



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0721AZ-1 for Sunnyside USD #12

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A clear vision was articulated as evidenced in the overview and section (A) (1) of the proposal. This vision of a Game-infused Learning Network to Engage and Empower Marginalized Youth rippled throughout the proposal. The vision was supported by the track record of success already in place.</p> <p>The evidence provided includes this school district accelerating student achievement through building an engaging, adaptive multi-modal and continually optimized learning environment with community support through the one-to-one laptop and technology infrastructure already in place.</p> <p>Student learning has been deepened as evidenced by giving students full access to digital devices allowing for every class to become a complex, blended learning environment whereby students, teachers, administrators, parents and curriculum developers work together to deepen the learning. This strategy is effective in deepening student learning versus simply exposing students to programs that simply adopt digital versions of existing paper-based textbooks. When the latter is done, there is failure to harness the power of digital connected computing and ensuring true deep learning.</p> <p>Finally, this proposal strives to provide increasing equity in closing the achievement gap especially as it relates to students from Hispanics descent. All students will have access to the Games-infused initiative. Thus, barriers will be broken and each student have the same chances of deepening and accelerating their learning. With all the evidences provided above, this criterion earns the full points having satisfied all the requirements.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It was not to the greatest extent that the applicant addressed this criterion.</p> <p>(a) The description provided of the process that the applicant used used to select schools to participate was a weak and incomplete description provided about the process. In essence, a clear description of the process used to select the schools to participate was not articulated explicitly in this proposal.</p> <p>This weak description led to this criterion not earning maximum points.</p> <p>(b) A list of the schools that will participate in grant initiative was outlined in the school demographics presented in Appendix B. A total of 21 schools will participate in this Game-infused Initiative. In addition, the school demographics table presents the raw data indicating the fact that these 21 schools do have a high needs population evidenced by students low income status.</p> <p>(c) The total number of participating students was cited as 12, 206 participating students with 94.4% of the students identified as minority groups. Approximately 86% qualify for free and reduced lunch based on the fact they are from low-income families. These students definitely have high-needs coupled with the fact that 14% of the district's population receive Special Education services.</p> <p>In sum, the narrative presented provided some evidences to support the applicants approach to implementation. A clear description of the process for selecting schools was not clearly articulated, hence full points were not earned. Most of the criteria was satisfied, hence, a high-range score.</p>		

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Games-based Learning Ecosystem Model forms the foundation (logic model) that is purported in this initiative. The model outlines the scaled impact, sustainability impact and replication sites for this to happen. As a means of leveraging these impacts evidence were provided to support student learning, teacher professional development and community involvement to establish the learning ecosystem model. District wide changes including the one-to-one laptop initiative and community involvement already benefiting Sunnyside Unified School were outlined as areas of success to build on.

Evaluation of the evidence clearly indicates that the applicant met the outlined criteria. For example, student learning is impacted (triangulated) as outlined on the Ecosystem model based on the Games-infused curriculum, Games-infused professional development and Game-infused family and community engagement. All these support are undergirded by each student's ability, confidence, and commitment to learning.

Based on the following evidences, evaluation of this criterion indicated all aspects accounted for leading to earning of full score.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Improving student learning and performances are clearly articulated in the vision of this initiative. The goals outlined are ambitious, yet based on the plan seems achievable based on yearly projections

A modest increase had been projected each year of the grant. Performance on summative assessments do provide the evidence needed to support what students are expected to learn and be able to do

- Clear evidence also was provided with regards to decreasing achievement gaps over time. The decrease in achievement gaps will be measured using Arizona's instrument in the areas of High School Math and Reading

Such clear evidence has resulted in scores reflective of the high-range

- Graduation rates were mentioned, but a clear unified vision of how graduation rates would be increased was not explicit in the narrative

Simply mentioning the graduation rate did not bode well for this criterion earning full points, because college enrollment data was missing. However, the overall plan presented for impacting the graduation rates --and by extension decreasing the gaps have been found to meet this criteria. As a result, this category has earned a high-range score.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A clear record of success as it relates to the one-to-one laptop initiative is in line with the the overall vision and goals of the Game-infused Learning Network proposed. The district graduation rates have been addressed since 2007. Now, the Sunnyside Unified District is no longer seen as the "drop-out

factory" it was known as earlier. There has been:

- Increase in the average GPA demonstrating improved student learning outcome and consequently closing of the achievement gap
- Increase in high school graduation rates and the number of graduates
- Achievement of significant reforms in low performing schools inclusive of decreases in
 - High school drop out rates
 - Absences
 - Number of out-of school suspensions

Student performance data showing

- Increase in the number of students prepared to enter four year college
- Increase in parental engagement
- Increase in promotion

Together, this information specify student learning and participation while simultaneously demonstrate to students, parents and the wider community the need for improved participation, instruction and services--available through the Games-infused initiative proposed.

Finally, this criterion has earned a perfect score because the evidences provided matched the criteria. The great extent to which the LEA has demonstrated evidence of making student performance data available to students, educators and parents fully satisfied the criteria outlined in the application.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>To the extent required, evidence has been provided regarding the transparency in the LEA processes and practices. Based on the documentation, it was revealed that actual personnel salaries are published yearly at the state's website for all personnel at all levels. Specifically, the applicant cited that on the business and Financial Report page of the public SUSD website, there are both past and current postings for Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) to assure transparency in disclosing financial information.</p>		
<p>This explicit disclosure demonstrates the LEA's transparency regarding state and local funds asked for in the application. As a result, this information addresses this criterion to the fullest extent possible. Thus, maximum points were earned.</p>		

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The context for successful implementation was not strongly articulated in this proposal. A weak attempt was made to do such. Casual mention was made with regards to having the "infrastructure to support true change for this marginalized community requires family and community involvement." More evidence is required to substantiate autonomy for implementation of the Game-infused Learning Network. This limited information does not fully satisfy this criterion. However, there was evidence put forth regarding conditions to implement personalized learning environments evidenced by previous success with the one-to-one laptop initiative. The capacity already exists for a personalized learning environment for the marginal students to be served.</p>		
<p>As a result, the applicant did not fully demonstrate adequate evidence for all the conditions needed to implement the personalized learning environments. However, some were demonstrated leading to a limited extent of</p>		

addressing this issue. Therefore, the applicant earned a mid-range score.

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

10

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A comprehensive description of stakeholder involvement was evident in the narrative of the proposal. Clearly how school and home connections were made and maintained were evident.

- Scientists, digital gaming experts, world renowned faculty at the university, state leadership personnel, graduate students, teachers etc were all cited as stakeholders willing to work for this Games-based initiative so it will succeed. Overall, it was justified that the majority of teachers in this unified school district supported this Games-infused initiative
- Multiple letters of support from key stakeholders demonstrates the far reaching effect of this Games-infused initiative on the school district. As a marginalized school district, the stakeholders presented a clear rationale for being interested in and wanting to provide extensive help and support in order to see the Sunnyside Unified School District succeed.

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

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

It is to some extent that the LEA has demonstrated evidence of analyzing the needs and gaps

The evidence put forth regarding analysis of the needs and gap indicate the "gap is widest for the Hispanic sub-group" as measured by AIMS in the areas of reading and math. The graph provided clearly showed the gaps between State Hispanics, state economically disadvantaged, state language learners, Sunnyside economically disadvantaged and Sunny side Hispanics.

Having identified the needs and gaps, the applicant made a stellar attempt at developing a high-quality plan for implementing personalized learning environment and the logic behind such. For example, evidence was provided that the Gramified curriculum proposed will not only engage students in core content areas but it is highly suited as a personalized learning system that will benefit students struggling with English language Proficiency.

By extension, this will "allow students the opportunity for "private failures" while opening the door for public successes. Also mentioned to support the need and gap analysis is the fact that their is a gap in the graduation rates as well. The graph clearly illustrated that there exists a gap in the graduation rates of students with limited English Proficiency. Hence ,there has been noticeable gap between Hispanics and LEA students. Based on the unique design to assist one-to-one classroom teachers integrate technology in their classroom. The evidence suggests that "the blending of whole-group one-on-one training, on-going technology support, and coaching has assisted one-to-one teachers with developing a vision to help students succeed.

In sum, based on the strong narrative outlying how the applicants would implement personalized learning environments this narrative has earned a high range score for the high-quality plan.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	19

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Rippling throughout this proposal are strategies for facilitating student learning. These strategies are supported by vision articulated, needs and gap analysis presented and the evidences cited for providing a Games-infused Learning Network. Support is shown from the following entities:

Support of parents and educators

- Parents who have been trained in workshops
- Students being challenged and provided with various resources as game-plat tools ans in terms of "core conceptual ideas the player must employ and solve."
- Such challenging approached do indicate the expectation fr deep learning experiences
- Access to a community of diverse learners (mostly Hispanics) contextualizes the initiaitive
- Games-infused curriculum requires goal-setting etc., and above all critical and creaiive thinking as well as problem-solving

Support and access

- Students already have access to the one-to-one laptops
- Multiple learning approaches have been proposed
- The digital learning proposed is consistent with high-quality instructional approaches

Feedback

- Feedback is implied in the activities as it relates to the evaluation process. Formative and summative feedback will be needed to ensure fidelity

Training

- Some evidence has been provided in terms of mechanisms that are inplace to provide training and support that will lead to sustainability of the project

Overall, it is was to a great extent that learning was evidenced in this narrative. Missing was an account for how students with special needs would be accommodated for. Hence, a high-range score but not full score was earned.

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

20

17

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A comprehensive approach to teaching and leading was provided in a convincing manner. How this approach will further help teachers improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress college or career readiness also was outlined. Again these approaches will ultimately enable effective implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all marginalized students in this district who will be impacted by the Games-infused initiative.

(a) individual and collective capacity were substantiated by the following

- Support indicative of the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that will help each of the marginalized students who will be served to graduate on time and be college/career ready.
- Clear indications of how the content and instruction will be adapted in order to provide students with multiple opportunities to become actively engage in common and individual tasks based on each student's individualized learning. Evidence provided allows students will be engaged with collaborative work, doing hands-on work that is project-based, utilization of multimedia and multi modal learning opportunities inclusive of the use of videos and digital games. These games are uniquely suited for "fostering critical skills necessary navigating an interconnected,

rapidly changing 21st Century world including problem solving, critical thinking, creativity, collaboration and systems-thinking."

- As evidenced in the proposal student progress toward meeting college/career readiness will be used frequently to measure success. Each year this data will be compiled and used as a benchmark standards to evaluate students performance and acceleration to graduation
- Furthermore, graduation data also will be utilized both formatively and summatively for teachers and principals to improve practice and effectiveness. This will be coupled with using feedback provided from evaluation systems to monitor teacher effectiveness, provide recommendations for areas of supports, needed interventions and improvements as the needs arise. All this will be coached and consistent with the broader Common Core State Standards.

(b) All participants have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college/career readiness inclusive of...

- Actionable information has been provided that has the potential to utilize optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests by use of gamification. A goal of the grant is to develop rigorous strategy for portfolio development for students to use research-based games for learning.
- Already there are high-quality learning resources available evidenced in the on-to-one lap top initiative. This digital resource is appropriate and aligned with college/career readiness. The tools for creating and sharing new resources are being asked for through this grant to allow these marginalized students to further accelerate student learning towards college/career readiness.
- The processes and tools outlined in this proposal to match student needs and to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs. This feedback mechanism envelops both formative and summative assessments

(c) A reasonable case has been made for all participating school leaders and school leadership teams to have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment using Game-infused approach to learning. Such evidence has been provided in the following areas:

- Qualitative and quantitative information, from the district's teacher evaluation system will be made available. This data will serve to help school leaders and school leadership teams identify strengths and weaknesses and by extension take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement; and
- Furthermore, training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps

(d) Whereas the applicant has proposed a strong high-quality plan for increasing the

number of students who will receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, no evidence or mention has been made regarding the inclusion of hard-to-staff schools. Furthermore, the information has not been parced out with regards to hard-to-staff subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education). Because of this missing information full points were not earned for this aspect of the proposal.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In evaluating this aspect of the proposal, very scant information was provided

- On page 33, clear mention was made of how digital games differ from other media. No mention was made of how the central office, or the consortium governance structure provide support and services to all participating schools
- Again, missing from the narrative to address (D) (1) was the provision is any made for participating schools to have sufficient flexibility and autonomy over school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets;
- No evidence of giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic was mentioned;
- No evidence regarding the giving of students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways was offered either
- To a small extent vague mention was made regarding the provision of learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to students; Students will be able to interact with the digital games based on their level of mastery and skills. However, again no evidence was found addressing students with disabilities. By way of contrast, this initiative is designed to be in a marginalized area serving a high number of Hispanics for whom English is a second language. Furthermore, there has been indication regarding serving students in low income families.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

As specified in the proposal, the school infrastructure supports personalized learning in some ways and not in other ways.

- Some evidence was provided ensuring that participating students, parents, educators and other stakeholders regardless of income have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources. Evidence was provided for in school access but not out of school access.

- Evidence also was provided that parents, educators, and other stakeholders have access to appropriate levels of support extended through a range of strategies. For example, as the player solves the mission challenges he or she will then take on the roles and develop skills or talents that indicate a level of mastery. This will be facilitated by the use of an API system to connect into the designed games connected to the recently adopted Power School and School Net infrastructures.
- Justification was made of how information technology systems will be used that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format for this data to be used across platforms. The data will be stored and utilized by electronic tutors and tools that make recommendations for additional learning supports in conjunction with the ability and level of the students.
- With the infrastructure already in place, to a large extent, there is some evidence of LEAs and schools having the ability to use interoperable data systems inclusive of human resources, student information data, and instructional improvement system data. What was missing was explicit evidence with regards to interoperable budget data.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: A strong strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process was laid out in this proposal. The timeline of 4 years seems appropriate and timely with regular feedback on progress toward project goals built in. In addition, a strategy for sustainability is in place for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The evidence clearly provided was how the Sunnyside Unified School District will address monitoring, measuring, and publicly sharing information. These areas include the sustenance of professional development activities, technology usage, and staff in place to support the Game-infused initiative.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: A clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve the Game-infused initiative has been advanced its plan. Strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing a vision for the use of technology in teaching and learning 2. Having continuous individualized technology support that is a personal fit 3. Breaking down of hierarchical structure allowing access 4. Establishing open dialog and collaborative relationship 5. Providing mutual benefits for mentors and mentees 6. Establishing and maintaining learning communities 7. Providing support for parents and afterschool programs to leverage student data 		

- 8. Building bridges between generations
- 9. Leveraging of organizations such as boys and Girl's clubs, libraries, churches etc, serving a s unique training spaces for families

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The information provided for (E) (3) was obscure and vague as it relates to performance criteria. Ambitious yet achievable performance measures for all students was provided showing realistic and modest increases over time. However,

- A rationale for selecting each measure was absent
- How the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success was not included in the narrative
- How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress also was absent form the narrative.
- Unfortunately, only 5 performance measures were documented.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Extensive plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the Games-infused initiative are fully in place in the narrative. Both implementation and outcome evaluation measures are accounted for. These measures will ensure fidelity the process. Implementation evaluation measures will address formative evaluation encounters to improve the program. Hence, the following will be evaluated:

1. Teacher participation in technology based professional development
2. Teacher tracking of student progress
3. Student use of common core game-infused curriculum
4. Family use of computer technology outside of the school

Outcome Evaluation will address 4 main components

1. 1. Growth in student achievement
2. Personalized of students through game-infused curriculum and learning management tools available to teachers
3. Personalized professional development for teachers, and
4. Performance measures for teacher, principals and superintendents

Other pertinent areas for evaluation will include student outcomes, teacher outcomes as well as community and family outcomes. Hence, a complete plan that appropriately evaluates the implementation and success of the games-infused initiative has been put in place.

In sum, the narrative provided evidences for more than 90% of the criteria asked for, hence, a high-range score was earned. However, missing from the narrative were evidences regarding how improved technology would be extended to external stakeholders.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The following budget (inclusive of the budget narrative and tables) provides cogent information that—

- (a) Identifies all funds that will support the project both external and internal funds
- (b) Based on the budget and the amount being asked for this is a convincing budget that is reasonable and sufficient to support the development implementation and sustainability of the games-infused proposal

(c) A careful and thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities also were provided that was in keeping with the vision and mission of the Games-infused initiative.

Missing from the narrative is clear identification of funds to be used for one-time investment. Funds for on-going operational costs were identified. Hence, this narrative scored in the high-range but did not earn full points.

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

10

10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Sustainability of project goals have been assured based on the project's goals after the term of the grant in multiple ways

1. The plan includes support from State and local government leaders
2. Budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds
3. The need to support research and development that strengthens the multi stakeholder alignment and continued optimization of games-infused services
4. Maintenance of a research and development team
5. Provision of support for ASU's research infrastructure to support ongoing data collection
6. Having adequate staffing
7. Partnering with stakeholders Pearson, E-Line media, Center for Games and Impact, Cooney Center, BLEgroup, Greaves Group and ASU Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College

Together these alliances helps to focus the Games-infused initiative in becoming entrenched in the Sunnyside Unified School District

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

There was no evidence provided for competitive preference priority as required in the application. Hence, no points were awarded.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Woven throughout the tapestry of this proposal, evidences have been provided that Sunnyside Unified School District is capable of implementing a meaningful Games-infused curriculum to reach marginalized youths. Core educational assurances would be built through strong partnerships with individuals and businesses in the public and private sectors. A learning environment designed to significantly improve learning and teaching using technology as a tool for teaching with game-infused strategies is a winning combination for these marginalized youths to connect with. The Games-infused initiative is aligned with the mission and vision of getting students graduating from high school college/career ready.

Importantly, appropriate measures to accelerate student learning; deepen learning; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access; decrease achievement gaps and above all increase

the rates at which students graduate from high school has been demonstrated in this narrative as an absolute priority for the Sunnyside School District--all evidenced in this proposal.

Total	210	169
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0721AZ-3 for Sunnyside USD #12

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria may appear.</p> <p>The applicant builds a case for "Game-based Learning Ecosystem" in Section I of the proposal narrative. However, the applicant does not provide a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda built on the four core educational assurances.</p> <p>Additionally, the applicant does not articulate a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. In Section III, the applicant provides the key focus of this project, "to pull together a world-class team of game-based-learning researchers, designers, developers and publishers committed to sourcing, curating, adapting and creating original game-infused learning products and services so that they can be effectively implemented and continually optimized at Sunnyside... to ensure that students are being successfully prepared for successful 21st Century lives and careers." Later in the same section, the applicant introduces the goal for the project, "to develop and promote a uniquely innovative learning environment for students, teachers, families and communities that allows each to build agency, ability, competence and courage to fundamentally change the 21st century world."</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria may appear.</p> <p>(a) - (b) Although the applicant provided a School Demographic Table which includes a list of the schools: 4 elementary schools (grades 4-5), 6 middle schools (grades 6-8), 3 high schools (9-12) that will participate in grant activities (as shown in the appendix section), the applicant failed to provide a description of the process of how and why the participating schools were selected to ensure that they (as defined in this notice) collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements.</p> <p>(c) There are a total of 12,208 participating students of which 10,891 participating students from low-income families, 12,208 participating students who are high-need students, and 520 participating educators.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria may appear.

The applicant failed to provide a plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools (as defined in this notice), and how it will help the applicant reach its outcome goals.

The applicant provides as an examples previous reform efforts, "Project Graduation", Digital Advantage, and Digital Advantage Scholars that included a digital component and one-to-one computing. The application includes a replication process that is underway in Sunnyside for their Project Graduation and One-to- One Computer Initiative in 7 school districts within the state. The applicant did not provide a plan for its district on how it will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served by the RTT-D grant.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria may appear.

The applicant has set ambitious goals for Sunnyside students exceeding state targets in 3-8 grade reading and math, and high school reading as shown in data charts found in the Section II of the proposal. The applicant was not clear if the annual goals are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA(s), overall and by student subgroup (as defined in this notice), for Sunnyside School District in the following areas:

(a) Performance on summative assessments from baseline data to end of grant year: 3-8 grade Math from 54% to 95%; High School Math from 27% to 68%; 3-8 grade reading from 66% to 100%; and High School Reading 51% to 92% as shown in charts found in the Appendix section (proficiency status and growth) .

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps from -10% to -2% Eco Dis and ELLs, and -5% to 0% for Hispanics. The evidence shows there were gains experienced in reading for elementary and middle school students.

(c) Increase graduation rates by 2% from the baseline in the overall group as well as sub groups. A chart is provided as evidence showing a steady increase in the number of students graduating from 2007 - 2011.

(d) Improve college enrollment for Sunnyside students at their local university and community college as seen between 2008 and 2010 in the chart provided by the applicant. However, the applicant did not provide data for 2011.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria may appear.

The applicant provides some evidence of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching, including a description, charts or graphs, raw student data, and other evidence.

(a) The applicant provides examples of improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps:

- The applicant indicates that the gap between Arizona state average percent passing decreases between 2008 and 2011 with the greatest gains experienced in Reading for elementary and middle students - grades 3 - 8 (as shown in corresponding chart);
- High school graduation rates in Sunnyside's three high schools has increased from 505 in 2007 to 900 in 2012;
- Graduating seniors enrolling at the local university (University of Arizona) increased dramatically, and the enrollment into the local community college increased between 2008-2011 (as shown in charts);
- Decrease in percentage of LEP graduates; no longer LEP due to effective language support; and
- Increase of college enrollment among their graduating seniors.

(b) A weakness to this selection criterion is that the applicant did not demonstrate how the district will achieve ambitious and

significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) or in its low-performing schools (as defined in this notice).

(c) A weakness to this selection criterion is that the applicant did not demonstrate how the district will make student performance data (as defined in this notice) available to students, educators (as defined in this notice), and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.

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

5

4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria may appear.

As per the applicant, there is a high level of transparency in Sunnyside processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. On the business and financial page of the public SUSD website, there are past and current postings for Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) to assure transparency in disclosing financial information on the district. Contained within the SUSD website (www.susd12.org) is information regarding access to personnel information including highly qualified status of teachers, aids and paraprofessionals.

(a)-(d) The SUSD Human Resources department submits to the Arizona Department of Education an annual SDER report that contains in-depth information on administrators, teachers, and other district personnel salaries, numbers and location. The applicant did not indicate whether or not this report is made publicly available or just submitted to the Arizona Department of Education.

The applicant did not provide any evidence to substantiate its assertions/previous statements regarding transparency.

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

10

0

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.

The applicant describes leadership and change management in the Replication Plan for the One-to-One and Project Graduation Project.

For the current proposed project, the applicant does not demonstrate evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments. None are described in the applicant's proposal to address this criterion.

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

10

3

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.

A strength of this selection criterion is that the applicant provides several examples of how students, parents, and the community supports the use of technology to develop and utilize digital gaming for instruction, one-to-one computer initiatives, expert staff to provide instructional and technical support, Digital Advantage program, parent technology camps, and families and communities engaging in the learning environment.

(a) A weakness noted is that the applicant does not describe or provide evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of and providing feedback on the RTT-D grant proposal. There is no description or evidence of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools (as defined in this notice) were engaged in the development of the proposal and, as appropriate, how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback.

(b) There are strong letters of support provided by some of the stakeholders: the Arizona Dept of Education, the Mayor of Tucson, the business community, service providers, and institutions of higher education. A weakness to this criterion is that the applicant did not provide any evidence of support from one of the key stakeholders, the teachers.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middlerange. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.</p> <p>The applicant describes their current status initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology infrastructure to accommodate the effective use of over 15,000 portable computing devices across 23 school sites; • The increase of technology personnel support districtwide and within the sites; • 23 new coaching and technology integration support personnel • Parent and community connections; and • Ability to have the computing devises go home with the students. <p>However, the plan lacks a clarity on the needs and gaps that the plan will address to implement personalized learning environments.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria may appear.</p> <p>The applicant does not present a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. Although the applicant describes previous efforts, this proposed plan does not include an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students (as defined in this notice) that enable them to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) and college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs.</p> <p>(i) Although the applicant will measure this element in the evaluation plan, the applicant does not describe or provide evidence on how students will develop an understanding that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals.</p> <p>(ii) The applicant proposes a plan to personalize the learning environment by adapting and creating original game-infused learning products and services in order to develop and promote an innovative learning environment for students, teachers, families and communities that will allow each to build agency, ability, competence and courage to fundamentally change the 21st century world. However, the applicant does not identify and pursue learning and development goals that are linked to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice). Additionally, there is no discussion as to how students can understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals.</p> <p>(iii) Through this project, the applicant intends to design, develop and establish a game-infused curriculum in grades 4 – 12 in the core areas of Mathematics, English Language Arts, and Science, Social Studies. However, there is no indication that the students will be able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest.</p> <p>(iv) The applicant does not include in its plan student opportunities to access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning; and</p> <p>(v) The applicant does not include in its plan how students will master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving;</p> <p>(b) Although the applicant describes personalizing the learning environment by adapting and creating original game-infused learning products and services, there is no strategy in place to ensure that each student has access to:</p> <p>(i) – (iii) A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development; a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments; and high-quality content, including digital learning content (as defined in this notice).</p>		

(iv) The applicant describes that ongoing and regular feedback will be provided through its evaluation plan. However, the applicant does not show how: (A) student data will be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; and how (B) personalized learning recommendations will be made based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and available content, instructional approaches, and supports.

(v) The applicant will implement game-infused learning products and services for all students including strategies for high-need students (as defined in this notice). There is no discussion that ensures that students are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice).

(c) The applicant did not demonstrate in its plan that there are mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

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

20

4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.

The applicant does not demonstrate a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The applicant proposes to support teachers by developing their ability, confidence, and professional network so that they can successfully implement, share and iterate game-infused experiences in the classroom.

Although some of the elements in this criterion are evident, this plan does not include an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students (as defined in this notice) that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) and college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs.

(a) The applicant includes a professional development plan for all participating educators (as defined in this notice) that include plans to build into a mentoring program to:

- Provide a vision for the use of technology in teaching and learning
- Individualize technology support (personal fit)
- Break down hierarchical structure
- Establish open dialogue and collaborative relationships
- Provide mutual benefits for mentor and mentees
- Establish learning communities

(i) However, the applicant does not show how this plan will support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

(ii) The applicant describes plans on utilizing existing games and creating new ones to adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches (e.g., discussion and collaborative work, project-based learning, videos, audio, manipulatives).

(iii) The applicant does not address how and when student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements will be measured (as defined in this notice) and how they will use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators.

(iv) The applicant describes that it will use their new teacher evaluation to improve teachers' effectiveness by using feedback from the evaluation rubric (BEST) to measure academic growth of their students. However, there was no discussion on what is used to measure the principals' practice and effectiveness.

(b) The applicant describes that the district has instructional and technology support that allows for all participating educators (as defined in this notice) have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources.

- (i) & (iii) The applicant shares that educators have access to an iPad application developed by the university which allows teachers to track student progress in “real time” that respond to individual student academic needs and interests;
- (ii) Previous initiatives have provided for high-quality learning resources (e.g., instructional content and assessments). The applicant proposes to provide the tools to create and share new resources.
- (c) The applicant’s Replication Plan shows that all participating school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress. However, it is not evident for the proposed project.
- (i) The applicant provides information, from such sources as the district’s teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice), that helps school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement.
- (ii) The applicant describes the training, systems, and practices that teachers and school leaders will take part in to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice).
- (d) The applicant does not demonstrate a clear plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals (as defined in this notice), including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education).

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	0
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.</p> <p>The applicant presents a "Replication Plan" for Project Graduation and One-to-One Computing. The applicant does not make it clear if components of the Replication Plan are linked to the proposed project or if it will support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p> <p>(a) The applicant does not demonstrate that the Sunnyside central office structure (as defined in this notice) will provide support and services to all participating schools (as defined in this notice). Although the applicant provides a structure in the Replication Plan found in the appendix, the applicant does not link this structure to current plan.</p> <p>(b) The applicant focuses on describing components of the Replication Plan that it failed to describe how the school leadership teams in participating schools (as defined in this notice) will be provided with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets;</p> <p>(c) For the current proposed project, the applicant did not include in its plan opportunities for students to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic;</p> <p>(d) For the current proposed project, the applicant did not include in its plan opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways; and</p> <p>(e) For the current proposed project, the applicant did not clearly identify learning resources and instructional practices that can be adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated

alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.

Although the applicant did not provide a plan, the applicant demonstrates to some degree that school infrastructure supports personalized learning.

(a) The district has made great strides to ensure all students, parents, and educators have access to electronic devices both at school and at home. Internet access has been made available to parents through their tax program.

(b) The applicant demonstrates that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support from the instructional technology department and the information technology department to ensure that instruction is not compromised.

(c) The district has information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format such as Parent Connect (a student information system, The Parent Link, a tool used to communicate with parents via phone, email, and text, and iPhone application which provides instant news, calendars, and notifications).

(d) The applicant does not provide information regarding interoperable data systems (as defined in this notice) (e.g., systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data).

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.</p> <p>The applicant provides evidence of an evaluation plan that consists of both an implementation evaluation and an outcome evaluation. While the implementation evaluation will ensure fidelity to the model proposed and will examine descriptive statistics including activities and participation rates, the outcome evaluation will examine the impact of the program on students, teachers, administrators, and at the school-level.</p> <p>This plan does not include a strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant, nor how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.</p> <p>Within the Evaluation Plan, the applicant indicates that data will be collected, analyzed and shared with key program stakeholders. However, the applicant did not provide strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the low range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.</p> <p>The applicant did not address this Selection Criterion. The applicant provided a chart that did not appropriately outline the required performance measures for the applicant’s population, and did not support responses to performance measures.</p>		

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. The applicant presents a plan how it will evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District.

As a strength to this criterion, the applicant plans to conduct two forms of evaluation.

- An implementation evaluation will serve as a formative piece to gather data on: teacher participation in technology-based professional development; teacher tracking of student progress; student use of common-core game-infused curriculum; and family use of the computer outside of the school.
- An outcome evaluation that will examine: growth in student achievement; personalized education of students through game-infused curriculum and learning management tools available to teachers; personalized professional development for teachers, and performance measures for teachers, principals, and superintendents.

However, the applicant did not include nor was evidence provided on evaluating effectiveness of: productive use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures (e.g., service delivery, school leadership teams (as defined in this notice), and decision-making structures).

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range.

The applicant's budget is thorough and includes a budget narrative and table as evidence.

(a) The applicant identifies all funds that will support the project from Race to the Top – District grant and local district funds.

(b) The applicant has allocated funds for various positions that will be needed to facilitate the work of the grant and are reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. Positions include project manager, marketing manager, gaming positions, digital curriculum specialist, systems analyst, game studio senior programmer, and research development team positions. The applicant focuses funding teacher stipends so that they can participate in professional development activities.

(c) The applicant justifies the need for the funds (i.e., personnel requests, travel, training, videography equipment, and cache devices) through its rationale and in the budget narrative.

(i) A description of all funds that will support the project from Race to the Top – District grant and local district funds to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from these sources; and

(ii) The applicant identifies one-time investments, such as caching devices for each network to accelerate access to web content.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. It is important to note that the applicant has designated alpha and numerical notes to sections of the narrative where the selection criteria appear.

The applicant has a history of working with its business and higher education partners and seems to have a long term relationship based on the proposal. The applicant does not demonstrate a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. However, there is evidence in the proposal and in the appendix section that the partnership will continue to support the district in its initiatives. Based on the letters of support the applicant provided, there is local and government support for this project. Additionally, the community is also a strong supporter of the district that it passed an \$88 million bond of which \$27 million was earmarked to increase technology use.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not address Competitive Preference Priority: Results, Resource Alignment, and Integrated Services in the application. The applicant did not propose to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students (as defined in this notice), giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students (as defined in this notice).

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not address Absolute Priority 1 in its responses to the selection criteria. The applicant did not build on the core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total	210	67
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0721AZ-4 for Sunnyside USD #12

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>Applicant provides a compelling vision for developing a game-based learning infrastructure and community network service that will be continually optimized for maximal learning and engagement of youth. Applicant emphasizes that sustainable game-based services can be continually optimized for the learning and social impact outcomes articulated in the grant. The vision does not appear closely linked in the narrative to several of the core educational assurance areas beyond improved academic outcomes. It is unclear what changes might be made to the scope and depth of the curriculum by dramatically changing the delivery mechanism for providing curricular content. This project is very much technology-focused, while glossing over elements of a broader reform agenda in which technology might also be a component if the applicant had a more comprehensive vision for change and improved outcomes in the district. A score in the middle range is awarded.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application does not describe the process that the applicant used to select schools to participate, although it does provide the list of schools and the information on participating students, as requested. A score in the middle range is awarded.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application does not provide a high-quality plan, as defined in the notice, beyond broad and short descriptions of what will happen in the first year of the project and in years 2-4. However, a detailed description of the game-based learning ecosystem model is provided (the theory of change). A score in the low end of the middle range is provided.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Ambitious goals are set forth for subelements (a) to (d), but they do not seem achievable based on the limited scope of this application, which is focused on introducing game-based technology. Insufficient attention is paid to any research body that would support being able to generate these ambitious goals due to the specific reforms in the plans. For example, it is very unclear how college enrollment rates will increase from 20 to 50 percent in 4 years because of this new approach to accessing the curriculum. Such an increase does not seem achievable based on the project's reforms. Achievement gaps are expected to be reduced by at least 40%, and in some cases entirely eliminated, in four years because of the reforms in this project. Points were awarded for the improved student outcomes, but in the middle range due to several of the outcomes being deemed unlikely to result from the project's activities.</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>The applicant has committed resources in recent years to providing 15,000 digital devices in the hands of 4th grade to 9th grade students, creating a one-to-one digital learning environment. The district has experienced greatly fluctuating trends in academic proficiency in math and reading since 2008. For example, the passing rate of district 10th graders on high school math examinations have declined. The gaps are not as big in reading, but the district is below the state average passing rates. The district does not provide explanation for several sizable drops in achievement. For example, African Americans went from scoring 12% higher than the state average in high school reading in 2008 to 31% below in 2011, a gigantic decline in performance that dramatically increased the achievement gap with white students. The story overall is mixed and not one of a clear record of success, and the lack of success in some areas, which is at times startling in the data, is not explained. A score in the low range is provided.</p>		

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not directly address this criterion. Instead, it mentions that the Board maintains a high level of transparency and that the district submits to the state department of education reports that contains in-depth personnel salary information. Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports are posted on the district website, but it is not clear what salary information they may contain. A score in the low range is provided.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not demonstrate specific evidence of existing State legal and regulatory requirements to implement personalized learning environments. Very brief mention is made of the state superintendent supporting the district in its one-to-one computer initiative and helping to implement a computer math intervention into elementary schools, for which a point was given for implying that conditions exist under which certain personalized learning environments can be fostered in the state. Other than that single sentence, which is of limited use in demonstrating successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State statutory and regulatory requirements, the applicant does not appear to have responded to this criterion.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides evidence of broad local support for this project, from leading learning scientists, to renowned local faculty, to innovative companies devoted to publishing impact games, to teacher college faculty to the state superintendent. A 2012 Technology Town Hall and subsequent technology camp for parents helped to inform parents of the digital process and plans for their children. Letters of support are provided from a broad set of stakeholders. It is not clear, however, how teacher and principals and families were specifically engaged in the development of the project proposal. A score in the middle range is awarded.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has not demonstrated evidence for a high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments. There are no timelines, targets, plan of specific actions linked to specific actors, as set forth in the notice for a high-quality plan. Very thinly described needs and gaps are identified that are linked to the logic behind the reform proposal, for which a point is awarded. A score in the low range is provided.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	2
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>No organized attempt is made to address this criterion. Instead, several broad statements are provided about how the district has developed a unique design to assist one-to-one classroom teachers integrate technology into their daily instructional practices, through professional development with trainers as well as coaches to support the learners, for which a couple points are awarded. The proposal never clearly defines how the use of game-based ecology specifically enables participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements and how that would accelerate learning. There are assumptions clearly made throughout the proposal that this will happen, but the necessary transitions between such standards and graduation requirements and increased learning due to introducing game-based strategies is never clearly demonstrated. A score in the low range is provided.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>No organized attempt is made to comprehensively cover the elements of this criterion. The application broadly describes the current level of technology trainers and coaches and the coaching and training processes, which embed effective components to help change teacher practices and move toward the incorporation of technology into the existing curriculum. The Governing Board of the district has authorized additional FTE for instructional technology coaches, technology trainers, and teacher technology facilitators. The professional development department of the district also plans to create a mentoring program based on current literature on effective mentoring models. Four points are awarded for these specific examples.</p> <p>The proposal never clearly defines how the use of game-based ecology specifically enables teachers to deliver a more rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements and accelerates learning. There are assumptions clearly implied throughout the proposal that this will happen, but the necessary transitions between such standards and graduation requirements and enhanced teaching and leading at the site level due to introducing game-based strategies are never clearly demonstrated. A score in the low range is provided.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	1
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not address this element clearly, beyond providing some discussion of the district's organizational model of teacher support (technology coaches). A score in the low range is awarded.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's project clearly focuses on ensuring participating students have access to necessary content and tools through mobile devices aimed at supporting personalized learning. The applicant outlines the technology coaching process and technology training assistance for teachers and its use of site coaches at the middle school and elementary levels to provide technical support.. The discussion for this element largely does not address subelements (c) and (d), however. A score in the middle range is provided for points awarded for adequate coverage of subelements (a) and (b).</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Most of the continuous improvement process discussion in this application is not about a strategy for implementing a process for ongoing corrections and improvements for this grant, but about a process implemented previously for Project Graduation, which was a five-year project from 2008-2012 in the district. The district does describe a high-technology-enriched family and community engagement program, providing parent access to the Student Information System as well as to ParentLink, a communication tool used by the district to send important information on school or district events via phone, email, or text. It is not clear, however, how such access will provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals. A score in the low range is provided.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district has a state-of-the-art family and community engagement programs that is high-technology enriched. The applicant will provide support to parents and after-school programs to leverage student data and increase understanding with</p>		

respect to supporting youth in making connections between in-school activities and real-world challenges with the goal of extending the school day. Face-to-face meetings will be encouraged, but the goal is to create an online community, supporting parent involvement, to strengthen the connection between parent involvement with their children's progress or lack of progress in schools. Sufficient information with all elements of a high-quality plan is not provided to merit a score in the upper range. A score in the middle range is provided.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The performance measures found in the appendices are incomplete, and most of them do not provide numerical targets or even baselines. In at least one case (grades 4-10 math and language arts), the targets for annual growth seem unrealistically ambitious (29% to 31% ranking of movement in percentile rankings over just 4 years, with no explanation). A score in the low range is provided for the limited number of performance measures that were complete, with numerical targets and baselines provided.

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

5

4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides an evaluation plan consisting of both an implementation evaluation and an outcome evaluation. A mixed-methods design will be employed to collect quantitative and qualitative data and will be based at the teacher and student levels, but will take classroom-level, school-level, and district-level variables into account. While many components such as student-level achievement and teacher effectiveness will be measured for all participants, a stratified random sample will be used to examine socio-emotional indicators for students. Student participation in technology-infused games will be examined as it relates to academic growth, socio-emotional measures, progress toward college and career readiness, and number of and enrollment in AP classes. Teacher and community/family outcomes will also be explored. The strategies described do not seem to be focused on working with community partners, compensation reform, modification of school schedules and structures and decision-making structures. A score in the high range is awarded.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget summary's total budget line in the narrative of the application does not match that in the full budget found in the appendices.</p> <p>The budget identifies all funds used to support the grant. However, only \$200,000 is anticipated from unidentified community and national sponsors, less than 1 percent of the project budget, despite significant enthusiasm supporting this proposal in the letters from partners who will be involved with this project. The rest of the \$29.9 million budget will come from funds under the RTT-District grant, if awarded.</p> <p>The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal.</p> <p>The budget provides a reasonably thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities, but It is unclear what will happen to some of the proposal's funded staff needs when the grant ends. There is no discussion of long-term sustainability or strategies for how these reforms will be reformed or continued beyond the term of the grant.</p> <p>A score in the middle range is awarded.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>No discussion is provided for what will happen to the reforms in this project beyond the term of the grant. No points are awarded, as there is not a high-quality plan for continuing these reforms after the term of the grant. The project, even during the term of the grant, was envisioned to be funded over 99% by this federal grant. No optional beyond-the-grant budget is provided, nor any discussion about budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds beyond the term of the grant.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides no discussion of the competitive preference priority. No points are awarded.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: This project seems like a mismatch with the RTT program. It is focused almost exclusively on expanding mobile technology in classrooms, but is not aligned closely with several of the core educational assurance areas, and is proposed with little focus on how the introduction of significant game-based tools will affect or modify the curriculum or is likely to lead to increased academic results. The scale of the project may also not be reasonable for a single district to earmark upon. This one district is trying create a rich and varied and extensive portfolio of game-based tools for the use of just students in this district, at significant development cost.		

Total	210	58
-------	-----	----