



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0646CA-1 for San Rafael City Elementary School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that includes processes and practices to ensure that all children within the district are college and career ready. Overall, the applicant has engaged systemic and data driven approaches to identify issues that interfere with their ability to ensure that all children have equal access to college-career ready pathways, and proposes systemic approaches to reaching sustainable reform to address these issues. The four core educational assurance areas are incorporated within the vision, with future work in the Assurance Areas 1 (standards and assessments) and 3 (recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals) being the most strongly supported by data collected by the applicant. The vision is connected with past efforts and successes.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a detailed and highly achievable approach to implementing its reform proposal. The applicant has experienced previous success with this implementation approach. All schools in both consortium districts will be involved in reform efforts, and an inclusive list of all nine schools that will participate is presented. The applicant provides a comprehensive chart of school demographics which includes specific characteristics as required by selection criteria (e.g. total number of participating students; number of participating students from low-income families; number of participating students who are high-need; and number of participating educators).</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Since all schools in both consortium districts will be participants in the applicant's reform efforts, all changes brought about by reform will impact total districts. The applicant presents a feasible theory of change and logic model to guide LEA-wide reform and change efforts. Specific outcomes which are student/child focused are clearly delineated and point to what children/students will know and be able to do. A corresponding set of teacher, administrator, and district activities are listed which describe their actions in order to facilitate child-student centered outcomes. There are no timelines listed in the plan for activities or outcomes, nor are the parties responsible for initiating certain activities listed. For example, parties responsible for teacher workshops, expanding parent support strategies, or preparing teachers to differentiate instruction are not explicitly listed.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes reasonable and achievable annual goals for student performance in grades 2-8 at the proficient or advanced levels in English Language Arts overall and for different subgroups, with similar goals for mathematics. Performance goals for high school students in English Language Arts and mathematics are also achievable. The achievability of these projections is probable based on averages of past performances of students in the districts. The reduction in achievement gaps goals are also reasonable, and correspond to achievement of the performance goals at the elementary and secondary levels. The applicant establishes ambitious yet achievable targets for graduation rates, and reasonable rates for college enrollment. Reasonable targets for post-secondary degree completion have also been established. The applicant references CLASS as an assessment for younger students. This tool is more of an assessment of teacher interactions with children rather than a measure of children's performances. Insufficient information is provided in terms of how an assessment that focuses on teacher actions will be used to develop summative assessments for younger children.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates a clear record of success in terms of improving student learning and achievement at the elementary and high school levels in both mathematics and language arts, both overall and among all subgroups. The exception is special needs students at the elementary level (the applicant explains that the decline in performance of special needs students was due to reclassification issues). The applicant also displays outstanding results in terms of improving learning and achievement of students in a previously low achieving school based on implementation of structural and personnel changes (e.g., release and/or transfer of ineffective administrators, teachers and other personnel, and changes in student placement practices); revising goals and expectations for teachers and students; and working with community and other partners. The applicant has initiated appropriate means for students, parents and teachers to have access to databases that include performance and other information on students as part of their efforts to improve student learning and achievement.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant currently provides information on their websites of expenditures for personnel salaries for instructional staff and teachers at the school level, and commits to making non-personnel expenditures available in the future. These efforts suggest a high level of transparency in the applicant's processes, practices, and investments.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a state climate where innovation for improved educational outcomes is encouraged, and where priorities, practices, and systems (e.g., recommendations for the school systems to pay attention to the demands of the 21st Century economy and society; state-wide data system to track and provide access to student achievement data; and standards for the teaching profession) in support these efforts have been established. These conditions point to ample evidence that the applicant will have both the support and encouragement to implement the personalized learning environments suggested in their proposal.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Stakeholders' support of the proposal is documented in letters of support, and in many instances, the letters confirm stakeholders' participation at the proposal writing stage and commitment to involvement in specific elements of the proposal when it is implemented. The applicant also describes processes where parents, students, teachers, administrators and collective bargaining representatives were provided information about the proposal, and were invited to submit recommendations, suggestions, and feedback. While the signature of the president of one of the two collective bargaining units appears on a Memorandum of Understanding associated with the proposal, and while the applicant describes multiple meetings with bargaining unit representatives to discuss professional growth systems associated with the proposal and the overall design of the proposal initiative, there is no clear evidence or documentation that teachers from the participating schools support the proposal.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes the current status in implementing personalized learning environments, discusses a logic model for reform in their proposal, and delineates needs and gaps a high quality plan would address. Evidence that a high quality plan was used to reach conclusions presented in the proposal is not clear as elements of a high quality plan, such as goals, activities, timelines etc., were not presented.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a detailed and high quality plan for preparing students for college and career success based on the identification of milestones in grades pre-K through grade 12 that predict a continuation of successes at each grade level, and processes, programs, and strategies to facilitate continued progress toward each milestone. The applicant's plan ensures that students' learning and development are grounded in existing or soon to be developed standards, which are connected to college and career-ready standards. Progress toward achievement of content and skills embedded in the standards will be tracked through student achievement data that will be available to students, families, and teachers so that appropriate responses can be made to students' performances. Appropriate mechanisms for students to track and self-monitor their learning are included in the plan, as are processes to teach students how to access and use these mechanisms. The identification and implementation of information and activities that will facilitate parents' active support of students' achievement and success are clearly presented as part of the plan as well.

The applicant's plan includes a sound approach for linking students' current knowledge and skills to standards and graduation requirements through content, support, and instructional approaches both inside and outside of classrooms in ways that enhance personalized learning. The plan includes a comprehensive description of ways in which students will experience a variety of instructional approaches and learning environments (e.g., self-directed learning, independent learning, collaborative learning groups) that will allow them to personalize learning while they are involved in deep learning and mastery of grade appropriate content and skills. There is a clear explanation of how the structure of learning experiences will be designed to help students develop habits and traits which support learning (e.g., teamwork, critical thinking, etc.). The plan delineates a sound approach to helping students develop and keep track of a personalized sequence of learning that will lead to graduation on time and the next step of college enrollment or entry into a career.

Three areas of the plan do not appear to be as comprehensive and/or inclusive as are most elements of the plan. Accommodations and strategies to address the needs of high need students are too narrow as they focus on high school English learners, with no plans for elementary and middle school learners or learners at any level who might fit other high need categories. The applicant's plan for inclusion of digital learning content is equivocal as it not clear whether this content will be included solely in high school grades or at all grades levels, pre-K through grade 12 as appropriate. Also, while structural components (e.g., advocates for students & parents new to the school system; culturally appropriate information for parents; addressing institutional attitudes and structures that might limit access) to ensure access to diverse cultures, climate, and perspectives are evident, plans for connecting access and exposure to motivation and deep individual learning are lacking.

The timelines described to initiate and implement plan activities are reasonable, and the expected deliverables and persons responsible for plan activities are clearly presented.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	19
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a detailed and high quality plan to support students as college and career ready graduates through experiences in personalized learning environments created by educators who receive support and ongoing training focused on personalized learning. The plan delineates education and training in the form of workshops and other training opportunities to improve teachers' capacity to structure personalized learning environments by using a variety of teaching strategies, and common core standards-based instructional materials to better meet the varying needs of students in all grade bands. The plan also describes a comprehensive strategy to ensure that teachers are able to use data as indicators of the acceleration of student progress that includes both the purchase of an integrated district-wide learning management system and training teachers to ensure they are able to access and use data from the system to inform their teaching.

The plan clearly describes intentions to ensure that teachers are able to adapt instruction through use of a variety of teaching-learning strategies (e.g., face-to-face, online, project-based learning) however no explicit discussion is included as to how teachers will adapt content to meet the needs of all students.

A multifaceted approach is incorporated within the plan to support teachers as they engage strategies to meet the learning needs of their students, to include peer support as members of Professional Learning Communities, access to model lessons, and assistance from consulting teachers. The plan also describes processes to acclimate new teachers to district plans, processes, and practices to structure personalized learning environments, an "on boarding" process to support continuous

progress toward increasing student performance. An explicit statement of activities to ensure ongoing work toward closing the achievement gap is lacking.

The plan includes a description of a comprehensive teacher evaluation process that includes both formative and summative assessment processes designed to provide feedback to teachers of their impact on student learning so that they may improve their practice, and to collect data from a variety of sources to inform “what teachers do” and “what students learn.” A set of effective strategies to improve the leadership capabilities of leaders at all levels (building and district) are incorporated into the plan, which includes professional development for leaders, development of professional growth plans, and training specifically focused on how to become a skillful leader. The plan includes specific activities to improve school leaders’ ability to access and use information collected by the district (e.g., the district’s evaluation system) in order to help them take steps to improve educator effectiveness, school culture, and school climate for continuous school improvement.

The applicant’s suggests that increasing the number of students taught by effective and highly effective teachers and principals will be accomplished by district-wide processes and practices (e.g., professional development and training, comprehensive evaluation system, teacher access to standards-based instructional materials and resources, etc.) discussed throughout the plan. The plan does call for specialized support and training for teachers of English learning and special education students. A more robust and explicit plan to ensure support and training for teachers in hard-to-staff schools and subject areas is warranted.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant is in a relatively unique position to develop a high quality plan for project implementation and support that impacts all structures, rules, practices and policies associated with the proposal, since proposal participants include all educators, schools, and students within consortium member districts. Central to the plan is the Deliberate Excellence Leadership Team (DELT) which includes membership from representatives throughout the district, and which will ensures transparency, collective responsibility, and distributive leadership during implementation of reform proposal initiatives. School-based leadership teams and an Oversight Committee complete the infrastructure to implement reform initiatives. The plan describes goals that when met, positions students to reach grade-band identified milestones, as well as interventions for students who need support for continued progress. The plan lacks innovative ways for students to demonstrate mastery of standards beyond traditional avenues. While there is discussion of the success among some schools in increasing achievement outcomes for Latino students, and while coaching will exist to improve principals’ and teachers’ ability to address achievement gap issues for Latino students, there are no overt or comprehensive components of the plan to adapt learning resources and instructional practices so that they are accessible to all students, including English learners and student with disabilities.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant’s plan describes activities that will lead to upgrading and sustaining information technology so that parents, students, educators, and other stakeholders will have access to technologies and other learning resources related to implementation of the applicant’s reform proposal. The plan also includes appropriate provisions for support, services, and learning-based venues to ensure access to and usability of the updated systems and resources. Finally, the applicant includes reasonable plans to ensure an open data format for use by students and interoperable data systems to be used by schools across the districts.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		

The applicant has a tested and effective process for continuous improvement developed during previous reform efforts—one which is based on district generated grade-appropriate milestones that predict college and career ready success. They plan to initiate a monitoring system based on formative and summative assessment data in order to track identified performances. The stated plan points to a rigorous process for determining progress toward stated goals. Upgraded data systems included as part of the applicant's reform proposal are critical to plans to make data and other information available to students, families, educators and other stakeholders in order to monitor and track progress in performances, as well as to provide data as feedback in order make decisions about policies and practices needed to accelerate students' learning and achievement.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant details a constructive and collaborative process for ensuring ongoing communication and engagement based on their plan to “build a culture of professionalism, distributed leadership, and shared ownership” among educators and community stakeholders around a set of agreed upon goals and strategies. The DELT will be instrumental in ensuring that communication and engagement in reform efforts are maintained during proposal implementation and sustained beyond the grant period.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents the appropriate number of performance measures which are grade appropriate, with rationales that point to the importance of information gathered from the measure to the overall reform proposal and theory of action. A detailed and reasoned narrative is included for each measure describing actions to be taken to review and improve the measure if insufficient progress is made. Ambitious yet achievable performance increments are included for each measure.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a reasonable process for evaluating RTT-D funded activities that relies on data and information collected through an upgraded technology system, with the goal of determining whether or not activities have had the intended impact and outcomes. The applicant details the instrumental role played by DELT in the evaluation process. The Team will be responsible for analyzing data, communicating outcomes of annual reviews to stakeholder, and devising strategies for improvement when activities do not generate expected outcomes.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a well-conceived, comprehensive budget with clear narratives to support proposed distribution of requested funds. The budget narrative connects requested funds to project goals and activities. Funds requested for various activities are sufficient and the applicant has taken care to allocate funds for the length of time needed to complete a goal.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

While the applicant presents activities related to long-term sustainability; partnerships it plans to grow or initiate, and possible funding sources—all of which will likely ensure continued support and maintenance of its reform efforts, their plans do not include timelines and responsible parties which are key elements of a high quality plan.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes a sound partnership with a number of organizations focused on the issue of chronic absenteeism in kindergarten. The sustainability of the partnership is enhanced by the stated purpose of each partner organization and the ways in which each will contribute to an issue of common concern for each. A list of reasonable and achievable anticipated results of the partnership is included. The applicant outlines a feasible plan for using data to target its results and to track indicators used to measure results. The partnership's plan to scale the model from addressing absenteeism at the kindergarten level to all levels, PreK -12 is reasonable, and will be based on lessons learned from implementing the model at the kindergarten level. Plans for the partnership to continue to analyze and address the issue of chronic absenteeism for ongoing improvement are feasible. The applicant presents a comprehensive plan for integrating education and other services for the purpose of reducing absenteeism that would include bringing together, for example, personalized education, attention to issues of cultural competency and diversity, family engagement, and family education. The partnership plans for a framework and tools that will effectively build capacity among staff at participating schools to support reduction in chronic absenteeism strategies. A set of ambitious yet achievable measures are included in the plan which proposes a reduction in absenteeism over the grant period and beyond for all consortium kindergartners and first grade students.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a coherent and comprehensive plan that clearly delineates how core educational assurances will be addressed, so that learning environments will be created to ensure that children and youth in participating schools are college and career ready at the conclusion of their PreK-12 schooling experience. The consortium intends to build on past successes, and presents a convincing case for how RTT-D funds will help complete learning and achievement efforts all ready begun. The applicant is in the unique position to impact a total learning community, given that the consortium is made up of all schools in the district. The strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators strongly suggest that the consortium will be able to meet its stated goals. Plans to improve teaching and learning are or will be aligned with college and career ready standards, and the consortium requests funds for technologies to strengthen their assessment, analysis, and evaluation capabilities. The consortium's plan includes goals, strategies, and activities that suggest that they will be able to accelerate student learning, reduce achievement gaps, and increase graduation rates by providing for the personalized learning environments, effective educators, and family and community support needed to do so.

Total	210	195
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0646CA-2 for San Rafael City Elementary School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes serving 6,362 students, of which 59% were identified as high need, in a total of 10 elementary schools

and three high schools in two districts. Two reform efforts were implemented; the first, called Roadmap to the Future was implemented from 2007-2011, and the second, called Road to Deliberate Practice was implemented in 2012.

There appeared to be a lack of consistency across the application. Critical information was lacking. For example, there were several references in this section on students' "academic progress" but little or no information on how this progress was measured. From a chart provided on the academic progress of students in one middle school, it appears as if all students listed were high need. Documented were significant differences (gaps) in achievement among student groups, both before and after the district began implementing two reform efforts.

After a new superintendent was hired in 2007, the district began integrating minority students, students who were English language learners, and other high need students with other (white) students in the two district suggesting that segregation or tracking of these students had been standard practice. Students were heterogeneously grouped at the suggestion of the National Equity Project, an organization that the district had consulted. From various statements provided, educators in this district at times appear to view all African American, Latino, students who were English language learners, students from low SES backgrounds, and others as "high need."

However, the college completion rates for students from the districts' high schools were not impressive for students from any group. Provided data for 2011-2012, indicated that 29.5% of all students in the district had attained a college degree within six years. This data suggests that even students not identified as high need may be graduating from high school but are not college ready.

The most innovative part of the proposal was its focus on the early grades and on other variables that lead to college and career readiness. However, a clear and credible approach to improving student achievement was not clearly outlined.

The applicant failed to set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision addressing all four core educational assurance areas. One of these areas, educator evaluation, was weak or incomplete. It was not entirely clear how the applicant planned to assess teachers, principals, or superintendents.

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

10

7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to serve 6,362 students in a total of 10 elementary schools and three high schools in two districts. Of these, 59% are considered high need, low income, at risk, or students needing support and assistance. A list of all participating schools was provided that included all schools in the two districts.

Descriptions of the process to be used are more clearly drawn in the applicant's plan for students in the early grades, the focus of the proposal. An appropriate listing and description of these schools are provided.

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

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

From the description of the applicant's plan, educators in these schools are making an effort to meet the educational needs of high need students. The plan to meet the educational needs of these students in the early grades was somewhat more comprehensive than for students in the middle and high school levels.

The applicant's response to meaningful reform was inadequate given the significant achievement gaps both before and after the two most recently implemented reform efforts. No timeline was included on implementing the applicant's current plan was provided.

Strengths in this section include providing professional development to teachers that focuses on cultural literacy, inclusion of a family component, and making a connection between students' success in the early grades to college and career readiness.

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

10

3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Based on the evidence provided on the applicant's Roadmap to the Future (2007-2011) followed by its Road to Deliberate Excellence (which started in 2012), it is unlikely that a significant increase in student learning and performance and in students'

degree attainment rates will occur for minority, low SES, and other high need students in the two districts.

From the efforts outlined, there appears to be growing understanding of the need for increased equity although this awareness is not matched by the sense of urgency that it merits given the data provided. The outlined goals are ambitious but insufficient in effectively addressing significant gaps in student achievement among students at the K-12 level or in significantly increasing students' postsecondary degree attainment.

- Performance on summative assessment (proficiency status and growth) -- The focus of this proposal is on students in the lower grades. Performance levels for all students in grades 2-8 on the state's standards test for the 2011-2012 academic year indicate that 62% attained proficient or advanced levels. Of these, 33% of ELL students, 47% of students from low SES backgrounds, 26% of students with exceptionalities, 47% of Hispanic students, and 88% of white students reached proficient or advanced levels. This is clearly unacceptable for students in all these groups. For the 2016-2017 academic year, the applicant projects that 77% of students will perform at a proficient or advanced level with funding with much of the growth coming from the non-white student population.
- Decreasing achievement gaps-- The two districts have been working on educational reform since 2007. However, significant gaps persist. The projected gains for 2016-2017 for the non-white student population appear unrealistic although projected gains for white students appear realistic.
- Graduation rates-- Applicant listed data indicating that 90.89% of students graduated within four years from high school.
- College enrollment--Over a ten year period, 70% of students enrolled in college. No information was provided on the enrollment rates by subgroup.
- Postsecondary degree attainment-- According to the applicant, only 29.5% of the 70% of the district's graduates completed a college degree within six years over a ten year period. Not much information is provided on the students who completed a college degree. However, data provided suggests that the number of minority, students from socio economically disadvantaged background, English learners, or students with exceptionalities who attain a college degree is low. The small number of students completing a college degree within a reasonable period indicates that students from all student groups are not graduating from high school college ready.

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:

Although the applicant implemented the Roadmap to the Future plan in 2007, followed by their Road to Deliberate Excellence plan in 2012, the data offered focused on data from 2009-2012. In some instances, the data offered was incomplete or confusing. For example, statements in this section at times suggested that all African American, Hispanic/Latino, and socio economically disadvantaged students were "high need."

In closing the achievement gap among the various subgroups from 2009-2012, the applicant accomplished the most significant gains in math and English among Hispanic students and among students from socioeconomic disadvantaged backgrounds. According to from the applicant's statements and chart provided, data reflected the performance of (not clear) high need African American, Asian, Hispanic, White, English learners, special education, and socio economically disadvantaged students from one of the elementary schools. A decline in performance was noted for students with disabilities.

At the high school level, the greatest percent of changes in the state tests (math and English) at the proficient and above levels was seen among African American, Hispanic/Latino, and socio economically disadvantaged students. Gains were listed for students with disabilities.

No evidence was provided to document the applicant's efforts on improving high school graduation rates or on increasing college enrollment.

Information provided to document the applicant's efforts to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in persistently lowest-achieving schools focused on one middle school and two elementary schools. At the middle school, the use of the tracking of students "of color," students from socio economically disadvantaged homes, and English learners was common practice until 2007. The applicant documents the placement of students based on one factor, their ethnicity, regardless of their academic performance. After structural and personnel changes that started in 2008, the applicant reports significant changes in improved student performance in math and ELA between 2009 and 2012, although the data provided was not desegregated by subgroup.

Data on student performance is available to parents and the public using the districts' software system, by mailing student data

to families, and during parent-teacher conferences. No accommodations were discussed concerning educating parents on the use of electronic data available or on providing or facilitating access to parents who may not have internet service. No references were made regarding providing information on students' academic performance to parents in their home language. The applicant included information on a Family Engagement Task Force; however, the Task Force appears to be a work in progress.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments could use some improvements.

Personnel salaries for all instructional and support staffs in both districts are provided through their website; however, salaries are represented as averages, not as actual personnel salaries.

The districts' annual budgets are available and subject to public comment; the process for this was not discussed. Non-personnel expenditures at the school level are not publicly available. No mention was made on whether information on salaries was made available in the language used by the non-English speaking parents of children in the applicant's schools.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant discussed the astonishing success in technology development and innovation originating in its state. All the elements in the context for implementation of personalized learning environments as outlined in the proposal are in place. This includes a history of support for innovation, recognition at the state level of 21st century skills for a knowledge based economy, a strong state-wide data system, adopted teaching standards, and the use of electronic portfolios.

However, the applicant failed to connect the stated elements outlined to their proposed plan.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant describes "extensive engagement" by students, families, teachers, and principals. However, evidence was lacking on the full extent of this involvement. Evidence on the involvement of some critical groups, teachers, students and families, appeared limited.

Evidence of involvement and support of the applicant's plan was provided by school leaders, school administrators, local school board presidents, and two presidents of teachers' unions. Missing from the application was evidence of involvement and support from parents' groups, teachers groups (except from teacher union support), student groups, and institutions of higher education. Letters of support were included from ten organizations, most of which were non-profits.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant discussed the need to do more to meet the academic needs of students who are English language learners and students with disabilities.

Missing from the applicants plan is how it plans to design, implement, or promote personalized learning environments. Teachers, students, and parents were minimally involved in the process of identifying students' learning needs.

Strengths of the application included recognition of the districts' changing demographics, references for the need of increased academic rigor, and a focus on intensive professional development of its teachers.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant identifies research based milestones for students from Pre-K through high school in its Road to Deliberate Excellence effort. Parts of the applicant's plan are likely to yield positive results, such as expanding learning opportunities for students after school and in the summer and encouraging students to use resources to track and manage their own learning, which would encourage students' self-efficacy.</p> <p>Unfortunately, other components of the plan, which sound promising, such as the expanded cultural proficiency and parental engagement component, are not fully described, or appear unrealistic. For example, the applicant proposes providing culturally appropriate information to parents regarding what their children are learning. As explained, this approach lacks detail, appears inadequate, and is not comprehensive.</p> <p>The most innovative part of the applicant's plan is its focus on the early grades especially on strengthening the quality of education from Pre-K through grade 3. For students in grades 4 through grade 8, applicant plans to communicate high expectations and the promise of support by a series of statements to students, such as "You can do it," or "I won't give up on you." Such suggestions appear inadequate, poorly developed, and incomplete.</p> <p>To provide deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest, applicant plans to encourage self-directed and independent work. However, some students may need or benefit from a more structured learning environment and support system.</p> <p>The cultural proficiency activities listed in the applicant's plan are comprehensive and address providing culturally appropriate information to students, parents, families, school staff, and administrators.</p> <p>To ensure that students have access to instructional content and skills that ensure college or career readiness, the applicant proposes accommodations, alternative credit, and what is termed "high quality strategies." No mention is made of providing these students access to effective or highly effective teachers.</p> <p>It is unclear what the applicant means in providing "real world" relevance of classroom experience for students.</p> <p>The applicant discussed a plan to provide ongoing and regular feedback and student data through the use of the technology resources. This approach is not comprehensive and is inadequate given the population being served.</p> <p>The applicant proposes an expanded learning alignment that extends learning time to students after school and in the summer. Expanding learning opportunity is one strategy that is likely to yield positive results.</p> <p>Suggestions offered to provide training and support to students so that they can manage their own learning sound promising.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant offers a somewhat comprehensive approach to providing effective professional development to teachers that focuses on content, instructional approaches, and other common responsibilities for teachers. Missing is a priority of the need for teachers to understand the students that they are teaching while creating positive learning environments.

The applicant plans to strengthen its professional learning communities and peer support with a somewhat comprehensive plan focuses on the individual student. Its plan is to "enable students to take ownership of their own learning process." It is unclear what this means as most high need students need the guidance and assistance of their teachers especially when they are not getting this guidance and support from their parents.

The applicant plans to combine fact to face instruction, which includes group work, project based activities, and independent

study, with online instruction that they believe will be effective. No research that connects the use of online instruction to effective teaching at the Pre-K- 12 levels for high need students, especially for English learners or for Latino students, was provided. There was little discussion on the challenges of providing effective instruction for high need students using instructional models that include group work and project based instruction.

The applicant included charts that described its Road to Deliberate Excellence plan; however, the plan was not fully discussed in the narrative.

The applicant discussed the need to upgrade its current learning management system in order to improve access to educators on timely individual student performance. It was unclear what educators were currently doing in order to assess whether students in their schools are meeting current standards.

It appears that the evaluation systems being used to assess the effectiveness of teachers and principals has yet to be determined pending the development of "professional growth systems" to be determined through discussions between administrators and teacher representatives. A similar process will be used to define measures of student growth when used to assess educators. Although the applicant makes extensive use of student data performance data throughout its proposal, such data will not be used to assess the effectiveness of educators. Such a decision suggests lack of confidence on the applicant's plan. The applicant makes references to "accomplished teachers," but it is unclear what this means or how this designation was determined.

The applicant plans to implement a comprehensive management system to inform teachers on individual student growth including performance on individual assignments. As part of this plan, professional development will be provided to educators and an effort to identify effective classroom practices on the use of laptops, tablets, and smart phones will be made.

The applicant offers an extensive professional development plan for educators at the school sites that includes leadership training and an induction system for new teachers. A plan to support classroom teachers was provided.

To identify effective and highly effective educators, the applicant plans to implement its yet undeveloped assessment system. Once "highly effective" educators are identified, the plan is to prioritize placement to serve English learners and students with special needs and to provide these educators with specialized training and support. It is unclear how this will work as the characteristics and elements of who a "highly effective" educator have not yet been identified. It is also unclear how or whether these characteristics will be matched to the needs of the high needs student groups that have been identified.

The applicant included several charts outlining its Road to Deliberate Excellence, but these were not fully discussed in the narrative. Fully discussing the details and timeline of this plan would have strengthened the proposal.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to expand the role of the districts central office as needed to implement the proposed plan pointing to what the applicant considers the positive results from the previous two reform efforts. An organizational chart was provided, and a communication plan is offered with a focus on "language equity and stronger internal/external communications, and establishing the Superintendent as Chief Communicator." Little or no description or discussion was provided on this part of the proposed plan, which appears vague. It is equally unclear if parents or teachers would play significant roles or would have opportunities to provide input.

The district coordinates schedules and calendars for participating schools, but applicant stated that participating schools will be allowed flexibility and autonomy to achieve the project's educational goals with the district providing support by coordinating bell schedules and release time. Applicant added that decisions about school budgets, staffing models, and use of classified staff will be made through "shared decision-making processes." Such a process was not followed described. This was followed by comments regarding how the district will leverage feedback from educators in participating schools about needed autonomy and flexibility. The conclusion appears to be that district administrators will determine the autonomy and flexibility to be provided to participating schools.

There were few ideas offered that would allow students to earn credit based on mastery of the standards. Options listed included online credit recovery and dual college enrollment; however, these options were not a priority based on lack of discussion on providing or expanding these options.

The applicant did not offer a credible argument supporting giving students multiple ways of demonstrating mastery of the

standards. The applicant did provide several ways to support student learning such as expanding learning programs like summer programming.

The applicant highlights removing lower level tracking of all Latino students as one response to providing learning resources and instructional practices to these students. No credible plan or details of a plan were provided to meet the educational needs of low income Latino students, students with disabilities, or English learners.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Although the applicant plans to expand its IT infrastructure in order to offer access to content, tools, and other learning resources, no plan was offered on how low income, non-English speaking students or their parents would gain access to these technology-driven resources outside of the classroom. Such expanded resources would be available to students, parents, educators and other stakeholders with the skills and equipment to access them.

The applicant stated that its current student information system requires replacement. The plan is to replace the current system with one that can track student data and provide a growing list of critical information to educators and parents.

The applicant included charts outlining a communication component in its Road to Deliberate Excellence plan, but these were not discussed fully within the narrative.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a plan to establish standards that begin with kindergarten readiness that provides monitoring of performance measures.

Currently the monitoring system is only available at the Pre-K-3 level, the plan allows adjustments based on results to professional development activities, curriculum, and related assessments. No information was provided on how this plan was working.

The system will be expanded to include a transparent data portal.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant documents efforts to maintain ongoing communication and engagement with many of its stakeholders, especially the internal stakeholders such as the board, unions, administrators, and school staff. These efforts do not include a well developed plan to communicate and engage with students, parents, or other external stakeholders.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identified 12 performance measures. The applicant provided an inadequate response as to how each measure would provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan regarding implementation success or areas of concern.

Interestingly, the applicant included the performance measure on the number of students whose teachers and principals were effective or highly effective by using student performance on the state test in ELA and math, mastery of reading fluency, and/or advanced scores on the Scholastic Reading Inventory to determine whether the educator was effective or highly effective. No information was given on whether demographic characteristics of students or their prior academic performance was included in the discussion. The applicant added that in the future, the district would develop a "high-quality professional growth system" to be used to identify effective and highly effective teachers and principals. The plan would provide opportunities for educators "to reflect on the data."

Another measure selected was on the percentage of children in grades 5-7 and 9-11, who feel safe at school. The applicant plans to survey students and use the results to create positive learning environments. This response is inadequate.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan is inadequate and does not provide a clear and a high quality, on-going approach for improvement.

The applicant proposes an annual review of its progress in implementing its plan through the collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data. Results would then be communicated to stakeholders.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The overall budget submitted indicates that personnel costs constitute 13% of the total budget in Year 1 and 63% of the total budget in Year 4. All funds to support the project were listed. Some funds were identified as a one time investment, such as \$2,223,000, for network hardware. A project manager is listed for each school site.

The applicant identified all funds to support the project. A significant amount of funding from other public and private sources was listed, over \$4 million, which included RTTT funding, Program Improvement funding from the state, Title I funding, 21st Century Learning Grants, and United Way funding. A plan to seek additional funding from the Marin Community Foundation and other private sources was discussed.

The budget as provided was unreasonable. Some costs, such as network hardware expenses, and in particular, personal costs were excessive.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a high-quality plan in place to provide for sustainability of the proposed plan following the term of the grant and has identified various public and private funding sources to assist the district in this effort. Sustainability appeared to be a high priority, and the applicant discussed a plan to make wise investments in changing student outcomes and sustain those outcomes over time.

The plan to build capacity includes: development of human resources; developing management structures, processes, and procedures to support staff, students, and families; developing relationships with and among stakeholders (including students and families); and developing an organizational approach, vision and strategy that allow educators and leaders to identify a shared vision.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant outlines the support it has and will continue to receive from various partnerships, most of which are non-profit agencies. Notably absent is lack of a partnership with an institution of higher education or other postsecondary institutions. The involvement described on the contributions of these agencies is consistent with the goals of the project.

The applicant lists ten population-level desired results for students that align with and support its proposal.

- Applicant proposes using the districts learning management system to track individual student progress and making this data available to educators and students' families.
- The applicant seeks to use data to target resources in order to improve results for students. Only one example was offered that dealt with improving students' attendance at the kindergarten level. Additional examples to address students' significant needs at other levels would have strengthened this part of the proposal.
- The applicant fails to provide a realistic strategy to scale the model to other high need students by focusing on students in the primary grades. Applicant states that once the "partnership is strengthened," efforts will be expanded across all grade levels. No information was provided on how or when this decision would be made.
- The question of improving results over time was not fully addressed except for statements that key partners would analyze strategies and develop modification.

The applicant discussed creating a school culture that encourages school attendance and students' engagement in school. The issue of school attendance for students in the early grades was the primary focus of the responses in this section of the proposal, and the applicant includes discussion of the various agencies that would support families in this effort.

The applicant seeks to build capacity of staff in participating schools by having the project's partners develop a risk and asset assessment tool for children and families to identify education, family, and community supports. No examples were provided.

The applicant seeks to build capacity of staff by have the project's partners identify resources needed to accomplish each strategy listed in the proposal Section (X)(4) with the objective of determining what gaps exist and identifying community organizations.

In order to create a decision-making process and infrastructure, applicant proposes creation of a team of school staff, parents, families, and community partners who meet monthly to review and to recommend strategies and best practices.

The applicant proposes several, friendly parent engagement events to educate parents on the importance of attendance. There appears to be little attention to substantively involving students and parents in the decision making process about solutions to improve and address student, family, and school needs with the possible exception of students' absences from school.

The applicant plans routine assessment in implementing its goals through monthly meetings of the project's leadership team with input from parents and families.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant outlines a history of low performance among various student subgroups. Some aspects of the applicant's proposal stood out: the low level tracking of Latino students that had been standard practice until 2007; the focus on addressing the student absentee problem in the early grades when there were significant problems across all grade levels; and the fact that only 30% of all graduates complete a college degree within six years. At various points, it appeared that all Latino and African American students were considered "high need" students.

Greater focus on developing students' self-efficacy, on a stronger parental component, and on educators' need to develop cultural literacy would have strengthened the proposal considerably. The most interesting parts of the proposal were focus on the early grades and on "backward mapping" to identify milestones across the different grade levels. There also appears in the narrative a beginning and promising understanding that something has to be done to improve the quality of education for all students in the two school districts.

Total	210	134
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0646CA-3 for San Rafael City Elementary School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Four core educational assurance areas:</p> <p>Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on PreK—3 students: Target 2nd grade scores through STAR tests; address chronic absenteeism at the Kindergarten level by working with parents through Competitive Preference Priority Later Elementary, middle and high school: Milestones will be identified for these three groups of students. Curriculum will be aligned with the CCSS. Family and student engagement is central to developing personalized support for students in reaching milestones of college and career-readiness. Equity is a key concept whereby it will be achieved through culturally responsive pedagogy and focusing on English language learners. <p>Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the current time metrics exist in the Roadmap and SRCS-RDE to measure college and career readiness. However an outside consultant identified five ways that the LEA can track student growth measures as a means of developing effective individualized instruction. See page 22 for the list. Staff and administrators have reviewed the list. <p>Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals especially where they are needed the most.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTTTD funding will be used to strengthen and expand existing professional capacity in four major ways that include: Directing efforts via Skillful Teacher and Skillful Leader Training for all teachers and attention to new teachers in training and mentoring. This is based on Montgomery County’s model; Expanding PLC along college and career-ready measures; Creating staff development teacher positions to work with staff and PLCs, and strengthening Peer Assessment and Review (PAR). <p>Turning around lowest-achieving schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing the achievement gap for Latino students is key here. The superintendent brought in the National Equity Project. A chart representing progress at Davidson MS between 2009 and 2011 is presented. <p>The RTTTD funding will provide a means for developing an infrastructure to advance current efforts and to gain new investors in future programs. Three examples are provided for this part. There is a documented record of commitment to and implementation of programs that will strength college and career readiness since 2007. The narrative and supporting evidence (provided in the text, footnotes, and direct references to documents in the appendix) point to a strong vision for articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform. The LEA has been engaged in this work since 2007 with the development of the Roadmap to the Future and Road to Deliberate Excellence. Strong leadership in the superintendent and willingness of the school leadership and teachers are key components of these two programs. A strong infrastructure is key to reform.</p> <p>In summary, the reform vision is ambitious, but achievable. All four areas are described in detail and provide substantive empirical evidence that the plan is reasonable, well-thought out, and implementable.</p>		

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of selecting the schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Developing a comprehensive and integrated reform is key here. A total of twelve schools will participate. This is building on recent efforts under Roadmap, National Equity Project, and Road to Deliberate Excellence. Important to engage schools and staffs in both districts. The phrase "unified fashion" is used to describe this selection process. • List of the schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Seven elementary schools ◦ One middle school ◦ One K-8 school ◦ Three high schools (one continuation and two high schools) • Total number of participating students: 59% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ One table with detailed information on each of the twelve schools. <p>In sum, all three components required for this section have been met with detailed descriptions and substantial data.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>High quality plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First sentence states that all SRCS schools will participate in the proposal because the RTTTD funds are geared for accelerating and deepening current reform under the Road to Deliberate Excellence. All students will benefit from curriculum alignment along CCSS principles, improvement of technology, investment in professional development of teachers, enhanced personalized learning and avenues for parent and family engagement with the schools and the LEA in general. All students will be prepared for college and careers. PreK-3 education is for all students. • Clear goals (five) are provided in this section. <p>Theory of Change and Logic Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The theory of change is based on four basic components that are closely linked: school readiness at Kindergarten; advanced level of reading by second grade; 9th grade readiness; and college and career readiness. Each block is built upon the other so that one cannot advance from one stage to the next without mastering specific skills and knowledge. • The logic model for improving outcomes for all students consists of six goals, a strategic relationship between inputs e.g., strategic investments in educator supports, activities e.g., strengthening professional learning groups and PD for cultural proficiency, and outcomes e.g., all staff are culturally competent. Performance measures – measures of efforts and selected measures of effect – are provided that call for quantified data and concrete deliverables. <p>The section described here is a high-quality plan. Key goals are identified, activities are described in detail, timelines are reasonable, deliverables are identified, and responsible parties are listed. The rationale for this plan is excellent by its reference to prior work conducted in this district and the move to adapting to CCSS principles.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance on summative assessments: Two sets of data were presented: Elementary and High School. Data from 2011-12 is presented consistently throughout the narrative with reasonable progress with the passing of each school year. The percentages presented for the final school year 2016-2017 are reasonable. • Decreasing achievement gaps: Current achievement gaps are a concern for this LEA and they have set ambitious but achievable goals for decreasing the gaps by 3% each year. This will be accomplished by significant gains that will be made by target populations or subgroups. • Graduation rates: There is history of high graduation rates for all students in the LEA, but there are significant gaps between targeted subgroups. The LEA is setting a graduation rate target at 90% or higher for all subgroups by 2016-2017. • College enrollment: This rate is targeted to increase from the 2011 rate of 65.8% to 80% in 2016-2017. There is no baseline but the plan is in develop systems and infrastructure to track post-secondary enrollment by subgroup for all SRCS students. 		

- Postsecondary degree attainment (Optional): The baseline is 31.6% and a target rate of 45% is set for post-grant (2016-2017).

The vision presented in this section A-4 demonstrates an ambitious but achievable goals in all five areas described above. The narrative for each section provided important points and the empirical evidence provided in the tables supported the ability of this LEA to achieve their vision.

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	13
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps...: The narrative provides a context that begins in 2006 and 2007. The two initiatives -- Roadmap and Road to Deliberate -- began the process of gaining input from the community in surveys, focus groups, and interviews. A five year plan was developed which included the creation of a new mission statement. The empirical evidence presented in this section which consists of six tables clearly demonstrates the positive effects of education reform which in turn supports the conclusion that this LEA has a clear record of success since 2007.</p> <p>(b) Achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools...: A case study of one school -- Davidson Middle School -- was presented to illustrate the process and measures taken by the LEA and the superintendent to achieve significant reforms. A site visit by the feeder elementary school principals, analysis of the master schedule, and evaluation of faculty and staff at the school led to the major changes in the school. The principal was dismissed and replaced with a woman who received public recognition for her work at Davidson, faculty and staff who were not making positive contributions to the school were transferred (involuntary and voluntary) or retired. The superintendent mandated "non-negotiable" expectations for curricular placement of students -- including students-of-color who were tracked without substantial data. He also called for meaningful relationships between parents/families and the school in order for teachers to address the individual needs of the students. The data presented in table B-7 represents a positive change from 2009 to 2012. Other activities were presented at the end of the narrative including support for site-based instructional coaching, creation of PFL programs. Additional data was presented featuring two low-performing elementary schools. Tables B-8 and B-9 provide the data to support the narrative. Information about low-achieving high schools was not available in this section.</p> <p>(c) Make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents...: A number of avenues are available for communication between the schools and students, educators and parents. The Aeries Parent Portal (computer-based), School Loop (internet), mailings, and parent teacher conferences are the major means currently in use. A family engagement task force also meets in the evenings (no information on the frequency) and is open to all parents. Teachers can access data about their students via Aeries and School Loop Portal. The narrative provides a description of these avenues for communication, but there is an absence of less traditional means of a two-way relationship between the schools and families.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Personnel salaries for all entities are posted at the website. The posted salaries represent an average, but the claim is made that the salary schedules closely reflect the salaries at individual schools. The non-personnel expenditures is not available to the public at the present time, but it will be in future. The minimum requirement is met in this section.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative presents a broad overview of the state's initiatives for education reform. The Blueprint for Great Schools is described in the narrative which includes four recommendations. To illustrate the successful conditions of the state, the narrative presents a brief description of the state-wide data systems, standards for teachers, and electronic student portfolios. The conditions were addressed in the narrative. There was an absence of attention to sufficient autonomy and how this operates in the relationship between the state and the LEAs.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) A description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools...: Numerous meetings were held among key community stakeholders which included state-level, LEA, and site administrators, a board trustee, leaders from the collective bargaining groups, and parents. Input was collected at each meetings in the form of written documents. Student board members were provided with information about the proposal. Teachers played an "extremely active role" in the development of the proposal. Key union representatives were engaged in the formation of the professional growth plan. The minimum requirement was met.

(b) Letters of support from such key stakeholders...: In appendix 8 ten letters were provided. The letters were from parents and parent organizations, early learning programs, the business community, advocacy groups, and local civic and community-based organizations. The text of the letters recognized the integrity of the proposal and, in some cases (114th partership and Marin Community Foundation) references were made to Jerry Weast. There was a marked absence of letters of support from civil rights organizations and student organizations.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative and evidence provided for this section of the grant demonstrated an ambitious but achievable high quality plan that provides five key goals. The activities or plan of action to address each of the five goals are reasonable and are built the current infrastructure. The rationale is clearly presented in the discussion of the logic behind the reform proposal. PreK-3 grades are at the center of the discussion. The deliverables proposed in this section support the development of effective personalized learning strategies. Parties responsible for implementing the activities are not directly addressed in the narrative. In addition, a timeline is not included in the narrative.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) With the support of parents and educators, all students—

- Understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals: Personalized learning environments are at the center of this section. Data-driven strategies will be undertaken to develop milestones, support pedogogy that connects learning and school and real-life experiences (PBL) and family education activities. The focus here is on PreK-3 education.
- Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards...: A plan organized around three projects (based on grade bands) was presented in this section. The narrative provided the context for the project plan which appear to be based on empirical based research. With each project narrative was a table (C-1) that provided details on the key goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible party.
- Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest: The narrative focuses on the centrality that Project-based learning, after school programs, and summer school will promote self-directed and independent learning. There is no reference to empirical research in this section to support the claim that this approach wil strengthen student engagement and performance.
- Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives...:Project Four (4) addresses this element. There are two parts: part one focuses on cultural proficiency: 13 activities. Particularly impressive to this reader are activities 5 - 8 which address cultural proficiency for all staff, becoming an ally, addressing institutional racism, and identifying structural limitations. The second part addressed family engagement with 10 activities. The narrative provided the context for the project plan which appear to be based on empirical based research. With each project narrative was a table (C-1) that provided details on the key goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible party. There were no references to empirical research in this section.
- Master critical academic content and develop skills and traits...: Curriculum assignments and teacher approaches are described in a very short narrative. Small group and PBL are identified. Instructional strategies and models for developing mastery of critical academic content was not clearly defined in this section.

(b) With the support of parents and educators, there is a strategy to ensure that each student has access to—

- A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development...: The LEA will work with all three grade

bands. Differentiated opportunities are mentioned for high achieving students. Ideas are stated in general terms. There is no reference to specific ways that this will be achieved.

- A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments: Brief and refers to the discussion in the bullet above in achieving success at key milestones.
- High-quality content...: Real world relevance is a key feature in this section whereby students will be presented with strategies (not named here). A data portal with dashboards, etc. will be developed to expand access to data to multiple stakeholders and educational researchers.
- Ongoing and regular feedback...: A robust data and technology system will be the main avenue to this to be achieved. Two projects (#5-Student Data System Development and #6 RDE Expanded Learning Alignment) are described in detail. These two projects address sections a and b under section iv. The narrative is detailed in describing each project and a table (C-1) provides details on the goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible party(ies). The information presented in each cell is reasonable, ambitious, but achievable.
- Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students: The high need students identified in this LEA are English Learners. A Secondary English Learning Plan will be provided. A bilingual certificate of competence is another idea for development.

Mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students...: The Student Data Portal will serve as a major means of training. Four activities that include librarians, teachers, counselors, and technology support staff will achieve this goal. In sum, this plan has meets all of the criteria of a high-quality plan. The key goals are clearly identified, the activities to attain the goals are described in detail, the responsible parties for carrying out the activities and meeting the goals are identified, and the key deliverables are concrete and reasonable. The rationale is provided in general terms, but there is an absence of empirical evidence to support some of the claims made about strengthening student engagement and performance.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Note: Similar to all sections reviewed thus far (A, B, and C) an overview is presented at the beginning to set a context for the initiatives described in parts a, b, & c.

(a) All participating educators engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity to

- Support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies...:Personalized learning environments and strategies include professional development for teachers. A list of five activities are provided in this section. PD will be organized along the three grade bands with particular emphasis on PreK-3. In the PreK-3 band a list of four strategies are listed. CCSS training will also be provided to all teachers with Staff Development Teachers serving as instructional coaches and mentors. Professional learning communities will be strengthened in the process.
- Adapt content and instruction,...:The curricular response to this is to expand new models of instruction. No specific models are identified here. On-line resources are mentioned as a means of accessing additional curricular resources. Staff Development Teachers will serve as consultants and support.
- Frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards...: A single platform (LMS) will replace the present system that consists of six different non-integrated software programs. Teachers will be trained to access LMS as a means of informing instructional practice. Formative assessments will be conducted throughout a student's school year and experience. PFL will provide professional development. PFL is connected to the National Equity Project.
- Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback...:The narrative and data presented in this section was impressive. There appears to be a productive relationship between labor and management. Collaboration has yielded a reasonable, ambitious, but achievable high quality plan (goals, timeline, deliverables, rationale, responsible parties) for improving teacher effectiveness. Table C-3 provides a timeline for implementing the teacher evaluation system. What I did not see was detailed attention on the evaluation of principals with the exception of the framework in figure C-1.

(b) All participating educators have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

- Actionable information that helps educators...:A comprehensive learning management system will serve this purpose and will be in use by the teachers. Professional development will be provided for the them. The exact system (by name) is not identified here.
- High-quality learning resources...: Recognition of higher order thinking is made in this section. SRCS said it will work with teachers on evidence-based models (not specifically named or identified). Professional development will be offered.
- Processes and tools to match student needs...: Brief and general, the narrative states that the LEA has a number of

sources for processes and tools (not specifically named or identified). The Partnership for Deliberate Excellence and 114th Partnership are named as a partners in identifying approaches to achieve this goal.

(c) All participating school leaders and school leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data, and resources....

- Information...: The LEA will focus on four sets of activities listed on page 103. Each activity is described in detail. School culture and climate is not directly addressed in the narrative.
- Training, systems, and practices: Five programs are listed in this section. Professional development for new and veteran teachers is presented. Leadership will be reconfigured through an in-house leadership development program and realignment of central office personnel. How this will be achieved in terms of an existing approach that has been used in other LEAs is not provided.

(d) The applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals...: The narrative and evidence provided for this section of the grant demonstrated a plan that provides activities -- learning management system -- and rationale that is drawn on research conducted in Kentucky. Teachers are at the center of this plan with principals serving as administrative support. There is no mention of how hard-to-staff schools and subjects will be addressed. There is a statement at the end of the narrative that emphasizes the need for highly effective educators to serve English learners and Special Education students.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(a) Organizing the LEA central office, or the consortium governance structure...: At the beginning of the narrative the statement is made that there are no policy barriers to the proposed plan. The 2007 Roadmap initiative set a foundation for the proposed plan to continue working toward the initiatives and developing new ones as needed. The proposed plan (Deliberative) identifies five strategies that LEA leadership is responsible for implementing. An organizational chart (figure D-1) is presented in this section. The chart provides a clear understanding of how various entities listed at the top will operate to meet the needs of the three grade bands listed at the bottom. Documents in the appendices are referenced. This provides details which help to support this plan.</p> <p>(b) Providing school leadership teams in participating schools...: Brief description that does not provide details on how each element of this section is to be achieved. No specific models are presented.</p> <p>(c) Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery...: Mastery indicators are provided on pages 128 and 129. Earning credit is implied but there is no identification of specific (named) existing programs or programs beyond credit recovery and dual credit enrollment mentioned in bullet #6 on the outcomes list. There is an absence of information about how the dual credit program will work and specific universities and colleges in the collaboration.</p> <p>(d) Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways: Five initiatives are listed as ways to achieve this objective. There are no references to specific approaches to personalized teaching strategies.</p> <p>(e) Providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners: In the narrative there is recognition of the need to narrow the achievement gap between Latino students at the elementary level with other subgroups. Initiatives that are not named will track performances of English learners. There is no mention of how the LEA will address the needs of students with disabilities.</p> <p>In sum, there was a marked absence of details in the activities that will occur as a means of achieving the key goals. The rationale, deliverables, timeline, and responsible parties are mentioned in this section with limited description and details.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(a) Ensuring that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders , regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources...: The report generated by Booz Allen Hamilton is central to this</p>		

section. The entire report is provided in an appendix. The element that is not addressed in this section is "regardless of income." There is an absence of how families, students, and maybe staff and faculty who do not have the economic means to acquire access to the internet will be handled by the LEA if funded.

(b) Ensuring that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support...: Training will be made available to parents, families and students. Support from the Parent Engagement Task Force will be sought for this element. Specific programs, organizations, and community connections are not specifically named in this section.

(c) Using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format...: Repetitive sentence: "As SRCS advances its IT maturity..." begins the narrative of this section. Electronic tutors are mentioned. Cloud and cloud-based services are also mentioned. No specific programs that exist or that will be developed are mentioned here.

(d) Ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems...: Aeries is the current system and will be replaced with LMS that will be purchased in the first year. This new system will provide a variety of tasks that will help to identify and track "at risk" students.

Note: A table (D-2) on pages 138 and 139 provides three projects with goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties. This provides important details.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The strategy presented in the narrative has a management system that will provide timely and regular feedback. In their plan, they propose a three-point strategy that is described in this section. The narrative presents a concise discussion of how these three strategies will support phases one and two. Individuals responsible for the deliverables include key members of the RDE team Figure E-1 provides an excellent visual of the flow of continuous improvement data. Each individual position is fully described with details about the duties of each in this process. The RDE team will be responsible for monitoring, measuring, and publicly sharing the information on and progress made with the RTTT grant. Overall, the applicant provides a high-quality plan for continuous improvement because the goals are clearly indicated, the activities are mapped out in three strategies, the timeline is organized around two phases and the responsible parties are clearly indicated in the narrative. The rationale reflects previous work conducted in the LEA e.g., the DEP Charter document (appendix 3).</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders has been fully described in this section. The key goals are clearly identified, the activities are described and are reasonable, the responsible parties are identified, and the rationale is sound. Shared ownership is the key term that describes the charter that was created by internal and external stakeholders. Provided in appendix 3, the charter demonstrates a commitment to open dialogue among the stakeholders in the community of the LEA. A team, DELT, was created to serve as a public body of stakeholders to advise, monitor and provide oversight of curricular and policy initiatives. Clearly, this is a high-quality plan.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A total of twelve (12) performance measures were selected. The measures are cover all three grade bands in the LEA. Tables in this section provide quantitative data to describe target goals for five school years. The projected targets are reasonable and increments are appropriate.</p> <p>a. It's rationale for selecting that measure: The rationale provided for the performance measures are grounded on empirical based research. Throughout the narrative specific references in the form of footnotes are listed. The research is current.</p> <p>b. How the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information...: The tools for measure performance</p>		

include DIBELS, the California Healthy Kids Survey and the CAHSEE. College readiness will be linked to the expectations set by the University of California and California State University required for freshman admission. Absenteeism is an issue for K-5 students and it has serious implications for academic achievement in later grades. Attendance will be tracked by Attendance Works and Applied Survey Research. A support project for parents and families will also be provided.

- c. How it will review and improve the measure over time...: All of the measures and the strategies for measuring over time are reliable. A system of tracking individual students and grade bands will be in place to review and determine if adequate progress is made.

Overall, the narrative and supporting tables provide an ambitious, but achievable plan for addressing academic achievement, health and wellness, and college- and career-readiness. Key goals are imbedded in the performance measures, an empirical research based rationale is provided, activities are reasonable for implementation, deliverables are identified, and responsible parties for taking the lead in achieving the performance measures are identified. This is a high-quality plan.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 Plans to evaluate the effectiveness of RTTTD...: The DELT will take a leadership role in evaluating the effectiveness of RTTD. The LEA administration consisting of the superintendent and other members of this executive leadership are named and identified. The evaluation will take place on an annual basis and will include review of investments. The DELT will be instrumental throughout the process from the beginning to the end in each cycle of evaluation. They will take the lead in determining a response when an element of the RTTD project is not met or performed as expected.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- a. Identifies all funds that will support the project:
 - a. The budget is well organized. All proposed expenditures for RTTD funds are accounted for with a clear rationale. The proposed salaries are reasonable as is the amounts planned for release time (substitutes) for professional development.
 - b. Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development...: The budget is reasonable and sufficient to sustain the eight projects. The investment of RTTD is long-term in the sense that the proposal is designed to build infrastructure that will support the initiatives past the period of the grant in 2016.
 - c. Clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities..
 - i. A description of all of the funds...: Each description of proposed expenditures under each of the eight projects is clear and concise. When appropriate, funds from sources other than RTTD are described.
 - ii. Identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investment...: One-time investments are clearly described in the narrative in the budget and in the relevant sections e.g., Section C.

In sum, the budget narrative and tables present evidence of reasonable and sufficient support to implement the proposal. Ongoing funds are in the form of district funded projects in progress at the moment which include 4th - 8th grade teachers who are looking at the CCSS and working on formative and summative assessments and developing pacing guides.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The proposal provides for a high-quality plan for sustainability after the term of the grant. The key focus is to expand the strength of the current infrastructure of the LEA. In the narrative there is a recognition of the importance of sustaining the value of investments such as the RTTD funds in reforming the delivery and implementation of solid educational reform. In the narrative, there is a list of four strategies for sustaining the values over time. The parties who are responsible for meeting the goals and realizing the deliverables are clearly identified in the narrative. They include First 5 Marin, Head Start, and Marin Community Foundation. The LEA is committed to expanding the network of community partners such as community schools. Finally, the LEA has developed a working relationship with partners from Title I, 21st Century Learning, and United Way.

Clearly, this is a plan that recognizes the critical nature of sustainability after the term of the grant.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

(1) Provide a description of the coherent and sustainable partnership that it has formed with public or private organizations...:

- Central to the narrative is chronic early absence. Citing empirical research evidence from a study conducted by Chang, et al, the narrative draws a direct connection between the findings of a national problem to the local level. There is a stated need to address chronic absenteeism in kindergarten and first grade according to data collected in the LEA. This is well-documented and supported. If RTTD funding is granted to this LEA they will develop a partnership called "Comprehensive Attendance Support Partnership" which consists of public and private community entities. Together they will pool their resources and address the chronic absenteeism and strengthen student attendance. Later in this section they identify five specific entities – Marin Community Foundation, Canal Alliance, Parent Services Project, Bay Area Community Resources and First 5-- that will participate in CASP. Four of the five mentioned here provided letters of support and are in the appendix. In addition, the grant writer provides a concise description of each of the five entities citing the specific role, activity, and deliverable. This sets the context for a high quality plan that is ambitious, but achievable.

(2) Identify not more than 10 population-level desired results for students in the LEA or consortium of LEAs...:

- The proposal presents a reasonable plan that serves PreK-3 youth. A table is presented on page 172. The target results are reasonable, ambitious, and achievable.

(3) Describe how the partnership would –

(a) Track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children...:

- The SRCS learning management system will provide a means for tracking individual students and aggregates. Based on what I read in other parts of the proposal, this management system will be an efficient means of collecting the data and addressing the project indicators.

(b) Use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students...:

- CASP partners will work face-to-face with the youth and their families to address the causes of absenteeism. They will also work with teachers and other school staff to address these issues as well. High needs students and their families will be part of this initiative. The proposed activities assigned to the CASP to achieve key goals and deliver services is adequate.

(c) Develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students....:

- The plan is to begin with the PreK-3 grade band and expand to the other two grade bands via expansion of the partnership. Embedded in this plan is expand the pool of trainers and advocates. The strategy is reasonable and achievable as described in the plan.

(d) Improve results over time:

- Meetings will be held on a regular basis. The description is brief with an absence of a timeline or projected time of implementation and completion.

(4) Describe how the partnership would, within participating schools, integrate education and other services:

- The description in the narrative is concise and provides detailed explanations of each of the eight activities. In addition, a figure on page 176 presents a graphic overview of the range of activities that will address chronic absenteeism. Particular impressive in this section are the direct references to specific partners such as First 5 Marin, Marin Community Foundation, Parent Services Project and the Canal Alliance. There is enough information that is documented and supported with letters of support and a strong record of partnerships that convinces this reader that this is an ambitious, but achievable high quality plan.

(5) Describe how the partnership and LEA or consortium would build the capacity of staff in participating schools by providing them with tools and supports to

- This part of the proposal identifies five activities. Each activity addressed in this section is presented in concise descriptions. Particularly impressive are the references to strategies identified in sections A -- E in the proposal. This demonstrates a strong connection between the key goals set in the proposal and the priority identified in this optional section: chronic absenteeism. Given the abundance of data, empirical research based rationale, significant key goals, concrete deliverables, and pedagogically significant activities for achieving specific performance objectives, I see the LEA as being a good position to build capacity.

(6) Identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe desired results for students:

- Table X-1 on page 179 clearly demonstrates the feasibility of achieving the performance measures. The performance measures are clear and the incremental progress projected for each academic year of the grant is reasonable.

In summary, the proposal presents pedagogically significant goals, empirical research-based rationales, a reasonable timeline that reflects first-hand knowledge of the operation of schools and district business, concrete deliverables that will address the expressed needs in the key goals, and clear identification of parties accountable for meeting the goals, carrying out the activities, and partnerships internal and external to the LEA.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a coherent and comprehensive plan for creating effective learning environment and sustainability of reform after the grant has expired. The narratives, quantitative data, references to empirical research, and reform accomplished since 2007 with Roadman to the Future were particularly effective. This leads me to reach the conclusion that the grant demonstrated an ambitious, but achievable high quality plan. The plan provides clearly identifiable key goals, reasonable activities and empirically-supported rationales, a reasonable timeline, concrete deliverables, and a reasonable plan for parties responsible for implementing the activities. The work completed between 2007 and now is commendable and the plans proposed for funding by RTTT will definitely promote student progress among all of the students and their families. College and career-ready plans were sensible and focused on the critical nature of developing a solid foundation at the K-12 areas. Educators are recognized for their important contributions to the proposal through programs like the plans for expanding the work of current faculty and administrators in the area of professional development. Finally, the interest of community stakeholders is good and partnerships with entities such as 114th Partnership and National Equity Project will have a positive impact on reform in the duration of the grant and sustaining the efforts after the grant expires.

Total	210	184
-------	-----	-----