



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0427NM-1 for Santa Fe Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The vision for reform builds on the core educational assurance areas including aligning Common Core State Standards beginning with ELA and Mathematics. The district will 1) establish Professional Learning Communities and parent communication through a process to align the Standards with district designed assessments and lesson plans; wherein educators build a shared system of electronic curricula and teacher made materials. A 21st century learning environment is supported with resources to address graduation standards programs, early warning systems to increase the district's ranking in college and career readiness preK-12.</p> <p>2) The district has in place a system of school accountability based on state summative assessments. It employs a grading system by school to measure student growth and success holding principals accountable referred to as Value Added Modeling by school level. Teachers and other non-administrative staff will be assessed through a fair performance-based approach wherein the Professional Learning Communities and Principal Leadership Academies inform a research and outcomes based program focused on student growth and success.</p> <p>3) The vision does not address recruiting, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most. There is a vision to develop personalized learning environments, common core curriculum and professional development for teachers, but little else is addressed in the vision in this area.</p> <p>4) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools is part of the proposed program because the target schools are selected based on two years under-achievement in the transformation zones. However, the applicant does not address turning around lowest-achieving schools in the vision section</p> <p>This section was allotted a middle score at the mid range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant selected all the schools in the district that were identified in the lowest zone, out of a possible three zones. This is a strong response to implementing effective and comprehensive reform. The school participants were selected based on a state established zones. The applicant listed and presented the participating schools with clear and substantial data on student status to include 84% low income and 92% high need students. The target schools contain 39% of the total students and 447 participating educators.</p> <p>There was a last minute addition of three schools without a full rationale as to why they were not identified in the lowest zone originally and the data was not provided on these late additions with estimated number of educators, student data on low income and high need status. In addition, two of the schools are identified in the narrative as feeder schools to the high school. Yet the feeder patterns for the other schools were not discussed. A high score at the high range was allotted.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a reform proposal that will be scaled up to district-wide change appealing to the foundation established by the strategic plan of 2012 and identifying the theory for action placed on improving learning and teaching for every adult in the system, and for better family involvement. The applicant describes a number of support programs and approaches that are calibrated by zone, a whole-district model of reform. There are compelling components for district-wide change including a program for new teacher recruitment, a school evaluation system, leadership academies, and professional</p>		

learning communities.

The applicant, however, provided a three year general roll out period and the specifics of a timeline with details of activities and parties involved, for instance, were not provided for a high quality five-year plan. There was little reference to target schools, the number of teachers, students affected, by grade-levels and content areas. The brush stroke was wide. For example, the emphasis on high school is a pressing charge, but details of the math activities matched to goals and deliverables, for instance, to address how the plan responds to the highest problem content area need in math was not in depth in this plan. Therefore, a rating of medium at the mid-low level was allotted.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In all student outcomes, the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance. The vision prescribed by the applicant is likely to substantially decrease achievement gaps and increase equity as demonstrated by summative assessments. The applicant abides by the application document's definition of the achievement gap by providing sub-group scores that account for the difference in the performance between each subgroup within a participating LEA or school and the (statewide) average performance of the LEA's highest-achieving subgroups in reading or language arts and in mathematics. This comparison base will equal or exceed the state ESEA target for the LEA based on the approved ESEA waiver. The Hispanic gap, for instance goes from 32 to 20 in reading, and from 30 to 22 in math which appears ambitious over the four years of the grant.

The reported college and career readiness indicators by subgroups, and by schools, document baselines through final 2017 with achievable and ambitious targets. In addition, the applicant addressed how it will report college enrollment and post-secondary education by sub-groups with the deployment of the Naviance System and Next Step Plans.

The reported college and career readiness by subgroups and schools is substantially documented with baselines through final 2017 with achievable and ambitious targets. In addition, the applicant addressed how it will report college enrollment and post-secondary education by sub-groups with the deployment of the Naviance System and Next Step Plans. Last of all, the graduation rates are ambitious and achievable with targets for the participating high school based on a pure growth model. Full points were awarded.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reported comprehensively on the achievement gaps in reading and math. The LEA showed an inconsistent track record for achievement data by subgroups, grades, and content areas. However, the applicant stated that the "all group" category is composed mostly of sub-groups. It is true that 80% is the sub-group population in the all-group category because the LEA enrolls only 16% Caucasian. So this makes the academic growth of the all-category somewhat notable because in that sector, four out of six growth data display increases around 20 points over four years.

The applicant described graduation rates as meeting only "some success." The applicant also presented that there is little record available to report and can not report success in increasing college enrollment.

The applicant presented evidence of its experience in supporting turn-around schools. The turn-around process doubled student outcomes but the range of success was still low, between 22 - 42% proficiency in math and reading. The achievement gaps were not reduced.

The applicant reported that the data system is well in place already and supports the needs of educators, parents, and students. There are areas of the proposal where data is described as a developing reform agenda that will inform decision-making, professional learning communities, PD, and online assessment embedded lessons. Across the proposal, the teacher PD and the Leadership Academies embrace data-based decision making to inform instruction; and there is solid evidence the district is currently using principal compacts that are based on student growth measures and these are in place for all schools.

This data reveal disturbing glimpses that are not explained. For example, the percent proficient for English learners dropped to only 1% from 31% over three years in 11th grade. In fact, few of the data points for the sub-groups across 3rd, 8th and 11th grades are promising. Therefore, this section was scored at the middle level mid range because important first steps are in place but a record of achievement over four years is notably absent.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is a high level of transparency in school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction from instructional support to administration through Website budgets and annual audits and following state statutes cited in the narrative. Personnel and non-personnel expenditures were included. Therefore, this section was allotted full points.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrated evidence of autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement personalized learning environments. The governor gave the school district autonomy to use self-selected measures to improve teacher effectiveness. By state statute, the school board has control over the district's budget and the authority to determine instructional systems. The applicant states, therefore, that it has full authority and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement personalized learning environments. The applicant provides a strong letter of support from the Mayor, and a lively process of review and feedback with the State Department of Education in which the applicant gainfully participated. Therefore, full points were allotted this section.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Across the proposal and within the Appendix, the applicant provided solid evidence of engaging stakeholder-support in developing the proposal. There were a number of Community Conversations and a bilingual survey for parents as feedback on the proposal. In addition support for the proposal by school personnel was documented through disseminating an Executive Summary and teacher signatures from each participating school in the Appendix. The applicant stated that, for the schools named in the application, the Principals secured feedback from parents and teachers. In other places in the proposal, the district documented how it provided Spanish interpretation, childcare and handicap accessibility to its community forums.</p> <p>In addition, the strategic plan makes a large case for the district's effort by way of the executive team to include feedback on the proposal from 305 teachers, parents, students, and community members. There were 22 input sessions including teachers' union members and students from October 2011 through February 2012.</p> <p>Following romanette "i" for collective bargaining, the LEA's collective bargaining unit did not provide a letter of support. However, there were a number of teacher signatures to document site level support and one dissenting teacher questioning the process for signing without clear information. This was from one of the schools added in the last moment. Therefore, it is clear that the applicant followed a process to document teacher support in the participating schools.</p> <p>There were over a dozen letters of strong support from meaningful stakeholders including IHEs, educational organizations, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Mayor. Therefore, all considered, this section received full points.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not describe a high quality plan for an analysis of the current status in implementing personalized learning environments. There are no timelines, no goal statements, no prescribed activities, and no responsible parties to carry out a high quality plan for an analysis.</p> <p>The applicant provided a partial and limited picture of the current status of the personalized learning environments. It identified a gap in the use of data and reported that on-going professional development is in place utilizing student achievement data.</p> <p>The logic behind the reform proposal is limited in scope and breadth. The applicant reported only that it will build on research to implement professional learning communities providing data-driven tools for teachers at the individual student level. The plan for the professional development for teachers does not provide a strong or compelling plan of action. It is vague and general and lacks depth by simply reporting a need to improve rigor, differentiation and engagement in classroom practice. Therefore a middle score in the low range was awarded.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a high quality program to help create a college-going culture for K-12 students supported by parents and educators. The high quality content in digital learning includes college/career readiness programs that are described to be personalized for students and supported by teachers and families through Individual Learning Plans mounted on an accessible computer platform. The applicant's college/career readiness program offers individualized support and self-monitoring systems. The applicant describes fairly robust technology program with a comprehensive number college readiness systems at the middle and high school. Student's participate in deep learning about how to plan for college and careers and, common core state standards guide teacher planning and monitoring on-track courses.

Additionally, diverse methods such as multicultural education, cooperative learning, and culturally authentic books will be incorporated in the professional development program and provided at target sites. Recognizing that diversity in pedagogy is important, it will be part of the identification of effective and highly effective educators

There is opportunity for frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards. Counselors, course planners, early alerts address the ability of these systems to be updated and to determine progress toward mastery of college and career-ready standards. The approach uses a technology platform including digital learning content that is frequently updated and can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college-career-ready standards. For example, a program for monitoring course selection and early warning systems for students who begin to exhibit truant behaviors will be utilized with counselors. There is family/teacher access to the information. There are on-line assessments, readiness courses, test preparation, and career counseling to monitor and adjust individualized student pathways designed to develop college and career readiness.

The applicant provides a very limited example of accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students. There are two. One is AVID, added for the elementary grades. The other is an online math tutoring program in algebra, designed especially for high-need students.

The mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided are not well developed. The mechanism is described as setting up a trainer-of-trainer model where students are experts in the classroom and they also teach their parents. There was little adult guidance for parents and no structured implementation plan. There is no consideration of buy-in for the students by offering incentives or promoting the student role. Without buy-in, the technology experts have little chance of success. Additionally, there was no teacher support for working with the technology experts, and there is little in the way of a budget to support personnel to provide this program of training needed so students know how to use the technology.

The applicant did not identify a clear succession of roll-out activities linked to a timeline, deliverables, and person responsible as required for a high quality plan. It was difficult to understand how many teachers would be included in the profession development for using the algebra program, for instance. The applicant did not present a plan for training, or a clear succession of roll-out activities linked to a timeline, deliverables, and person responsible. A middle score at the upper range was awarded.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not have a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching because it does not provide processes and tools to continuously improve feedback about effectiveness. It does not provide a clear approach to train the targeted educators, and there is not a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including hard-to-staff schools, subjects and specialty areas.

The strength of this section is that the applicant sufficiently described how its teacher-leader learning communities will provide individualized learning environments for teachers with a platform of computer programs and Professional Learning Communities implementing Common Core State Standards. The platform of programs to support personalized learning for teachers is: the Frameworks Toolkit, a professional development management and evaluation system for planning (My Learning Plan) and an observation system which include personalized choices for professional learning experiences for teachers. Additionally, the applicant describes how these components would be used to ensure teachers know how to and can help students graduate on time and be college/career ready based on the programs that are provided for students. These programs allow for common and individual tasks such as ACT, Response to Intervention, AVID, etc.

There are frequent opportunities for assessment within the computer programs and opportunities for teacher professional learning communities across schools on a routine basis. In addition, the principals identify problems in practice through Instructional Rounds, developed in a sequence from one school to the next. The process is expected to mount an effective/highly effective rating for educators. Student growth measures are used in principal compacts and will be used with teacher evaluation. The District will monitor progress using student growth measures connected to teacher, class, and school but it is unclear how this will be done. The applicant did not describe how the evaluation system will be used, and does not have a definition of the components. The applicant did not address how the system will help improve effectiveness, school culture, and climate for continuous school improvement.

The applicant did not match student needs with the processes and tools to continuously improve feedback about effectiveness of the resources. The processes and tools were vague, referred to as tracking data-trends and patterns of achievement. The applicant did not identify specific methods or statistical analyses in qualitative or quantitative terms. The processes for obtaining feedback and the knowledge of using tools to inform implementation of the programs were not evident.

Access and practical knowledge of tools, data and resources to improve instruction are, in part, developed through Professional Learning Communities and Leadership Academies. However, it was not clear how teachers and principals would be trained, when the training would take place, and how the program would be implemented over the five years of the grant.

There was no plan to address hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. The applicant will place teachers (with longer experience in the district) to address gaps in reading levels. Clearly, there was not a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including hard-to-staff schools, subjects and specialty areas.

The applicant will employ a project manager and assessment teams with little evidence of a high quality plan to demonstrate organization of these human resources, goals, activities, and timelines. Therefore, a middle score at the mid-low range was allotted.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	7

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district has identified staff for the central office but did not address how it will organize the central office to provide support and services to the participating schools. There will be four new positions at the central office but the a management structure was not provided.

Currently there is a new Chief Academic Officer in the central office and three others are soon to be installed. The District has also extensively described its approach to Professional Learning Communities and Leadership Academies. In addition, every staff member can now participate in individualized professional development services through an online course offering, PD360. In this way, the central office identified personnel to support participating schools.

The applicant noted that there is autonomy exercised at the target sites for school based leadership in areas related to the proposed reform. The leadership teams have been given autonomy over factors such as curriculum materials, school schedules, personnel decisions and staffing models.

The district has trained 140 teacher experts in the Common Core State Standards and a platform of resources and research-based approaches are described to begin a reform-based program of instruction. English language learners and special needs students are focal to the District's professional development platform, but outside of the Algebra program and extending AVID to the elementary grades, the professional development, services and instruction for special needs and language learners were not addressed in this section.

The students are provided opportunities in dual credit courses and course acceleration while other approaches are being investigated through a High School Task Force. However, the applicant presented no evidence that it would provide students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent in a seat on a topic, or giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

Although the applicant describes some practices, programs and new personnel for implementing many elements of reform, there were many shortcomings. For example, there was no high quality plan with a timeline for carrying out implementation that is specific, measured, focused and a process to determine when goals are met. A plan showing the flow of communication or the organizational structure between the central office and the school sites, for example, was not evident. The resources

and program goals were not organized to show how they would be rolled out for the target schools and implemented across the five years of the grant. Therefore, a middle score at the mid range was allotted.

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

10

6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant will provide programs for training parents and students on content, tools, and other learning resources to implement the applicant's proposal with technical support, both in and out of school. The district will provide computer literacy in the school community for students and parents using a number of strategies such as: peer-assistance, tutoring, and workshops. Educators also will be engaged with students and parents utilizing the tools and technology within a highly mobile, elaborate, and extensive system.

Other stakeholders will be able to use the district's Powerschool (the system interoperability framework) such as in libraries, for nursing software, transportation software, etc. The district will involve community stakeholders with the Student Information System, an interoperable compliant open format system.

However, there was not a clear high-quality plan, for example, to address the barriers to access for low income households. There was not a clear high-quality plan for training and technical support for educators as to when and how technical support would be provided. The ability to export open data and securely store data by parents outside of school was not addressed.

The district does not provide a high-quality plan that conveys how the infrastructure over the five years of the grant will be built. There is not a high quality plan with timelines, persons responsible, and deliverables. A middle score at the upper range was allotted because the applicant addressed many, but not all, of the criteria.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides very little in the way of procedures and strategies to provide on-going feedback and adjustment during implementation. The applicant stated that qualitative and quantitative data collection will be carried out without identifying for which programs, which students, etc. Additionally, the applicant stated that the design of the evaluation is to provide roles for all stakeholders, but there are only broad and general terms and little in the way of describing a means for feedback and continuous improvement.

The District does not provide a strategy for implementing a rigorous and continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the grant. The applicant did not specify how this program of continuous improvement operates for the term of the grant and thereafter. It was not clear when the monitoring systems are deployed for each of the major program components over each year of the grant.

Outside of the use of performance compacts and state standard scores, evaluation of implementation and identifying oversight procedures were not discussed. There was no discussion about how to adjust implementation or problem-solve unexpected challenges. There was no person responsible for collecting anecdotal information, field notes and monitoring the ongoing conversations for each major program component. There was no basis for an organization approach to developing feedback, analyzing outcomes in a on-going methodical fashion. Therefore this section was allotted a low score at the high range.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant described a number of ongoing communication strategies with and engagement resources to update the community and external/internal stakeholders about the grant program. Annual reports are provided on the website from central staff personnel to update the school district's internal stakeholders. Reports are provided such as school report cards, school grades, and report cards for the schools in the program.

There will be a RTT-D website and community forums though public broadcasting, an American Graduate series. The district was successful with the 2012 Community Forum to begin the feedback process for the proposal. Therefore the program will build on its success with access via Spanish interpreters, handicap access, and childcare during forums. This section scored

full points.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The rationale for selecting the performance measures was related to the tests already in place, related to the objective to determine the student readiness for college and careers, and related to the Individualized Learning Plan, Early Alert System, and compatibility with the existing database system.

The applicant did not provide consistent rigor in the design of the performance measures. Some were not measurable (referrals will decrease, ELA scores will increase, etc). A decrease in referrals was posed as an indicator of increased social consciousness and also as a measure of community based service learning. Both pose spurious data at best. The FAFSA would be completed for all students at the high school without reference to the appropriate grade levels or a successful completion criteria. There was no discussion of improving the measures over time. For these reasons, this section was rated at a middle level in the lower range.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide a high quality plan for the evaluation of the program. There are resources that can be used for evaluation and documentation that will be gathered by district leaders on professional development plans. For example, the district will use commercial evaluation systems for professional development whereby the principals will determine effectiveness of teachers as the indicator of a successful professional development programs. The principals will conduct the needs assessments and educators will document their professional growth.

Outside of these processes and programs, there was no coherent evaluation plan for student components, parent components, and oversight of each principal/school's evaluation to monitor overall implementation and insure consistency and uniform evaluation that informs program implementation processes. The responses to evaluation are not multifaceted to show a range of measures. A medium score, low range was allotted.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant identifies some of the areas of the budget but did not provide sufficient budget items. It did not clearly provide a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities including a description of all the funds and identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period. There was little in the way of strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environment.</p> <p>For example, the applicant did not provide evidence of substantial human resources to implement the program successfully such as: technology personnel support for school sites, counselors and lead counselors to implement the new college readiness systems, and human resources support including additional secretarial / office administration, a parent-project budget, and supplies and office materials. It is not clear what funds were RTT-D, LEA, state or other federal funds. The score allotted was middle at the mid range.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant describes a solid rationale for building an infrastructure that will be maintained after the life of the grant. The professional development teams, the principal leadership programs, the investments in technology and college/career readiness will all become institutionalized. Additional enrollment will increase the funding for the schools based on successful and viable programs in place. There will be expanded employment opportunities as increases in businesses and services in the community result from a higher educated workforce. The applicant provides a viable plan for sustainability of the project.</p>		

It was not clear that the plan for sustainability of all Race to the Top programs through the building of a strong LEA infrastructure mainly because the applicant did not stipulate State and local government leaders to build upon the infrastructure nor other financial sources. Therefore, this section received a high score at the lowest range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identified a number of businesses and institutions of higher education to work in partnership to support increasing graduation rates, dual credit programs, and increase successful transitions to higher education. The results are identified for not more than 10 population-level measures or outcomes. The partnerships were described to scale up over time and were integrated into the school program.

The partnership with the broadcasting service, PBS, is very well developed in that it will emphasize needs for students facing significant challenges as drop-outs, The applicant stated approaches will be explored to scale-up the program.

The LEA addressed each area from 5) a. through 5) e. in a direct, single-line item approach. For instance, it includes a way to assess the needs and assets of participating students through online survey tools for teachers. Another example is that it will identify and provide oversight on the needs and assets of the school and community aligned with those goals for improving education and family and community supported identified through a resource list. In this way the LEA addressed each of the a-e items as required.

The shortcomings were only that the improvement of the program over time was not clearly developed. The aggregated and student level data were vague and the suggestions for improvement lacked detail of planning for a high quality plan (person responsible, timeline, deliverables, etc). Therefore this section was scored at the middle level at the higher range

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant defines a program to develop Personalized Learning Environments but the proposal did not meet the definition requirement for an educator evaluation system. It did not include student growth measures for teachers and for superintendents. There is no plan for a teacher and superintendent evaluation system (as defined by the grant application document) to be in place in year-two of the grant because the district's strategic plan pertains to year-one, and the RTT-D three year roll-out plan is insufficient in detail. It does not state that there are at least three levels to rate the educator; nor does the applicant define the components of the evaluation system, except that it will include student growth measures.

A second area not meeting the Absolute Priority concerned recruiting, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most, as in hard to staff subject and special needs student programs. The proposal did not address this part of the Absolute Priority because it did not define how it will provide a program to encourage and reward teachers to teach in hard to staff subject areas. Although it will recruit new teachers, the applicant did not reference supply and need in special education and with bilingual/special education teachers in particular. Neither were addressed, and therefore, the second Absolute Priority was not met.

On the other hand, the district met the Absolute Priority in its ability to establish Professional Learning Communities and parent communication through a process to align the Standards with district designed assessments and lesson plans; wherein educators build a shared system of electronic curricula and teacher made materials. A 21st century learning environment is supported with resources to address graduation standards programs, early warning systems to increase the district's ranking in college and career readiness preK-12.

Also, the district clearly met the Absolute Priority to have a system of school accountability based on state summative assessments in place. It employs a grading system by school to measure student growth and success holding principals accountable, referred to as Value Added Modeling by school level. Teachers and other non-administrative staff will be

assessed through a fair performance-based approach, wherein the Professional Learning Communities and Principal Leadership Academies inform a research and outcomes based program. The program is focused on student growth and success.

Total	210	127
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0427NM-2 for Santa Fe Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: A(1) The applicant's discussion of its reform vision, including the LEA's strategic plan that was appended, lacks coherence and specificity regarding the overall purpose of personalized learning, particularly with regard to student academic interests. It makes little or no reference to either accelerating student achievement or deepening student learning. Little attention to individual student needs is reflected in the vision. This criterion was rated in the low range.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: A(2) The applicant provided a thorough response to this criterion's requirements. The explanation for the selection of project schools was reasonable (based on use of the LEA's School Zone system aligned with the state's school accountability grading system) and supported by the district's strategic plan. Data regarding how the schools were selected and the number of participating students meet program requirements were appropriate. This criterion was rated in the high range.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: A(3) The application included a description of a theory of change that followed a logical path from improving the quality of teaching and increasing levels of family engagements leading to more rigorous classroom experiences enabling students to graduate on a path to college and career success. The application describes strategies relevant to the theory of change. The application includes a 3-year rollout plan suggesting how district-wide change will be pursued through periodic review of the categorizationj of schools based on a set six assignment criteria. It is unclear how the resource-intensive project's approach in the project schools can be scaled up in other schools. Finally, the timeline lacks several of the required components (e.g., deliverables, parties) of a high-quality plan. This criterion was rated in the middle range.		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A(4)</p> <p>The application completely addresses the full content of this criterion related to setting goals in the areas of performance on summative assessment, closing achievement gaps, and increasing graduation rates and college enrollment. The college enrollment goal, starting from a very low baseline, is ambitious and supported by the character of the college/career planning strategies to be implemented. In contrast, the goals for student performance in the other areas appear to be insufficiently ambitious (e.g., less than one-half of middle and high school students will score at proficient levels by the end of the project and the per year increases are limited). In addition, current achievement gaps among subgroups are projected to remain.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the middle range.</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	3
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>B(1)</p> <p>Evidence is lacking regarding a record of success in advancing student achievement over the past four years based on the tables included in the application for summative assessments, gap closing, or graduation rates. Data showing gains are only provided for selected grade levels in reading and math although the tests are administered across grade levels annually. The application does provide one impressive example of significant reform in a low achieving school (Ramirez Thomas ES) but since this school was not the only one undertaking the particular reform, the evidence is not fully convincing. The application provides a reasonable description of how student performance data is available to students, teachers, and parents but the complexity of retrieving such data may require user training and the application does not address this potential obstacle.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the low range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>B (2)</p> <p>The discussion of how the district has made expenditure data transparent to the public fails to specify whether such data at the school level (rather than district) is available. Appendix G details actual salaries by personnel categories but the application is confusing about whether such data are publicly available.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the low range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>B(3)</p> <p>The application presents ample and convincing evidence in the form providing language drawn from state statutes and regulations regarding relative responsibilities of the state and district and the district's autonomy and ability to implement the proposed learning environments</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the high range.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

B(4)

The discussion of how the district engaged stakeholders in the development of the proposal, including making revisions based on feedback was lacking. Instead, the application appeared to have been developed internally by the district and then shared with the stakeholder community. The discussion of support of teachers in participating schools was confusing as to whether teachers were represented under collective bargaining or not. Evidence is lacking regarding whether the threshold of 70 percent of teachers supporting the proposal was met.

This criterion was rated in the low range.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

B(5)

The application provides a detailed, evidence-based analysis of identified needs and gaps to be addressed by the project in Appendix I. It also documents the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments, chiefly operating at the elementary school level.

This criterion was rated in the high range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	11

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

C(1)

The application presents a comprehensive approach to improving student learning outcomes related to the goal of becoming college and career ready; the approach as described is relevant for the most part to students at the secondary level. A weakness in the discussion is the inattention to project components for elementary school students, although project schools include elementary schools. The approach's focus on involving the student in planning, helping the student make appropriate choices regarding courses, and receiving feedback on progress appears reasonable. There was insufficient discussion of how exposure to diverse cultures resulted in deep learning experiences, but plans for providing such exposure were illustrated thoroughly with examples. The application's description of the variety of programs the project proposes to use to support personalized learning (e.g. EPAS, P21 Common Core Toolkit, AVID, Own the Turf, TTM, Achieve 3000, ALEKS Quick Tables) could have been more extensive and focused more fully on the aspect of personalization but a general sense of appropriateness was conveyed. One weakness may be the plan to institute so many different planning, curriculum, and assessment programs; expecting teachers to manage them and students and their families to understand the data produced by them may be unrealistic. Finally, the discussion did not actually include all of the elements required of a high quality plan, as specified in the criterion.

This criterion was rated in the middle range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

C(2)

The proposed Instructional Improvement System that will pull together currently separate sources student-level information makes a useful contribution to personalizing the learning environment. Plans to regularly and frequently measure student progress to improve teachers' efforts to meet individual student needs are robust, as illustrated in a chart in this section. The approach in the application to ensure that teachers and principals are able to successfully implement the proposed practices rests on a belief, unsupported by past performance, that the staff in these low-performing schools will, through professional learning communities, be able to master a complex set of strategies. The leadership role of the district to guide and support

the schools during implementation is virtually absent. The project proposes to bring a large number of interventions into the schools and the application fails to address issues of potential incompatibility, redundancy, and discrepancies between these “canned” programs and the district’s own strategic goals. Discussion of specific details such as what the Instructional Rounds (classroom visits) are looking at in relation to the project goals and links between teacher’s professional development plans and teacher evaluations is obscure. Finally, the application does not provide a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

This criterion was rated in the low range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: D(1) The application describes changes in district staffing and organization that demonstrate the district’s intention to provide support and services to all participating schools (i.e., creation of position of Chief Academic Officer charged, along with the Office of Curriculum and Instruction with providing on-site, targeted support in the four core academic areas). The application presents convincing evidence regarding the degree of flexibility and autonomy provided schools, including school-level budgeting and ability to modify school schedules. . The application also demonstrates some efforts currently being studied related to the award of course credits based on mastery by a High School Reform Task Force. This criterion was rated in the middle range.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: D(2) The discussion of supporting parents raised issues of sufficiency and relevance. The application was unconvincing regarding how the information technology systems in use were sensitive to limitations families might have in accessing online data (e.g., access to computers). The description of possible courses offered through the Parent Academy in areas such as Personal Growth and Arts & Culture appeared to have little relevance to the focus on preparing students for college and careers through personalized learning environments. Application content related to other components of the criterion was adequate. This criterion was rated in the middle range.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: E(1) The proposed assessment systems related to project goals are strong evidence of strategies to employ a continuous improvement process; they include stakeholder surveys to obtain feedback on project strategies and suggestions for improvement for formative purposes and Discovery Education Assessments, SBA scores, ACT test scores for assessing results on student learning. Relying mostly on annual assessments to inform continuous improvement will hamper the ability to make adjustments in a timely manner. Plans to include reviews of technology systems to provide feedback on revisions are vague. The requirement to publicly share information on the quality of the investments funded by RTTT-D was not addressed specifically. This criterion was rated in the middle range.		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E(2)</p> <p>The application includes an extensive and appropriate description of strategies the district plans to use for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders, including Powerschool where parents can find out what's going on at a student's school anytime and annual reports from the Assessment and Accountability Office, and the use of social media such as Twitter.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the high range.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E(3)</p> <p>The number and type of performance measures meet the requirements of this criterion. The academic measures logically relate to project goals for improved achievement and readiness for college and careers. The non-cognitive performance measures are appropriate for the grade level and align well with the project goals related to student behavior. The application, however, does not address provisions to review the measures over time if they prove insufficient to gauge implementation progress.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the low range.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E(4)</p> <p>Except for inclusion of a discussion to evaluate the relationship of professional development to project results, the application does not lay out a sound, reasonable approach to evaluating the effectiveness of the investments of time, staff, money, or other resources related to project activities, as well as the multiple strategies and programs incorporated into the project. Trying to establish the contribution of individual project elements to results requires a design not presented in the application.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the low range.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>F(1)</p> <p>The application provides a comprehensive presentation of overall and project-level budgets regarding the use of RTTT-D grant funds. The application's discussion of other funding (primarily from the district) is a superficial, multi-year estimate. The budget appears to be reasonable and sufficient to support the proposal. The assumptions regarding long term sustainability are unconvincing. For example, there is no evidence that the district has or will identify project components that are ineffective and re-purpose resources. It also appears unlikely that, without the grant funding for the proposed professional development program (i.e., extended hours for teachers to plan within professional learning communities), this effort can be sustained.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the middle range.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

F(2)

The application provides no convincing evidence of financial support to sustain the project's goals after the term of the grant. No budget for years after the term of the grant is included in the application; that requirement is not met. However, there are letters of support from local government leaders, as well as a number of institutions of higher education and the local business community and the application discusses the possibility of securing additional grants. The application addresses sustaining efforts by (1) eliminating programs tried and deemed to be unhelpful and (2) building capacity within the district to continue efforts (e.g., the principal evaluation system) without external programs.

This criterion was rated in the middle range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Competitive Preference Priority

The application's response to the competitive preference priority is inadequate and incompatible with the priority's emphasis on partnerships and outcomes beyond academic performance (i.e., social, emotional, behavioral). The application fails to describe partnerships with organizations outside the school district and provides no evidence in the text of understanding that the priority concerns the integration of education and other services. What the application discusses are partnerships with public television regarding support for early learning and with institutions of higher education for teachers (e.g., Practitioner Researchers) and students (e.g., dual enrollment). There is also a lack of attention to the inclusion and support of families of participating students.

This criterion was rated in the low range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Absolute Priority: Yes

The application details the district's approach to personalizing strategies, tools, and supports for students that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. The project will implement a large number of programs to support academic achievement and student-centered processes for planning an instructional program, as well as activities to use data related to student and teacher performance more effectively by use of a consolidated information system. The project's emphasis on professional development demonstrates support for providing students with access to the most effective teachers.

Total	210	92
-------	-----	----

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0427NM-3 for Santa Fe Public Schools



A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Santa Fe has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that addresses all four core educational assurance areas using a 5-pronged approach as follows:

1. Standards and Assessment for Students to be College and Career Ready

The district plan calls for implementation of the Common Core State Standards effective for the 2012 – 2013 school year and assessment systems that measure student academic achievement in reading and mathematics, graduation rates, college and career readiness, and development of individual learning plans. New assessment systems for evaluating teachers, principals, and academic departments, as well as professional development activities and attainment of individual school Performance Compacts are also integral to this district's RTTT-D plan. The district plan provides for multiple instructional tools for accelerating student achievement such as Achieve3000, ALEKS Quick Tables with Think Through Math, ACT learning resources, P21(Partnership for 21st Century Skills) *Common Core Toolkit* and its *Framework for 21st Century Skills*. These programs will be combined with a new Individual Instructional System for personalized student support.

2. Data Systems to Measure Student Growth

Several data systems for measuring student growth are planned, including but not limited to Discovery Education Assessments, Achieve3000 Lexiles, AVID (Advancement via Individual Determination) student progress measures, ACT College and Career Readiness instruments, PowerSchool and School Net student data management systems, and OASYS, Response to Intervention software, and Naviance, a college and career-readiness platform..

3. Recruitment, Development, and Retaining of Effective Teachers and Principals

The district has plans for a New Teacher Project to strengthen recruiting and hiring practices and will also have a Leadership Academy for developing teachers for school leadership. A wide range of ongoing, job-embedded professional development based on an analysis of teacher instructional strengths and areas for growth will also address this educational assurance area. A new teacher evaluation system will integrate the Charlotte Danielson model of teacher observation and MyLearning Plan and Instructional Rounds.

4. Turning Around Low-Achieving Schools

Using student achievement and growth measures, as well as the state's School Grading System, the district has identified its low-achieving schools. It is proposed that these Transformation Zone" schools will have increased and differentiated resources and support to transform them from F - C schools to C – A schools within the grant period. All schools in the district, including those now within the district's new Acceleration and Innovation Achievement Zones, have Performance Compact targets for student achievement, school operations, community satisfaction, and instructional leadership that must be met as part of the district's efforts toward deep changes in the teaching-learning paradigm.

LEA-wide SMART goals. The goals are: "1) Improve] the quality of teaching and learning at every school; (2) Heighten expectations for every adult and student in the system; and 3) Increase the levels of family and community engagement

throughout the city (emphasis added).” The five primary strategies for district-wide reform includes: Performance Compacts for each school, differentiated funding and resources, differentiated monitoring, establishment of a committee to plan reform at the middle and high school grades, and parent involvement. The RTTT plan states that all teachers and administrators will be evaluated based on set performance goals

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

10

8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district selected its Transformation Schools (those schools with low student achievement for two years) using the NM school accountability grading system and student performance on state tests. The state’s school accountability system meets state and federal requirements for measuring Adequate Yearly Progress. Schools are given a grade of A – F indicating student growth over time. The district’s targeted schools are those with grades of F - C, with the goal being to “transform” the schools so that they will become C - A schools within the grant period. The number of participating educators in the participating schools is 447. The district also documented in its completed *Applicant’s Approach to Implementation Table* the participating schools, and demographics of participating students (84% of participating students in these schools are low-income and 92% are high-need students out of 4886 participating students). The table also lists the grade spans for the project, participating schools collectively meet the competition’s eligibility requirements. The selected schools, participating grade spans and each school’s state grade on student achievement are provided in the above-referenced table. In totality, the percent of low-income and high need students for the district is above requirements. Three of the plan’s 10 participating schools were added to the RTTT-D project just before the proposal was due so that all student demographics for these schools could not be collected. The district will have to provide this information within 100 days of the grant award if Santa Fe is successful in its application.

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

10

5

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The RTTT-D grant requires that applicant’s plans enumerate key goals and the activities for achieving the district’s reform goals, a reasonable implementation timeline, designated and appropriate deliverables and staff responsibilities for a credible reform plan overall. This application delineates a plan for district-wide reform based on a Theory of Action originally articulated in the district’s one year-old system-wide *Choose Success* Strategic Plan that specifically calls for LEA-wide SMART goals. The goals are: : “1) Improve] the quality of teaching and learning at every school; (2) Heighten expectations for every adult and student in the system; and 3) Increase the levels of family and community engagement throughout the city (emphasis added).” The five primary strategies for district-wide reform includes: Performance Compacts for each school, differentiated funding and resources, differentiated monitoring, establishment of a committee to plan reform at the middle and high school grades, and parent involvement. The RTTT plan states that all teachers and administrators will be evaluated based on set performance goals and that all students will be expected to meet college readiness standards, regardless of the district school that they attend. The AVID program in the district’s design will be scaled up to all district elementary and middle schools.

The district’s only a 3-year RTTT-D timeline of implementation for each of the five primary strategies for achieving its goals that is sequenced and includes benchmarks to measure progress. For example, with reference to the school Performance Compacts, in Year 1 the compacts are put in place and monitored and Compacts for the district’s administrative departments

are drafted; in Year 2 adjustments are made to the Compacts based on monitoring data and the Compacts for administrative departments are put in place; in Year 3 there is ongoing refinement of both school and administration Compacts. Yet, given the complexity and breadth (a concern of the district's state department of education) of the district's proposed strategies and components, a timeline of all additional activities, when they should start and end and persons responsible, such as what teachers and school/district-level administrators would be responsible for programs like AVID or ACT.

Some deliverables and timelines are also outlined. For example, college readiness benchmarks are researched in Year 1, however, there was no listing of other deliverables and timelines making it difficult to ascertain all products of this plan.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's vision is for “. . . Santa Fe Public Schools . . . to become New Mexico's top performing school district in five years.” This would require the district's students to reach near 100% proficiency in reading and mathematics within the years of the grant period. But, Santa Fe's Academic Performance Targets based on the state's School Grade System and displayed in a table in the proposal establishes a 38% proficiency rate for math performance for all 11th grade students and a 48% target for reading by 2015. Performance Targets for 3rd – 8th grade reading and math are similarly low. For its RTTT-D plan, the applicant projects higher improved student learning set at approximately a 4 – 6% gain each year of the grant compared to the state targets of only about 2 - 3% ; an achievable gain that also results in an achievable, narrowing, but not closing of the achievement gap between Caucasian and subgroup students of about 6 – 8% each year. Caucasian students are projected to perform at about 82% proficiency and subgroups at 67% or less in reading district-wide by the end of the grant period. Even if these targets were achieved, the district would still be 18% from Caucasian students reaching 100% proficiency and 33% or more from Hispanic and other subgroups performing at high proficiency levels, less than stellar targets for a district that wants to be the best in its state.

Graduation rates are projected to improve 4% each year from 53.2% in 2011-2012 to 68.5% in 2015-2012 district-wide. Low-achieving high schools, by federal guidelines, are defined as schools with less than a 60% graduation rate over a number of years. District-wide Santa Fe Schools may attain this benchmark by 2013-2014. It is noted however that Santa Fe HS has already met this benchmark for some sub-groups though not others. Capital, the target high school has not met the 60% benchmark for any of its subgroups, and the Performance Compact for this school for 2012-2013 is for graduation rate improvement from 53.5% to only 57.5%. It appears that Capital will not meet the minimum benchmark of 60% graduation rate until probably 2014-2015. Projections for college enrollment are more ambitious with an expectation of 50% growth the first year alone.

The district's projections for improved student achievement on the state summative assessment, decreasing achievement gaps, and increasing graduation rates will result in increased equity but in small increments and without full closure of the achievement gaps and graduation of subgroup students.

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	5

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district presented narrative and raw student data charts as evidence of having a clear record of success improving student learning, increasing graduation rates and increasing college enrollment. Gains in student achievement across the district on the state tests have been small, about 4% per year and some subgroups have shown decreases in achievement; for example, ELL students in 3rd, 8th, and 11th grade reading and math. Graduation rates have increased, but drop-out rates have also increased and although the district touts Santa Fe HS for its increased graduation rate as compared to the grant HS, Santa Fe appears to have had a reduction in the number of graduation-eligible students by over 50 pupils. College enrollment has gone slightly up and slightly down over the last three years for graduates of each of the district's two high schools and is presently at only 35.3% for the grant HS and is at 64.7% at the district's other high school.

The district is at the beginning stages of implementing its new School Zone Model whereby district schools are placed in one of three zones based on student achievement and state grading system data. Schools in the Transformation Zone are the districts' lowest-performing schools and they will receive higher support and resources than schools in the district's Acceleration Zones and Innovation zones. Performance measures were established for all schools regardless of Zone and, per the district's application. As the district sought to identify what was working in the district for improved student learning and

college readiness, it identified interventions needed to reduce achievement gaps, the need for expanded learning time and in parent involvement. Implementation of these interventions was begun at the end of the last school year and during the beginning of this school year so that there is no long term record of success in the targeted schools. The district did cite one example of an elementary school that used a SIG to implement a School-Wide Turnaround Model resulting in improved student achievement.

The district reports that it uses both SchoolNet and PowerSchool to make student performance data available to teachers, parents, and students, but provides no evidence that use of these systems has resulted in informed decisions to improve student learning. Elsewhere in the application, the district acknowledged that “although data was being generated on student achievement, it was often not used to enhance the education system(s) already in place. In fact, in some cases, the data was never even seen by teachers, students, parents, principals, administrators or other pertinent stakeholders.”

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

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that it has already established a high level of transparency of its processes, practices, and investments by making public, at the school level, actual school expenditures for instruction, pupil support, and school administration via postings of annual budgets and monthly financial reports, audit results, salary schedules and policies in accordance with state sunshine laws on its district website. Its Citizen’s Review Committee is a forum for comment and review of capital expenditures and plans. Other public hearings reviewing the annual budget and process for development of same are also held each year. Actual personnel salaries for instructional, administrative, and support staff are also included in the annual budget for each school and the district and can be reviewed by parents and the community on the district website as well as non-personnel expenditures. Detailed tables of these salaries and expenditures that are also part of the public record were included in the Appendix of the district’s RTTT-D application.

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

10

9

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant cites the state governor’s *New Mexico Effective Teacher Task Force* report of 2011 as evidence that the LEA has conditions and sufficient autonomy under state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized environment of the applicant’s proposal. The Task Force recommended that school districts have “. . . the authority to use multiple measures, including student achievement data, observations and other proven measures *selected by local districts* to improve teacher effectiveness and NM schools.” It is assumed that the Task Force’s recommendations were adopted by the state, but no evidence of this was provided, thereby weakening this assertion by the district of sufficient autonomy under state legal requirements. But, the applicant also quotes state statute that gives “. . . local school boards authority *without state control and supervision* to determine instructional programs best fitting their populations.” In its comments reviewing the district’s RTTT-D application, found in Appendix M, the state also agreed with Santa Fe Public Schools that it “. . . has sufficient legal and budgetary authority to implement a RTTT-D grant should they receive an award.” The state’s comments also supported the district’s plans to implement personalized learning citing alignment with state reform initiatives, but *encouraged* additional personal learning options for students in grades K – 7.

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

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district states it used input from parents, students, and its own educators that had previously been gathered for development of the school system’s Strategic Plan to inform development of its RTTT-D proposal, but it did not provide any evidence that these stakeholders were specifically involved in development of this proposal before signing letters of support. The Executive Summary of the proposal was shared with principals of the targeted schools. The Executive Summary was also shared with teacher union leaders to garner their support of the application. The district states that “Teachers were given time to review the plan and offer suggestions,” but evidence of the degree of *meaningful* engagement in development of the proposal was not provided. It is also not clear whether they and principals were given only the Executive Summary or the complete plan. It appears that they only received the Summary since the district states that “After receiving the Executive Summary, principals set up meetings with their teachers and staff presenting the RTTT-D plan . . .” Teachers were asked what they needed to implement the plan; their responses primarily focused on purchase of computers and other technology.

The district also offered the following as evidence of stakeholder engagement in support of its proposal, but not development

of it:

- The district states that over 375 stakeholders, including teachers, parents, students, community members and administrators vetted the district’s Strategic Plan, the foundation for this RTTT-D application.
- Individual teachers at each school were asked to indicate their support or non-support of the grant application by signing their names to show same. The individual school signature sheets are included in the Appendix of the application.
- The union leader signed off on the proposal in the Application Assurances.
- Support letters were solicited from IHE and other community groups.

Thus, the description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in development of the proposal indicates only limited engagement, with most of that engagement being as participants in overview of the proposal sessions..

The state reviewed the proposal, providing detailed written comment on most components of the district’s plan and the district responded to the comments by providing its own answers which in some cases, resulted in changes to its plan in response to state input, and in other cases resulted in no revisions to the original proposal.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

A high-quality plan for this RTTT-D grant not only calls for highlighting past reform initiatives and an overview of proposed new strategies, it also requires key goals, clear implementation guidelines, sequenced activities, and identified deliverables be clearly and cohesively presented in a detailed design. Santa F conducted a thorough analysis of its current status in using personalized learning tools, an important preliminary activity of the plan. SFPS found problems/gaps in use of these tools. In those instances where significant gaps were found, the district has already selected new tools/resources to replace existing ones or has developed plans for more effective use of those that they have. For example, when the district found that student achievement data was not always placed in the hands of teachers and therefore could not be used by them to understand nor close school and district achievement gaps, the district established Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) so that teachers can learn how to use research-based practices from each other and be given job-embedded PD on the use of data-based tools. Increases in implementing personalized learning environments as a result of school PLCs in still to be proved in Santa Fe since this is a relatively new initiative for the district. Santa Fe’s response in this section of its plan also stated that recent district-led instructional audits showed that teachers needed support in adding rigor, differentiated instruction, student engagement, and research-based pedagogy to their teaching. The PD 360 appears to offer more promise for targeted professional development and is online so teachers can turn to it as a training resource at will.

The district did include a 3-year RTTT-D timeline of implementation for each of the five primary strategies for achieving its goals that is reasonable and includes benchmarks to measure progress. Yet, as already commented on, given the complexity and breadth (a concern of the district’s state department of education) of the district’s proposed strategies and components, a timeline of all additional activities and persons responsible for the activities/initiatives, and monitoring/support of them, such as what teachers and school/district-level administrators would be responsible for programs like AVID or ACT and when they would start and end was sorely needed.

Some deliverables and timelines are included, such as: the Performance Compacts, previously mentioned and establishment of the School Leadership Academy and Parent Academy. However, there was no listing of other deliverables and timelines for same making it difficult to ascertain all products of this plan.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Response to this component of district RTTT-D plans requires identification of instructional strategies and program. The

strategies SFPS will use include but are not limited to AVID, the P21 Framework for 21st Century Readiness, Caulkins' Reading and Writing Projects, and the ACT Educational and Planning System for each student in the targeted schools to have access to a personalized, more rigorous program of study aligned to college-readiness standards and requirement. The strategies and programs have been proven to have particular success with high needs and minority students and/or are research-based. And, the sample 21st Century lesson plans provided evidence of the district's potential for providing rigorous learning experiences. The district's proposed use of the School Counselor Advocacy College and Career Counseling 8-component program is noteworthy in its comprehensive, systemic approach to academic planning and college and career preparedness. The proposed use of online Individual Learning Plans, web-based career assessments, and "Early Alert" systems is designed to engage and empowers all learners to have ownership of their personal achievement data and college and career plans, while placing responsibility on educators and parents to provide support to students as they learn to use such tools and improve their learning. The district's acknowledgement of the need to have a streamlined data-base for ease of use and its integration of Naviance, PowerSchool and SchoolNet will be key to increased use of student data to inform instruction and learning and to help students and parents understand the importance of personal learning goals.

The state, in its comments reviewing the district's proposal, commended the district on its plan for personalizing the learning environment aligned with state reform initiatives, but was concerned that much of the plan was targeted to students in grades 8 – 12 and that more options for personalization needed to be available to students in grades K – 7. Indeed, the state advised the district to use proven Blended Learning models to address this deficit in its application. The district adjusted its plan by making the suggested change in its proposal, but justified its focus on secondary education with tables showing 10% lower reading proficiency at grades 7 – 12 as compared to grades K – 8 and 13% math proficiency. Unfortunately, the table showed that proficiency rates at K – 8 levels were not impressive either, with reading proficiency at 50.85% and math proficiency at 40.23% so that personalized learning environments are obviously needed at the elementary grades, as well as at the middle and high school grades.

The state also commended the district on its plan to establish an "Early Alert" system but, appropriately, wanted more specifics on the factors to be included in such a system.

With reference to implementation timelines, the state was concerned about how the district would be able to successfully implement the many activities/programs presented in its plan. This peer review revealed over 14 major programs/initiatives included in this district's RTTT-D plan. The district responded to the state that schools will be able to select the programs and services they will use at various points over the 3-year grant period; that they will not have to implement all programs at once, but still did not delineate time frames for school-level implementation of selected activities. The district, delaying planning for possible variations in program reform approaches, stated that detailed plans for each school will be developed should Santa Fe be successful in receiving an RTT-D grant.

Regarding SFPS's plans for evaluation of goals, the district acknowledged past difficulties in consolidating and using student data to plan personalized instruction. It has purchased the Pearson SchoolNet and PowerSchool instructional management programs to facilitate regular and ongoing use of achievement data for decision-making. When these systems are paired with the district's Discovery Education Assessments, it is postulated that teachers will use the generated data to plan individualized, class-, grade-, subject-, and skill-specific lessons based on student mastery of content. Monthly and weekly data analysis meetings by staff are proposed.

Structures for development of a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development were not discussed in the plan. The district plan also failed to address how students would be helped to understand how to structure their learning to achieve learning goals. However, the district did present a table showing that all of the proposed programs and instructional approaches either have built-in ongoing feedback structures on student growth and achievement toward college and career standards and/or provide personalized learning.

Accommodations for high-need students are also stated to be built into the Thinking Through Math and AVID programs. Thinking Through Math uses video and audio support and bilingual versions to support varying student needs. AVID is a program specifically designed to support underrepresented minorities graduation rates and matriculation to college. Data is presented showing 84 -90% AVID students completing four-year college requirements regardless of ethnic subgroup.

And, the district plan is for students and parents to receive ongoing training and support in how to use SchoolNet, PowerSchool, Naviance, the ACT programs, AVID, Discovery Education Assessments, etc. to monitor student progress toward college readiness goals. Data-dashboards will also help students and their parents to have responsibility for managing individual student learning. The district will implement required components of the state's mandated NEXT STEPS Individual Learning Plan program so that students can plan and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards.

Yet, for all of the detailed descriptions of programs and strategies contained in the district's RTTT-D Plan, it must again be repeated that the district failed to provide descriptions of the timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible for implementation and monitoring and evaluation that are as rich and clear as the overviews of the proposed programs and

strategies. Thus, the district's plan lacked needed substance for overall credibility of full and timely implementation and evaluation of all components of the plan.

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

20

12

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

As for C1, the district has identified a broad platform (probably too broad for effective implementation, project support, monitoring and evaluation) of teaching and learning strategies for teachers and administrators in the targeted schools to use to improve instruction, personalize the learning environment, and increase their capacity to support students in meeting graduation standards. Blended instruction classrooms, project-based learning, and service learning are among the strategies the district proposes to put in place. In addition, the district seeks to use PLCs, Understanding by Design (UbD), and job-embedded professional development to increase teacher growth in curriculum development, teaching all students to achieve college readiness standards and the CCSS, and in the use of data to differentiate instruction. Most district/school year calendars would be strained to find time for the many professional development workshops needed to support this many teaching programs, although the present calendar provides for Early Release Fridays at the elementary level. Additional preparation time at the secondary level has been budgeted and planned in the grant for PLCs to meet for teacher planning of differentiated, personalized lesson planning and instruction, student engagement, and the teaching of mathematics, as well as the use of data. The issue again is whether these two constructs will allow for all the professional development called for in this application. And, explicit details regarding timelines for implementing all of these activities, evaluations of so many individual activities/strategies on student learning and what should be the deliverables are not included in the plan.

Also of concern is that the district's plan calls for an as yet unproven integrated teacher development and evaluation system using MyLearningPlan (MLP) components, the Danielson model of teacher observation, and Instructional Rounds. The idea is to tie the evaluation process into professional growth and student outcomes; an impressive approach if it can be done. Teachers and administrators will need training, not accounted for in the plan, in use of the MLP. The district proposes a unique avenue to identifying optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student needs; namely Action Research by teachers studying their own classrooms and schools so that they can be agents of change. No monies are included in the RTTT-D budget to compensate teachers for after-school time for such research, although given the need to have funds for secondary PLCs to meet, such funds will probably be needed for this component to be implemented.

Fortunately, several though not all of the district's proposed strategies and tools for improving the teaching-learning paradigm have embedded measures of student progress and, as previously mentioned, the district's PowerSchool and SchoolNet programs will provide ongoing and frequent actionable data on student progress and academic needs. Teacher and administrator capability of learning how to use all of these tools effectively will again be dependent on professional development and coaching supports that are not addressed in the plan. Finally, the district's proposed Teacher Institute and Principal Leadership Academy, together with the New Teacher Project may have promise for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, but review of the applicant's *Performance Measures* table in Section E3 of the plan suggests that only 1 – 2 additional highly effective teachers per year, per school will be with participating students; a slow rate of change in this regard for major expenditures of time and monies.

Using SchoolNet and PowerNet the district will consolidate data analysis and reporting, curriculum, interventions for improved student performance, and professional development into one platform to facilitate decision making at all levels. This is a potentially time-consuming task for technology personnel that is not addressed in the project timeline; professional development for teachers and other users is a concern here as indicated above.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district's plan for practices, policies and rules that facilitate personalized learning begins with reorganization of the schools into school zones whereby the central office will provide differentiated support and resources. The district provided a table in Section A3 that outlined the types and variations in such services. A Chief Academic Officer was recently hired by the district

to give support to research-based teaching practices. It is also proposed that the central office add four new CO positions as a means to add rigor to curriculum development, professional development, school implementation of improvement plans, and use of data. It is significant that the district plans to hire a Director of Multicultural Education given the decline in ELL student achievement the last four years. The three other positions are a Project Director for the RTTT-D grant, a K-12 Associate Superintendent who will help schools focus on their school improvement plans; and an Executive Director for a new Accounting and Strategy Department, responsible for collecting grant implementation data, student achievement data, and reports on areas which need improvement to achieve grant goals. Salaries for these positions are based on district salary scales; funding for the Project Director and a Data Analyst position is through the RTTT-D grant.

Each school already has an operating Leadership Team. The district states that school leadership teams “have been given autonomy over factors such as curriculum materials, school master schedules, school personnel decisions and staffing models, and roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators.” No evidence is provided as to the effectiveness of Leadership Team operations to date and whether there is a need for re-structuring and/or re-training of same.

A newly formed High School Reform Task Force is researching options such as digital learning and virtual classrooms for secondary students to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery and not seat time. Middle grades students can already accelerate by taking Algebra 1 and Geometry in grades 7 and 8, rather than in high school. Dual credit and advanced placement courses are available to high school students. The District Portfolio in the Appendix shows that in 2010 – 2011 of 155 Capital students, the targeted high school, in AP Statistics, only 26 or 12% scored 3 or higher on the AP exam; in the last 4 years as few as 2% of students have had such scores. For AP Biology and Chemistry and AP Calculus no students even took the exams. By contrast, 50% of AP Statistics students at Santa Fe HS scored 3 or higher on their exam. There is a significant achievement gap between the high schools and the probability of Capital students achieving mastery under present practices that is not addressed in the plan.

Although SFPS has “mandated full implementation K-12 of the CCSS, effective August 2012,” details of how the district plans to provide students with opportunities to demonstrate mastery of the standards are not evident. The district states generally that the students’ teachers will be given PD in the use of the MyLearningPlan Management System and PD 360, but does not state how such professional development will result in students having multiple times and ways to master the CCSS.

The district alleges that its offices of C&I, Special Education, and Bilingual Education are working to meet the needs of ELL and students with disabilities, but recent ELL student achievement data does not support this assertion.

But, as with Section A3, this subcriterion relates to whether the LEA provided evidence of goals, timelines, activities, and deliverables. As previously noted the district did include a 3-year RTTT-D timeline of implementation for each of the five primary strategies for achieving its goals, but a timeline of implementation of LEA policies, infrastructure and practices needed for the full project was needed.

Some deliverables and timelines are also outlined. However, there was no listing of deliverables and timelines for LEA practices and policies making it difficult to ascertain all products. of this component.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district’s proposal meets the criteria for an information technology system that will allow parents and students to district, school and individual student performance platforms in an open data format using PowerSchool and SchoolNet, two data warehouse program already in place. As indicated previously, there is a need for professional development for teachers and school/district administrators for effective and timely use of interoperable data systems that was not specifically addressed in the plan, although implied. Time and in-district expertise for such professional development of all stakeholders may be problematic.

There is a proposal for a Parent Academy that will offer parent training in guiding their child’s education and college and career goals, understanding the common core, assisting with homework and workshops that will address parents’ own personal growth and career goals. Parents will also be able to take computer literacy classes so they will be able to access student information and achievement data on their child’s progress in school. Upper-class student tutors and mentors will support students in lower grades to use these tools. A table describing online and peer support tools and resources available to parents and students to support student learning was found in the RTTT-D plan. Specifics as to how the infrastructure will actually be used for crafting individualized personal learning plans for each student were needed. The district also failed to address how families and students without computers would be able to access the resources and tools out of school. It does appear however that the district’s resources can be downloaded by those with computers so that students and parents can maintain a record of learning experiences, student performance, and school activities for themselves.

It is commendable that the district is integrating its library software, nursing software, and transportation software into the SIS programs, but the district does not explain how such integration will support personalized learning.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has described the tools and strategies it will use to establish a continuous improvement process that provides regular feedback using both qualitative and quantitative measures for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the grant. Specifically, the Performance Compacts, developed for each school target student achievement, school operations, and instructional leadership, are based on a Theory of Action to improve the quality of teaching and educators in the Transformation Schools. A table of student achievement benchmarks for reading and math for one target school's subgroups on the state tests was included as an example of Performance Compact indicators. Compacts for each of the targeted schools were also included in the Appendix of the RTTT-D plan. Noteworthy is the plan's listing of responsibilities for each category of stakeholders, yet traditional <i>annual</i> teacher evaluations will not provide timely feedback to impact teaching and learning on an ongoing basis. The listing also lacked indicators of the kind of continuous feedback each group of stakeholders would use for continuous improvement in carrying out their responsibilities.</p> <p>However, the Appendix did contain a table of <i>Data-Based Strategies and 21st Century Tools</i> already in place in the district, as well as proposed tools, which can be used to glean information for continuous improvement. The rationale for the use of each instrument and how the instrument will be used is helpful for understanding the intersection of strategies for timely, continuous feedback.</p> <p>No specific measures of the effectiveness of investments in technology appear to be planned. Sources of data such as Discovery Education assessments given three times per year, state test and ACT scores, the number of students served, and the number of students who graduate will be collected and analyzed for areas of strength and proposal components in need of adjustment.</p> <p>In its comments, the state observed that the district referenced cradle to career benchmarks and so encouraged the district to “. . . review the state's Early Learning Guidelines as they are aligned to the Common Core” The district agreed to review the Guidelines since they may illuminate additional areas for needed alignment and support</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant is relying on PowerSchool and its website as the primary resources for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders, as well as school and local newspapers and annual district reports as usually used by school districts today. While these are powerful resources for families and students to monitor student progress, class assignments and daily bulletins, the difficulty is that families, students, and community members without home computers may not have avenues to receive communications or engage in online dialogues about RTTT-D activities and student performance and college and career readiness. Similarly, not all families and students subscribe to local newspapers that would connect them with these communications vehicles. The district's plans for participatory community forums and the <i>American Graduate</i> series on the local PBS station are innovative and have the potential of reaching more families and students if the programs are well-publicized.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for student growth and the number/percent of highly effective educators were identified and listed in several tables for each targeted school. A wide range of well-researched descriptions of present and proposed performance measures were provided but not the district's rationale for selection of the measures as compared to other measures that might have been considered and rejected.</p> <p>The district proposes to use formative and summative assessments. For example, as stated in the plan, the DIBELS assessment (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills), a set of procedures and measures for assessing the</p>		

acquisition of early literacy skills from kindergarten through sixth grade, is age-appropriate as a performance measure.. They are designed to be short (one minute) fluency measures used to regularly monitor the development of early literacy and early reading skills. Discovery Education Assessment (DEA), formative assessments for students in grades Pre-K to grade 12, are also age-appropriate. Both DIBELS and DEA are given 3 times per year. The state tests of student achievement are given annually as are AVID and ACT assessments. High school students will complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), which will also serve as a measure of the number and percentage of participating students on track for college and careers. Naviance is a college and career readiness platform that helps connect academic achievement to post-secondary goals. Alignment of the proposed Naviance formative assessments to the state assessments may be an issue. Discipline referrals will be used as a measure of students' social-emotional growth. Reports on all these measures will be by school and sub-groups. Projection charts of benchmarks through 2015 – 2016 were provided in the RTTT-D plan for each measure. The district also provides evidence in the Appendix that secondary students take the SAT, ACT, and AP tests. The district provides tables of baseline data and projections for the number and percent of highly effective teachers and principals in the targeted schools.

The district's pure growth model limits the expectations for greater student growth over the grant period. Three examples support this point: (1) most of the target schools will not have 100% effective teachers in place prior to the end of the grant since it seems that only two teachers per school per and per year will be certified as highly effective; 2) this year's kindergarten students will only reach 74% proficiency in reading by their 3rd grade year based on data for the DIBELS performance chart; and (3) on the average for most of the targeted schools, only about three-fourths of this year's 3rd grade students will be on track to be college and career ready by 8th grade. Only 41.3% of the Career Academy students will be on track to reach this benchmark in 2016-2017.

The applicant did not respond directly to the question of review and adjustments over time of performance measures that may prove insufficient to monitor implementation progress. A Performance Measure chart outlined the proposed instruments by applicable population and measurement goals; for example, that PreK - 3 "Students will grow in language and and literacy as measured by DIBELS, Ages and Stages . . . ," by 67 - 82%, but did not delineate what other measures might be used if the DIBELS proved to be a crude measure of language development and/or if it does not measure the degree of/fidelity of language instruction.during the grant period. Certainly, there was no evidence in the descriptions of performance measures to be adopted for this grant of why the identified measures were selected and why, if any, other performance instruments were rejected.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section describes the district's plans for evaluating the effectiveness of RTTT-D funded professional development and the impact of PD on teacher evaluations, using its MyLearningPlan (MLP) and MLP Online Assessment System (OASYS) systems in conjunction with student achievement data. It does not directly address whether budgeted investments, for example in extended planning time for PLCs or consulting costs for recruitment of new teachers or teacher practitioner research or instructional and student development programs result in changes in teaching practices (such as more research-based strategies are used in classrooms) and better student outcomes (such as increased student scores on state tests). Rather, the district contends that have used these products, that the purchase of the MLP and MLP OASYS provides SFPS with tools to: (1) conduct needs assessments to identify professional development needs; (2) gather data from post-professional development surveys to measure educator use of instructional and/or administrative strategies; and (3) links the professional development an educator may participate in with that educator's annual evaluations and student achievement results through integration with PowerSchool and SchoolNet data on student assessments. The district also asserts that purchase and use of these tools will allow it to ". . . examine those strategies that the evidence deems effective in RTTT-D target schools so that those strategies can be brought to scale district-wide. Although these are worthy evaluation objectives, documented evidence of the content of MLP and MLP OASYS measures and resulting data --- sample needs assessment reports or PD surveys or teacher evaluations --- was not presented to validate these assertions.

By contrast, the district's budget narrative for the RTTT-D grant identified assessments embedded in new instructional programs that the district will purchase with RTTT-D monies, the ACT College & Career Readiness program being one such example, and described in detail the content of the assessments (" subject area tests that represent the level of achievement required for students to have a 50% chance of obtaining a B or higher . . . in corresponding credit-bearing first-year college courses.") and the utility of the data ("four-five years of longitudinal data on student achievement and progress toward college/career readiness").

As already noted, no specific measures of the effectiveness of investments in technology appear to be planned, though web-based programs are being used to evaluate the impact of other student achievement and reform initiatives.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables, should identify RTTT-D funds as well as district monies, grants, state and other Federal funds that will be used so that determinations can be made as to the reasonableness and sufficiency of requested monies and the rationale for same. SFPS used the required Table 4-1 to meet requirements to document activities funded with RTTT-D monies for each project year and across all years of the project. For each budget category, SFPS included sufficient itemization to demonstrate how costs were calculated and total costs for each item for all years of the project. .</p> <p>A strength and also required component is the district narrative citing one-time investments versus those that will be ongoing operational costs during and after the grant period. . The district also addressed plans for sustainability of RTTT-D funded activities in the budget narrative, but such plans may not be realistic. For example, the district states that funds for training principals in how to conduct Instructional Rounds will not be necessary after the grant period since trained principals will be able to support each other. Yet, how will new principals be trained when the grant period ends and how will such costs be paid? A similar concern might also be raised for continuance of PLCs. How will costs for ongoing planning time for PLCs and curriculum development during implementation of the CCSS be addressed; posting of lesson plans on the district's website may not be adequate and a previous practice of payments to teachers for extended planning may not mitigate for continuation of PLC work without stipends. The Data Analyst is budgeted for .6 FTE. Will that be enough considering the very vast array of data sources and information that the district is planning to collect, analyze and report on for this RTTT-D grant.</p> <p>The district states that "realigned resources" will be used to continue such programs as its Principal Leadership Academy and acknowledges that external funding will be needed to continue personalized learning programs such as Achieve3000, although there are no committed funding sources at this time. It is noted that the district was able to reduce cost of the ACT program due to the high number of low-income participating students.</p> <p>A review of the RTTT-D budget for SFPS also revealed that over \$7.5 million of the \$10 million grant are for personnel costs, including over half a million dollars for administrative costs, a significant percentage of which could be projected to be continuing beyond the grant period. How will the Data Analyst be paid after the grant? The district contends that the Analyst will not be necessary to post-grant activities; this does not seem likely given ongoing needs for data collection and understanding for continued/scaled up reform. Will the Project Director position be continued after the grant to sustain and scale up reforms? Also, costs for most purchased programs/tools do not decrease during the grant period --- for example, Think Through Math and the district's MLP OASYS Evaluation System --- raising concerns about how the district plans to continue supporting these costs at the end of the grant period. There are no personnel costs indicated for the Teacher Practitioner Research component of the plan in a district that appears to have to pay teachers by contract to participate in professional development beyond the normal school day (see costs for the Teacher Summer Institute and PLCs. Clarity was also needed regarding whether the district is absorbing any equipment and supply costs of the project since none are included in the budget.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district states that it expects to sustain project programs through potential, but not committed alternative grantors and by reduced costs associated with elimination of ineffective programs and services and alludes to ongoing in-house support of professional development previously provided by consultants during the years of the RTTT-D grant. While predictions of ongoing in-house support are laudable, new principals and teachers will continue to need deep initial Academy and Summer Institute training and PLC development that busy peers may not be able to provide. No explanation is provided for how the district will continue its annual cost of the MLP OASYS Evaluation System (\$8,000 per year) which is so central to continuous measurement of the effectiveness of teacher evaluation and professional development or the Naviance system for personalized education at \$10,000 per year. There is no budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds. In its response to the district's RTTT-D proposal, the New Mexico department of education did not speak to post-grant state financial support of the project. Finally, there was no itemization of the use of district monies, grants and other external funds for project activities, the resulting implication being that no such monies, other than indirect costs, are being used for the SFPS project</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This district is opting for the Competitive Preference Priority that calls for districts to integrate public and private resources in partnerships designed to augment school system resources for providing additional social, emotional, and behavioral supports to RTTT-D grant participating students and their families. In a strong narrative with supporting tables, and with goals, activities, deliverables, and identification of persons responsible. SFPS addresses this priority with detailed descriptions of proposed partnerships with institutions of higher education and its local PBS station for more personalized educational opportunities and to increase awareness in targeted students and their families of the devastating effects of dropping out of school, while also increasing graduation rates and college enrollment of targeted students. The options described for students through these partnerships are validated through letters of support from Santa Fe Community College, the University of New Mexico, Eastern New Mexico University, and the PBS station KNME-TV.

KNME offers the RTTT-D participating schools, their teachers and their students, two primary resources for personalizing education. The first is a library of digital educational media from the PBS LearningMedia program, *Classroom-Ready and Curriculum-Targeted*. This program provides award-winning programs such as *NOVA* and *Sid the Science Kid* that also include related curriculum materials that meet national and state standards. KNME-TV will also have participating schools and students be participants in its *American Graduate: Let's Make It Happen* television series designed to improve high school graduation rates. Santa Fe Community College (SFCC) will allow SFPS participating secondary students the chance to take Dual Credit and Concurrent Enrollment courses for accelerated personalized learning. The district's application states that SFCC is a Hispanic-serving institution, thereby meeting the requirement for serving high-needs students under this priority. The University of New Mexico will provide participating RTTT-D students workshops on preparing for college, completing the FAFSA, and online college registration processes. The University will also offer campus visits and orientations to recruit SFPS students to attend UNM. The program opportunities that will be provided by these two institutions of higher education are totally compatible with overall RTTT-D grant goals of increasing graduation rates and college enrollment of targeted students. The Eastern New Mexico University will support the Teacher Practitioner Research component of SFPS RTTT-D plans by providing consultant support.

The district states that it plans to track the success of partnership initiatives looking at quantitative and qualitative factors, but while for some cases, the instruments measures are identified, in other instances the specific instruments for collecting impact data are not identified. For example, the district indicates that data will be collected on frequency of teacher use of the PBS LearningMedia program and how the program has been used to personalize learning. All stakeholders --- teachers, students, parents, and community members --- will be involved in community forums, focus groups, surveys, online blogs and other methods of ongoing communication for feedback. Performance measures by program and for the stakeholder group being served (educational, family, and community) as well as population-level desired results are displayed in easily-readable tables. By comparison, specifics are not provided regarding the tools the district will use to determine whether the partnerships will result in students being on-track to graduation and college; particularly students in the elementary grades.

With reference to strategies for scaling up the model beyond the participating schools and students, the district states that results of the Teacher Practitioner Research program will be shared at conferences for highlighting best teaching practices in the hopes that the SFPS program will serve as a springboard for reinstatement of this initiative by ENMU, there are no details about how this will occur. Another example of the lack of planning an infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students can be found in the proposal to use the *American Graduate* series to raise student understanding of the benefits of college and the danger of dropping out. Strategies for routinely assessing this program's impact and the resolution of challenges and problems is absent.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

A summary of how all four core educational assurance areas were addressed follows:

1. Standards and Assessment for Students to be College and Career Ready

The district plan calls for implementation of the Common Core State Standards effective for the 2012 – 2013 school year and assessment systems that measure student academic achievement in reading and mathematics, graduation rates, college and career readiness, and development of individual learning plans. New assessment systems for evaluating teachers, principals, and academic departments, as well as professional development activities and attainment of individual school Performance Compacts are also integral to this district’s RTTT-D plan.

2. Data Systems to Measure Student Growth

Several data systems for measuring student growth are planned, including but not limited to Discovery Education Assessments, Achieve3000 Lexiles, AVID (Advancement via Individual Determination) student progress measures, ACT College and Career Readiness instruments, PowerSchool and School Net student data management systems, and OASYS, Response to Intervention software, and Naviance, a college and career-readiness platform..

3. Recruitment, Development, and Retaining of Effective Teachers and Principals

The district has plans for a New Teacher Project to strengthen recruiting and hiring practices and will also have a Leadership Academy for developing teachers for school leadership. A wide range of ongoing, job-embedded professional development based on an analysis of teacher instructional strengths and areas for growth will also address this educational assurance area. A new teacher evaluation system will integrate the Charlotte Danielson model of teacher observation and MyLearning Plan and Instructional Rounds.

4. Turning Around Low-Achieving Schools

Using student achievement and growth measures, as well as the state’s School Grading System, the district has identified its low-achieving schools. These Transformation Zone” schools will have Performance Compact targets for students achievement and increased and differentiated resources and support to transform them from F - C schools to C – A schools within the grant period.

Total	210	122
-------	-----	-----