding purposes. These data are then loaded/transferred to the Texas P-20 Public Education Information Resource (TPEIR). TPEIR currently has 18 years of P-12 and 17 years of Texas IHE data on teacher certification and preparation programs and will enable P-20 student monitoring of an individual student from enrollment in the public school system to graduation for Texas IHEs and/or the labor market.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(1)

The applicant has indicated a strategy for 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. The strategy addresses how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

The applicant's reform agenda includes a comprehensive and detailed Continuous Improvement Response System (CIRS) for RTT goals and objectives that will ensure intra- and inter-district and agency communication and collaboration. The system will respond to issues through a corrective action plan that encompasses two specific areas of the improvement plan: Academic Goal and Objective Response Management (focusing on student growth, college- and career-ready standards and assessments, and teacher and leader growth) and Academic Support Services Progress Response Management (focused on optimizing PLEs, instruction-improving interoperable data systems, and recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals). Each area of focus includes on-track indicators and resolution approaches for monitoring by the School Implementation Teams, monitoring instruments and measurement, measurement frequency, initial response timeframe, response staff, response resources, and public transparency. The applicant indicates that each campus will closely monitor programmatic impact .

Educators will be evaluated on a regular basis including quarterly SWOT analysis and monthly check-ups to provide clear timely and useful feedback that will be used to identify and guide professional development needs. Multiple measures of performance levels will be used such as student growth ins grades and content outside of the STAAR assessment, bimonthly observations based on rigorous leadership performance standards, teacher and principal evaluation data, teacher portfolios and student and parent surveys. Low-performing educators will be placed on rigorous corrective growth plans in accordance with superintendent, principal and teacher evaluations systems set forth by the initiative. Additionally, educator Improvement through effective communication is identified through a feedback loop for actionable positive and negative program input that will propel educators to a higher level of performance.

It is not clear how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share specifics on the Cloud development, implementation, and continuous improvement, inclusive of how the ADC fully integrates with all other components of the educational system.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(2)

The applicant demonstrates strategies for ongoing communication and engagement for internal and external stakeholders.

The applicant's reform agenda includes a comprehensive and detailed Continuous Improvement Response System (CIRS) for RTT goals and objectives that will ensure intra- and inter-district and agency communication and collaboration. The system will respond to issues through a corrective action plan that encompasses two specific areas of the improvement plan: Academic Goal and Objective Response Management (focusing on student growth, college- and career-ready standards and assessments, and teacher and leader growth) and Academic Support Services Progress Response Management (focused on optimizing PLEs, instruction-improving interoperable data systems, and recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals). Each area of focus includes on-track indicators and resolution approaches for monitoring by the School Implementation Teams, monitoring instruments and measurement, measurement frequency, initial response timeframe, response staff, response resources, and public transparency. This process includes quarterly Dream Team meetings, monthly ADC reports to local school boards, weekly staff meetings and daily communication with RTT partners.

In order to encourage uncensored honesty candor and maximize engagement, external stakeholders will have the option to submit anonymous one-way or personally identifiable communication. Communication formats include email, Cloud forums, Cloud suggestion boxes, Cloud feedback boxes, and newsletters with a feedback envelope with options for anonymity. Internal and external stakeholders have been identified in the applicant's plan.

The applicant indicates a number of research-based family engagement strategies that recognize all family members in a student's life as having the potential for positive influence and support. The applicant identifies communication as an essential factor in promoting and sustaining family engagement and indicates that schools are responsible for setting clear and explicit expectations for family involvement. Strategies such as considering family resources and schedules, providing materials in the native language and having available translators, staff training on cultural diversity, parental involvement workshops, and ESL and GED training and classes for parents.

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(3) The applicant demonstrates ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. The applicant's reform agenda includes its rationale, 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.

Highly Effective Teachers- All Students

The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are a highly effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and a highly effective principal (as defined in this notice)

Effective Teachers-All Students

The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are an effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and an effective principal (as defined in this notice).

Extended personalized Learning Environments and Parent Monitoring

24/7 Access to Personalized Learning Environments

STAAR Aligned Curriculum

Parent Monitoring

Academic Growth and Educational Value Grades PK-3

Educational Value PK-3

Screening, Process, and Diagnostic Assessment Indicators PK

Family Participation in Early Reading Programs PK-3

At-Risk Youth Grades 4-8

The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness Grades 6-8

Met TAKS Standards and Community Service Learning Projects- Grades 4-8

Met TAKS Standard (Passing all tests)- Grade 7

Community Service Learning Project Involvement-Grades 4-8

FASFA Completion-Grade 9-12

The number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the FAFSA

Advanced Placement/Dual Enrollment- Grades 9-12

The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness Grades 9-12

Distinguished Achievement Program Graduates- Grades 9-12

The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness High School Graduates

ELA-Mathematics Master and CSL-Grades 9-12

The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who demonstrate mastery in both ELA and Mathematics

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(4)

The applicant indicates plans to evaluate the effectiveness of activities and resources acquired through RTT funding via an internal Comprehensive Internal Response System (CIRS) team and an external evaluator. The cost effectiveness of all RTT acquisitions will be examined periodically by the evaluation team.

The external evaluator will conduct formative and summative program evaluations at each site, with program goals and objectives evaluated using qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluator may participate in observing or conducting quarterly benchmark reviews, weekly departmental meetings, weekly staff meetings, and the internal educator evaluation process.

The applicant addresses, in this section and throughout the application, plans to evaluate the effectiveness of RTT-District funded activities. However, more substantive information regarding the applicant's plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the Cloud specifically is required, inclusive of development, implementation, impact and monitoring.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(1)

(a) The applicant identifies funds that will support the project as city funds, county funds, private funds, community funds, and state and federal funds. The applicant states that compiled leveraged resources and purchased equipment for grant years one-four will account for less than 50% of programmatic structure for years beyond grant funding and states that sustainability funding will be dependent, in part, on local communities. To that end, the applicant has leveraged partnerships and support from local boards and city government, however, more evidence as to specifics on how these partnerships and support groups will be leveraged is required.

(b) The applicant's budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal and includes the integration of new and existing college, LEA and local resources and sharing of resource providers.

(c) The applicant clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities. The facility for the community ADC will be provided by the city/community partnerships.

(c)(i) External revenue sources and amounts are identified as VICDC Facility, Local Campus, State compensation, Title I, Migrant, and ACE Programs.

(c)(ii) The applicant identifies funds that will be used for one-time investments verses those that will be used for ongoing operational costs during and post grant period. However, owing to the scope of the proposed reform initiative, additional detail regarding funding post grant is required.

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

10

8

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(2) The applicant has a plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the grant that includes support for State and local government leaders and financial support. The plan includes budget assumptions, potential funding sources, and uses of funds. Funding beyond the grant cycle will begin at 60% of the currently proposed budget. In grant years three-four, ADC will split fund staff to 90% funds. All partners will continue to meet quarterly in forums to discuss options and ensure quality. Post grant, the applicant indicates 60% sustainability with 40% in acquired services and resources in-kind support as follows:

District: 25% through labs and educational resources, Title I, transportation, classrooms, outreach programs, GEAR UP, TRIO Center, Math camps, local campus funds, and AVID

Community: 10% through workforce boards, youth day funds, IHE support, STEMS, work studies, CIS/VICDC, PTO/PTA, mentoring, tutoring, CSL projects, grants

Partners/Networks: 15% through childcare licensing, ReBrilliance, Chess federation, Adult Education classes, nutrition program, training, ESL instruction, regional 21st Century CCLC Directors Program, collaborations, site visits

Councils: 5% through fundraising, scholarships, Chess clubs, ASP stores, community events, AAC/CTF support, recruitment, advocacy, leadership, carpooling

Businesses: 5% through donations and contributions, sustainability support, CSL projects, ASP Champions, camp t-shirts, school supplies, backpacks, hair cuts, incentives

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's Competitive Preference Priority: Results, Resource Alignment, and Integrated Services demonstrates plans to increase college matriculation and completion, reduce teen delinquency, increase extended learning opportunities for at-risk families, improve early school readiness, improve performance on state exams, improve teaching and learning strategies, provide accessible resources for disadvantaged families, engage community supports, and provide academic recovery processes.

The applicant proposes to integrate RTT public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family holistic supports to schools that address the social, emotional or

behavioral needs of participating students, To meet this priority, the applicant proposes a comprehensive approach to provide student and family supports that focus on a community-wide anti-poverty strategy to address these needs through higher education attainment.

The applicant does not fully address how families and students will be engaged in the decision-making process about solutions to improve results over time or in addressing student, family and school needs.

(1) The ADC is a coherent and sustainable partnership formed between private and public organizations including public healthy, before- and after-school, social service providers, integrated student service providers, businesses, philanthropies, civic groups and other community-based organizations, early learning programs, and IHEs. The proposed partnerships will generate motivational skills to propel students toward graduation beyond high schools. The applicant proposes a comprehensive and sequential unit of services to high school students in order to progressively prepare students holistically for degree attainment.

(2) The applicant has identified 10 population-level desired goals for students and families that align to the RTT-District proposal.

(3) (a) LEAs will track the identified indicator measures through the state data system and through coordinated federal and state data systems such as PEIMS, AEIS, TPEIR, THECB K-12 Data, Workforce Solutions, and local IHE data systems.

(3)(b) The applicant's plan includes students with disabilities, ELLs, and students impacted by poverty including migrant students, students in unstable family situations, and students impacted by child welfare issues.

(3)(c) The applicants plan includes scale up efforts beyond the participating students, with the most critical scale up design indicating that target students will matriculate to career focused academic development and not to a welfare system for governmental dependency. The applicant's plan includes graduation counselors to coordinate local IHE and LEA efforts, outreach programs such as AVID, GEAR UP, TRIO and ACE, extended learning opportunities, supplemental summer programs, and a Degree Plan that includes career exploration and planning, financial aid and money management, postsecondary planning, personal responsibility and advocacy, science and math camps, parent/family workshops, supplemental credit instruction, campus cultural events, and other services.

(3)(d) The applicant's reform agenda includes plans to improve results over time using the SIG Transformation Model goals and objectives and includes oversight by the grant director, LEA coordinators, and external evaluators. Technical assistance will be provided by PHD Vision.

(4) The applicant's holistic design provides for comprehensive and logical integration of services that address socio-emotional and behavioral needs, acculturation for immigrants, mentoring first generation college students, and family support.

(5) The applicant thoroughly addresses capacity building through specific identifiers for a) providing teacher quality, data-driven instruction, and high academic performance; b) providing a positive school climate and culture and increased learning time; and c) providing support for leadership effectiveness.

(5)(a) The applicant has conducted a campus needs assessment that identified the needs of participating students. Campus Improvement Teams for each LEA attended four workshops in conjunction with the design team. The top 10 needs were identified, and the applicant established committees for each area of need, determined the type and sources of data to be collected and analyzed, and determined areas of priority.

(5)(b) The applicant identified an inventory of the needs of Campus and District Improvement Plans and the school and community assets aligned with the project goals, The Campus Needs Assessment finalized by a 60-member team who reviewed the data, proposed solutions, and made budget recommendations. The number one proposed goal was to provide community stability programs (adult education, employment opportunities, workforce training, improving educational levels, job skills, college readiness) to increase family stability and improve prospects for long-term economic self-sufficiency.

(5)(c) The applicant developed a five-step decision-making process that includes 1) development of program model profiles and partner/provider profiles 2) development of school profiles; 3) determining best-fit model and partner/provider; 4) defining roles and developing action contracts; and 5) forging relationships. This process ensured the right model, understanding of problems and issues, recruiting best partners, defining all roles, and building long-term relationships remained at the forefront.

(5)(d) The applicant presents a thorough plan for family engagement that spans a student's transition from K-12 to college and career. Family literacy, AE and AET, mentorship, community resources (museums, libraries, etc.), business support, early reading, learning program and service availability and benefits, navigating through the school system and how to advocate for improved learning opportunities, and programs for healthy development were included.

The applicant does not fully address how families and students will be engaged in the decision-making process about solutions to improve results over time or in addressing student, family and school needs.

(5)(e) The applicant addresses routine assessment of progress through quarterly board meetings with key stakeholders of city and school leadership teams. PHD Vision plans to host the meetings and document the progress via agendas, training, and reports.

(6) The applicant identifies ambitious yet achievable performance measures and describes desired results as follows:

LEAPS Required Outcome Objectives

Academic Performance - GPA above 2.5: ADC Goal 32%

Academic Performance Test Score Met Proficiency (Reading, English, Math): ADC Goal 89%

Secondary School Persistence: ADC Goal 85%

Secondary School Graduation: ADC Goal 90%

Postsecondary Enrollment: ADC Goal 70%

Degree Attainment within 6 Years: ADC Goal 20%

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes the American Dream Center (ADC) as a comprehensive and coherent anti-poverty vision that embraces the Public Education from Home to Doctorate (PHD) concept and will create a PK-21 Community Cloud, a first of its kind in the applicant's region, that will use the one-to-one technology framework to customize school and life curricula. The applicant's holistic, research-based approach incorporates Maslow's hierarchy of needs throughout its vision to improve the educational outcomes for a target population that is 83.9% economically disadvantaged and struggling daily with basic needs. The Community Cloud presents an innovative solution for delivering standards-based curriculum and educator, student, and family support via 24/7 access to appropriate resources.

Throughout its application, the applicant coherently and comprehensively addresses plans to build on the four core assurance areas and demonstrates high levels of stakeholder support in developing, implementing, and sustaining a credible vision for personalized learning environments.

Total	210	180
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0607TX-3 for San Benito Conolidated Independent 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:

The applicant has presented some preliminary ideas in how it intends to work with the targeted populations. It is less clear how the applicant intends to build on the work of each of the four core assurance areas. The framework of antipoverty, holistic approach, and Holistic Education Clouds are mentioned as strategies but they are not fully connected to the four core assurances.

The approach of the Holistic Education Clouds is vague as it is not clear how this would work in supporting the personalized student support. Similarly, the Individual Graduation Plan is a promising idea but it is not clear how it fits into a larger vision of work supporting the diverse needs of the districts' populations.

The criteria scored a 4 out of 10 because the applicant has provided a vision for reform for its geographical area. However, the applicant has not specified how it intends to build its vision from the work in the four core assurances in a detailed manner.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a clear description of how the schools were selected to participate. A list of participating schools have been detailed by the applicant and criteria A2c have also been met.

The applicant provides a clear approach in working with its 22 schools across 3 LEAs. The applicant provides additional information on how it intends to reach families as parts of the proposed efforts include more comprehensive services that reach families of students in a holistic approach.

The applicant was awarded the full 10 points for this selection criteria because it addressed each of the 3 sub-criteria found in A2 in a clear and comprehensive way.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not included a high-quality plan as detailed in criteria A3. The applicant has not included special goals, activities, timelines, parties responsible in how the proposal would be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform. The ideas behind how the applicant intends to pursue meaningful reform has been presented by the applicant but the components of a plan that could take those proposed ideas and translate them into concrete plans of action are not detailed by the applicant.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided ambitious and achievable goals in the tables by providing proficiency status and growth across each of the subgroups, for each grades, for each subject area, and for each school district as requested in criteria A4a.

The applicant has also presented its anticipated annual goals in decreasing the achievement gaps and graduation rates. The goals set here are both ambitious. It is less clear how specific resources would be allocated to support these ambitious goals of decreasing the achievement gaps and increase graduation rates as the strategies and visions have not been detailed explicitly for these two goals. As a result, for sub-criteria c and d, it is difficult to predict if these two goals could be met.

For sub-criteria A4d and A4e, the goals for college enrollment and post secondary degree attainment are not ambitious. The proposed vision of work at the high school level should reflect more ambitious goals set at the college enrollment level for all subgroups.

Overall, the applicant provided sufficient evidence across the board regarding the goals it intends to set for its student populations. There was not as strong of a connection between the vision of the proposed work to the goals outlined. That is, the vision didn't explicitly address how it would support the goals by subgroups, across content areas, and in each of these 4 areas (a-d). As a result, the applicant was awarded 7 out of 10 points falling in the high part of the middle range score.

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	15

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented prior evidence of success in its participating schools. Table A2 is not present in the appendix tables so it was difficult to relate to some of the data points that was presented in the narrative. The high percentage of the ADC schools that moved from the states Title I is impressive as well as the percentage of schools that are meeting AYP. The applicant has also addressed its record of success in the areas of high school graduation rates and college enrollment rate, both rates have grown over time in the past four years.

The applicant has clearly addressed sub-criteria B1b. The description of the turnaround work at the schools is clearly detailed and the outcome data are strong. The reform work at these low-performing schools is promising and comprehensive in nature.

The applicant has met sub-criteria B1c in making not only student performance data available, but also a set of other data points that can help educators make informed decisions about their own work and improve on its services. The applicant also has plans of supporting parent engagement in the data in making the data presentations in bilingual formats that support the needs of the families.

Overall, the applicant has presented comprehensive evidence that it has had a track record of success that is built on not only prior grants received, but also growth in goals across the board in student achievement, graduate and college enrollment rates, and a comprehensive way of making data available to stakeholders. Consequently, for this section, the applicant was awarded the full point value of 15 out of 15 as the applicant thoroughly detailed its track record of success.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided clear evidence in supportive of the components in criteria B2. Descriptions of sub-criteria a-d are provided as these categories of funding are mandated at the state level to be available to the public.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant as detailed how it intends to implement a number of systems as detailed by RTTT-district requirements such as the teacher and principal evaluation system but it is not clear how the state would impact the implementation of these systems. The applicant does not provide contextual details as to how the LEA would operate under conditions, rules, and regulations set out by the state. Consequently, the applicant was awarded a 3 out of 10 in this section because the applicant did not make a strong connection of how the conditions set out by the State level would create a supportive environment for the applicant to implement its personalized learning environment.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided strong evidence in meeting this selection criteria and was given a high score of 9 out of 10 points. The applicant fully described how it has engaged with families, teachers, and principals in developing this proposal and has provided extensive letters of support for this work. The applicant has provided strong evidence of school and teacher support of this work as detailed by the numerous teacher signatures found in the appendix. The applicant has not addressed the role of students in their engagement and feedback on this work. As a result, the applicant was not awarded the full 10 out of 10 points for this selection criteria.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has detailed an extensive plan that includes the logic behind the proposed activities. The needs and gaps are clearly identified and connects logically to the proposed activities along with its goals and outcomes. The applicant does not address a clear timeline of work as part of its plan. As a result, the applicant earned a high score of 4 out of 5 in this selection criteria.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	8
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has proposed a number of promising strategies as part of its vision of supporting students' personalized learning environment. The strategies proposed intend to get at supporting students and families so they are college and career ready.</p> <p>The actual tool of the cloud platform is vague as it is not clear whether the quality of the content would be college and career aligned. The cloud platform has the potential to work effectively with students and parents but the applicant does not provide clarity as to how students would leverage the use of this tool to further understanding their own learning as well as identify their own learning goals as stated in sub-criteria C1a.i and C1a.ii.</p> <p>In the proposed strategies, it is not clear how all learners in the system would benefit from these strategies. Also, in some of the proposed work, it is not clear how the online work would be matched up with other types of services for students.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has presented a lot of promising ideas and strategies but it does not come together to form a coherent and comprehensive plan in personalizing learning for all students. The proposed plan does not different among student grade spans or across content areas. The feedback mechanism provided to the students is not clearly defined as the strategy of personal mentoring is vaguely described as one possible mechanism.</p> <p>The score for this criteria was an 8 out of 20 because essential parts of a high quality plan was not present. The strategies and activities presented were strong but the plan laced clear timelines and persons responsible for the work.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8
---	----	---

<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In regards to criteria C2a:</p> <p>The applicant does not specify the types of training or professional teams that all participating educators will engage in that support students' personalized learning environments. In regards to sub-criteria C2ai, the sample list of activities provided such as online course, workshops, books, and DVDs are generic strategies and it is unclear how these types of activities would be connected to building educators' individual and collective capacity and expertise to support personalized learning. The applicant does not clarify the specific types of information, tools, and supports that it intends to propose for teachers. The applicant presents some promising ideas such as virtual and blended learning and groups tasks, but does not further clarify the types of training educators will undergo over the course of the project timeline.</p> <p>The applicant provides a promising list of activities that may support how teachers adapt content and instruction as listed in sub-criteria C2aii. However, it is unclear how these activities are connect to specific teachers or matched with the individual needs of students. For many of these activities, it is unclear the persons who would be responsible for leading the work.</p> <p>The applicant has presented initial ideas as to why frequent measurements of student progress are important and beneficial to student learning. The applicant gives strong rationale as to why measuring progress is important as described in sub-criteria C2aiii. The data collection work is less well defined. It is clear how teachers would use this data to inform their own work and improve instruction.</p> <p>The applicant has described sound general plans in meeting sub-criteria C2aiv that includes a comprehensive way to examine teacher and principal effectiveness.</p> <p>In regards to criteria C2bi:</p> <p>The applicant does not describe how it intends to support sub-criteria C2bi.</p> <p>In regards to criteria C2bii:</p> <p>The applicant has presented a series of tools that have the potential to support students' personalized learning. It is not clear how the applicant intends to populate these tools with high quality learning resources. The resources that are listed such as e-books (dictionaries, thesauruses, etc.) are generic and do not target specific needs of individual students. The use of the cloud resources and other technology infrastructures such as emails, mobile strategies, databases, etc., provide a process or a way for students to access the content. However, the applicant does not fully specify the types of resources that would be available across grade spans and content areas.</p> <p>In regards to criteria C2biii:</p> <p>The applicant does provide a bevy of tools available to students to interact actively with technology and build some skills in</p>		
--	--	--

interacting with technology tools. It is unclear how the tools in themselves are solutions for address children's literacy problems. That is, the applicant doesn't detail how the school system would support the students' use of these tools to improve their own learning. There's a disconnect between the tools that are presented and how these tools would be used by students to improve their learning.

In regards to criteria C2c:

The applicant has addressed sub-criteria C2ci and C2cii moderately. The applicant agrees with the importance of both of these sub-criteria but does not further elaborate on how these ideas of training and evaluation would fit as part of a larger plan of improving student learning. The PLC idea holds promise but the work is described in generalities. It is not clear how this would be implemented across districts and within each school site. There are not enough details presented to fully understand how these ideas would work system-wide.

In regards to criteria C2d:

The applicant has some strong initial ideas as to how it would meet this sub-criteria. The ideas such as partnerships with teacher educational partnerships and the proposed ideas of financial and housing incentives are promising. However, the ideas are not part of a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

Overall, the applicant has earned an 8 out of 20 in this criteria because there are a lot of promising ideas presented within each of the sub-criteria. However, all of these ideas are not organized into a comprehensive high-quality plan that could be implemented system-wide across a multitude of districts and at each school site.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In regards to criteria D1a:

The applicant has proposed a clear organizational structure diagram that's found in the appendix. This diagram is a good start in understanding how the roles across the various systems may interact with each other. It is less clear how the consortium would lead the work across these districts.

In regards to criteria D1b:

The applicant doesn't fully address this sub-criteria. The role of ADC with each of the school districts is not clear. The composition of school leadership teams is undefined and the roles and responsibilities between the ADC team and the leadership team are not well developed. As a result, it is difficult to assess the level of flexibility and autonomy of school leadership teams to support personalized learning for students.

In regards to criteria D1c:

The mastery credit plans address some of the needs for students but does not address all needs of students across the various grades. It is unclear how each district treat non-traditional courses as part of their credits in its graduation requirements. It is also not clear if passing a course by an exam is the most effective way for students to demonstrate mastery of content.

In regards to criteria D1d:

The proposed way that the applicant is trying to address this sub-criteria is not a significant improvement from the traditional way of state mandated testing. The tools proposed are still the state mandated exams and district benchmarking tests. Neither of these tools give students an opportunity to demonstrate their mastery of standards in multiple comparable ways.

In regards to criteria D1e:

The applicant doesn't fully describe the specific types of learning resources and instructional practices that would support the needs for special populations.

Overall, the applicant received an 5 out of 10 because the applicant has strong beliefs and ideas in presenting some practices and tools that could be implemented to support students' learning environment. However, the ideas presented are not part of a larger system-wide plan that takes into account all educators and students varying needs.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In regards to criteria D2a:</p> <p>At the school level, the applicant has proposed a modest infrastructure (DCD) that supports educator access to data that in turn, supports the implementation of the project. It is less clear how students and parents would have access to all of the necessary tools and technology.</p> <p>In regards to criteria D2b:</p> <p>The applicant provides evidence that many of the families do not have internet access and there is not a strategy in place to address this family technology need. It is unclear how all students and families would have access to the technology tools if they don't have access to the internet.</p> <p>In regards to criteria D2c:</p> <p>The applicant has not addressed this sub-criteria in detail. The strategy for supporting parents and students' access to the information technology system is vaguely described and it is not clear students and families would access and use the tools available as part of the implementation.</p> <p>In regards to criteria D2d:</p> <p>The applicant describes the data interoperable data system in the lens of the state summative assessments and "snapshots" of work at the school and district level. It is not clear how these snapshots would be an effective data point within the larger data system.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has received a score of 2 out of 10 in this selection criteria. The applicant poorly addressed each of the sub-criteria in that the ideas were not part of a larger comprehensive plan that supports the relevant stakeholders in a systemic way. The proposed activities would reach a segment of the population and as a result, the applicant earned a low score in this criteria.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The quarterly Dream Team meetings are promising as the applicant as clearly defined the rationale and processes by which the team would convene and respond to data found in the implementation. The CIRS system provides key goals as well as on-track indicators that support the progress monitoring of the work across multiple areas.</p> <p>The applicant has some promising strategies such as SWOT analysis and School Implementation Teams to support implementation and progress monitoring of the work.</p> <p>The applicant scored strongly at 10 out of 15 for this criteria because the initial plans and strategies for this work are moderately detailed as part of a larger system of continuous improvement.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has presented a moderate plan on how it intends to address this criteria. Explicit parent engagement is not present. The Dream Team meetings, ADC reports, and meetings with various partnerships are promising strategies proposed in engaging with stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has fully described achievable measures with annual targets that meet the subcriteria E3a-c. For criteria E3a, the applicant was able to articulate reasonable rationales for how each of the measures have been selected. For criteria E3b,</p>		

the applicant has provided reasonable details on how the data captured from measures proposed. For example, for performance measure 4 on academic growth and educational value for grades PreK-3, the screening and diagnostic measures provided target the progress of student growth over time and allows teachers to adjust the supports so the instruction meets the students' learning needs.

For the measures proposed, the applicant has provided general descriptions on how it intends to review and improve upon the measure over time. For these measures, the applicant has set ambitious and measurable goals over the course of the proposal.

As a result the applicant received the full score of 5 out of 5 in this criteria.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented a set of processes that it will undertake with the internal CIRS team and the external evaluator to evaluate the effectiveness of the investments. The plans are described moderate and connect closely with the larger implementation goals. The processes that the evaluator will engage in allow him/her to assess the progress and success of implementation and in turn, evaluate the project progress and communicate the progress to key stakeholders.

It is less clear how the external evaluator and the internal CIRS team would work together in examining the evaluation process. Also, the timeline how the evaluation take place and specific milestones and deliverables are also not well detailed in this plan. As a result, the applicant scored a 3 out of 5 as it has presented some ideas that support an evaluation plan, but is not robust or detailed in enough in the plan to merit the full 5 points.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant have identified sources of all funding that would support this work including both RTTT-District requested funds and externally funded sources.

The applicant does not provide enough evidence or details as to a clear and thoughtful rationale for its investment and priorities. The description and the intended uses of the funding sources are general and do not give a full picture of how the funding would explicitly support the implementation goals and activities.

The identification of long and short-term funds is poorly described as chart two only details a small subsection of the requested funding.

The applicant has not included budgets and budget narratives for each of the project activities.

Overall, the applicant score a mid-range score of 5 out of 10 as it presented a big-picture budget plan and it did not go into specific detail of how all of the budget would be used to support each project goal and activity over the course of the project timeline. The budget subpart 2 listed is not in enough detail to match how the services for each major activity would be delivered to all students over the project period.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has proposed preliminary ideas as to how it intends to sustain project goals beyond the grant period. The chart that outlines the participation of various funding source post-grant period describes clearly the potential organizations that may contribute resources and funding to continue this work. However, these ideas have not been translated into a high-quality plan for sustainability after the project period. That is it is not clear who would be responsible for raising each portion of these external funds, the types of fundraising activities that would be proposed over a specific time period, as well as rationale for how these proposed stakeholder groups would contribute in extending the proposed activities. The applicant has not provided enough specific details on a budget that is beyond the grant period. The percentages proposed beyond the lifetime of the proposed grant is not connected to specific dollar amounts that the applicant anticipates it would need nor does it provide a timeline of how those funds would be raised to support continued work.

As a result, the applicant has received a 3 out of 10 for this criteria that falls in low to mid range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not fully provide enough evidence for part 1 of this priority. The description of the partnerships from ADC to service and community based organizations is vague and described in general terms.</p> <p>For part 2, the population-level results proposed are clearly describe but the proposed results are not described in a measurable way over the project timeline.</p> <p>It is not clear how the partnership would address part 3 (a-d) would be different or supportive of the work that has been proposed as part of the broader RTTT-District proposal.</p> <p>The applicant does not have a plan in place to address how it intends to address part 4 of this competitive priority area. The applicant has described more the needs and rationale to improve services to this targeted populations than how the partnership would be supporting of the integration of services work.</p> <p>For part 5, the ideas listed in the checklist format of supports for teachers are promising. It's not clear how these tools and strategies fit coherently into a large comprehensive plan of work led by the partnership and integrated into the larger RTTT-District plan. It is not clear who the target students would be and how this needs assessment is an addition to or is complementary to what is proposed in the larger proposal. The applicant provides a stronger rationale as to why parent engagement is important in this work, but does not clarify how they would take part in the decision making process that are proposed by this partnership effort.</p> <p>For part 6, there is a disconnect between the performance measures that are proposed regarding the community service learning project and the introduction to education value work as details of these plans are not well described. It is unclear how this work connects to the population-level desired results.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant poorly addressed this competitive priority as the partnership details are weakly described. It is not clear how the work of ADC with partners would be used to support a specific student and/or family population that complements and builds on the work of the larger RTTT-District proposal. As a result, the applicant received 2 out 10, a low score in this section.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has not met this absolute priority area 1. The idea behind the Cloud-based technology tool holds promise in providing personalized learning environment for students. However, there was not a coherent and comprehensive plan that took into account the needs system-wide, at the school level, and at the classroom level. The strategies that were proposed are good ideas in themselves but do not fit into a clear logic model or high-quality plan that addresses the needs for all participating students in the system.</p>		

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

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

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

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: The applicant has not included an optional budget supplement.		