



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0859IL-1 for Unity Point CCSD #140

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 8 |

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A clear, concise vision is articulated within a feasible plan framework describing evidence of leadership teams expecting higher goals for student achievement. One core focus on preparation of accelerating students into the transition of postsecondary education alongside higher graduation rates is sufficient to expand on the need to turn-around low performing schools. Still, more specific detail is needed about high performance evaluations of teachers and principals and how to accomplish this task to complete the vision of the plan. Overall, the plan lacks cohesiveness of the implementation of timetable and deliverables within the framework.

Appropriate evidence includes, "Transforming the traditional landscape and placing students at the center of the learning, and preparatory stages of scaffolding into a complete sequence such as the College and Career Readiness Academy, and other instructional models that implement supports with high quality resources.

The four core assurances build the vision in a realistic and practical way for providing accelerated classroom, the structure of a data system, and the need for highly performing teachers and principal."The acceleration of student achievement, and deepening student learning is sufficiently addressed through: high accountability for teachers and principals through rigorous certification and evaluation standards, along with strong professional development incorporated throughout the year. A few segments of the plan is unorganized in sections and is insufficient in the interconnectivity especially concerning how teachers and principals are to be held to a highly evaluative standard.

School-to-work and transitions to postsecondary components are justified pillars to support overall career-readiness standards. The plan is ambition in it's scope of work, and policy and procedures to close achievement gaps. Items such as truant students decreased over 4 years, students submitting FASA's increased, the number of college and career ready students are steady. Strong growth in overall math achievement scores on ISAT and PSAT's.

"A research and design approach is focused on the teacher practice of building better classrooms with strong student support and mentoring. Moreover the leadership management is justified to establish the organizational efficacy to implement three foundational conditions for personalized learning." The vision addresses implementing core curriculum that builds upon prior learning with assessments that drive and support sufficient foundational elements as outlined in the documentation. There is sufficient cohesiveness to transistion students into secondary education, but lacks the ability to address career-readiness completely.

The four core educational assurance areas executes evidence of rigorous content and application of evidence and research based models that justify collaborative learning profiles, alternative assessments, digital blended-learning that promotes individual learning choice, peer mentoring, train-the-trainer, coaching, and project based learning with survey's of learning that builds on current standards thus impacting the implementation of the vision. This in turn has far-reaching implications in impacting accelerated learning outcomes, and turning around low-performing schools. The vision is clear, although some parts of the organization of the plan are disorganized and harder to comprehend; for example how the parts work together as a connected whole. There appears to be many fragments and pieces to pull together to cohesiveness of the PLA.

RTT3 Framework-Impact Illinois, catalyst 2 research and design approach is realistic and reliable based on state standards, therefore the vision meets and somewhat exceeds the state metric for academic achievement. This vison aligns to the strategic goal of college and workforce career-readiness based on the vision to embrace dual credit endeavors, again, the how this is to be accomplished needs to be addressed with more specific details.

Rising Stars overarching framework is for keeping instruction moving that is both research-based and field tested. Strong digital strategies with ongoing communication and use of qualitative and quantitative based-data: it is this type of data that drills-down to inform the teacher and all stakeholders, of the targets students should be reaching in the classroom.

The vision builds on the strength of current standards, but dives deeper into realistic and practical approaches for the student to be at the center of his/her learning, and to be able to align the application of deeper student learning to equity consistent with lifelong learning skills. Equity is increased throughout the performance measures as insured through data-driven outcomes that target any gaps in learning, specific, measureable, targets inform the grounding of any shifts in learning resulting in stronger individual time-on-task academic endeavors. Focus on student interest aligns to work-ready and soft-skill attainments. Turning around low achieving schools is based on specific measurable outcomes, that is best addressed with data matching to each student for improved teacher understanding and knowledge of what drives each student's personal performance outcomes. The building of the data match from teacher to student, from teacher to principal, and principal to consortia, guides the strategic plan implementation and creates synergy throughout the LEA's with a clear, concise, and credible approach for individual students task's accomplishments and outcomes. The plan is ambitious but practical in its achievable attainments, but lacks fluidity and the connectiveness needed to articulate a clear vision.

Standards and practices are aligned for knowledge management and useable data in the hands of decision makers who have the most influence in how to allow teachers and principals to become reflective participants alongside students to adapt for instructional needs.

Data system will inform learning through teacher intensive training and understanding of the data and how the right data can impact and inform "promising practices" of student achievement. The information does not specify how the data system is to be developed and what specific measurements it will track.

Accelerated and deepening of student knowledge is documented into the cohesive plan which demonstrates, that if it is executed well, can have a far reaching impact into achievable, ambitious goals and metrics.

Turning around lowest achieving schools remains the challenge, and there was a somewhat qualified and projectory information on this point, lacked some evidence for how the turnaround process might proceed in a timely manner.

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

10

8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strategies and foundational supports are appropriate and convincing for the rural schools selected to participate in implementing a standard-aligned instructional system across demographics where over 50% of the student population is from low-income families. Documented evidence proves 35% of the educational consortium students are in high-need situations such as homelessness, poverty, and social-emotional distress, or substandard housing.

The LEA's approach to implementation of reform is based on buy-in from those who will be structuring the process of school achievement cycles and school reform improvements. The LEA's work to form quality consensus-building tasks based on changing school climates, and working towards excellerated growth modules that can be repleted.

The LEA's memberships are experts in their respective fields of learning and sit on boards throughout the state of Illinois, and this human capacity lends support to the evaluation of the plan and how the plan would be managed. The combined expertise of human capital goes far beyond the school building or school day. The bands cut across diverse student populations with various needs and vast use of flexible, yet comprehensive school based instructional models. The teachers form tasks of learning based on the assessments of the individual students, and ensures that quality of learning takes place through a variety of individualized learning plans targeted specifically to student performance goals. Principals and instructors will use the data and subject areas of math and English to negotiate and navigate skill learning gaps that can be closed with responsible and respectful approaches as evidenced in an ambitious yet achievable plan.

Evidence of Illinois RTT3 participating LEA's: high minority schools. A continuing improvement model: "The Rising Star" system details and justifies the criteria to select and define the schools eligible to participate in the application process. It creates systemic change mechanisms designed to close achievement gaps by providing evidence of achievements in grades 3-8 for high percentages of reading and math, across the district. High performance measures exceeded yearly average progress across the board.

Strengths of the ELA's included foundational elements are ambitious and achievable based on the grant activities outlined to impact the following criteria: such as the impact on the learning, and setting high but achievable standards, personal learning structures for more authentic and goal driven student mastery, the focus on graduation rates and career-readiness for all students, alongside the tracking of student data for more complete analysis of the learning structure

Overall, the plan lacks specific measures to address diversity within the student populations.

Unity Point CCSD 140 invited Murphysboro, Marion and Giant City school districts to apply as the **IMPACT ILLINOIS**

Consortium. Leadership representation (superintendent, assistant superintendent, building principals, teacher association president, district technology director and high school's vocational director) from each district met to review the eligibility requirements, selection criteria and scope of work. The administrative teams for each LEA met with unions and school boards to determine their

level of commitment. By majority, a consensus was reached for each LEA that all schools would participate in the competition.

All students in the consortium will participate. 32% of the participating students are high-need and 50% come from low-income families. Many of our low-income students are in critical situations such as homelessness, social-emotional distress, and/or substandard housing.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A strong but limited plan is presented as evidenced through effective training of teachers through professional development (Development Sequence Model). The district-wide LEA reform supports an ISBE center for improvement and outlines clearly the shifts of change and multiple layers of procedures and practices to impact higher, deeper, student learning initiatives. Three key goals provide a significant rationale for creating a highly effective classroom environment: a rigorous capacity for accelerated student support, organizational efficacy, teacher training and leading. There is evidence of strong policy reform to support project implementation (leveraged human capacity and funding resources.) A commitment, as demonstrated by 100% of the schools participating, makes it hard to scale-up, because all of the schools are involved.

This speaks to a boldly determined group of schools to diligently change and improve the current school environment and to improve student learning outcomes across the spectrum for accelerated learning, more effective and efficient evaluations of school leaders, the collaborative use of the data system, and commitment to turn-around low performing schools in rural areas.

Development of theory bases and educational philosophies merit a plan based in empirical and qualitative research. Plan rest in hands of Consortium model and each LEA is sturdy to implement the plan through professional learning communities, professional development sequence model, grant leadership team, Impact Illinois, and IASB.

The overarching plan is supported through Impact Illinois a state-wide initiative that includes many LEA's and stakeholders promoting a pathway for high academic and accelerated pathways. The district-wide support team would be a key stakeholder that would demonstrate appropriate managerial oversight and leadership to support the ongoing success of participating schools. The plan implementation either meets or exceeds the Illinois model of learning for successful student outcomes. The plan works within a strong, documented structure of collective and individualized learning for professional learning environments; also aligned to several ongoing models of consortium supports.

The plan works to overcome skill gaps and to create a common culture of student learning outcomes that is far reaching and creative in the dissemination of strategies and goals as documented by:

1. The Participating LEA's will agree to meet a high bar for participation across a comprehensive set of reforms.
2. Within the Participating LEAs, build systems and processes to accelerate and sustain improved student outcomes.
3. Participating LEAs will blaze the path for a comprehensive approach to key reforms.

Performance based outcomes are supported by " three foundational elements to justify focused and sound models of theory and change, that includes:

-Common data and technology platform-Illinois Shared Learning Environments/shared learning infrastructure/high quality resources.

-Integrated state supports, IMPACT (learning with a student center approach): Anytime, anywhere, learning (provides the student with the flexibility to eliminate the classroom walls, and learn at his own pace, within his/her own timeframe). Timeframes may need more detailed analysis and specifics.

-Personalized learning and teaching approach is strong and reasonable given the integration, training, and access to outside resources aligned to STEM and Illinois pathways. This is documented by the state and through legislation; also alignment with PARCC and Common Core Standards.

1. Anytime/Everywhere Learning, Redefine Teacher Role and Expand "Teacher", Project-Based/Authentic Learning Opportunities, Student Driven Learning Path, Mastery/Competency-Based Progression.

2. Personalized learning recommendations are facilitated through key Illinois state initiatives in order to provide learners, parents, and educator's immediate and meaningful access to resources and data.

3. Student support systems scaffold the process.

A transformative educational landscape with timelines around deliverables, although specific timetables were difficult to locate in the grant.

Strengths include: continued development of the Professional Learning Communities, an on-going school-wide Professional Development model

focused on establishing student-centered, technology-enriched learning environments that address CCSS and College and

Career-ready requirements through full implementation of personalized learning and teaching, although this needed more specific detail.

Attributes for success are characteristic in this district-wide model as evidenced by the adoption of :

Common Core State Standards, the expectation is to see a steady increase in these scores.

A myriad of supports conceptualizes and proves the construct of a high quality-plan and reflects a high score on the application. The goals are achievable and supports a model of improvement measurables that relies on research and best practice theories. The goals, are achievable and deliverable, the activities are deep in technology and blended-classrooms, along with flipped classrooms. The use of instructional strategies are supported for an accelerated learning model that is timely on measured outcomes, with data imbedded and infused into the personal learning environment. A high quality approach from the standpoint of buy-in for all stakeholders using team models, mentoring constructs, and autonomy for the learner. Ambitious goals centered on increasing graduation rates, and a clear pathway to transition students into postsecondary education and career-ready goals.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The outlined targeted vision and plan implementation is ambitious in scope and fortifies data related summative assessments providing feedback for decreasing achievement gaps and supporting students from middle-school to graduation. Previous partnerships with LEA's improves the impact of the educational consortium in reaching achievable and realistic goals. Plan is grounded in theory and research-based best practices that can align for superior student outcomes if access to school-based resources are available. Data charts indicate the likely results to improved student learning and performance. This comprehensive approach demonstrates and recognizes the work to be accomplished within the timeframe of deliverables to increase and support graduation rates and the transition into postsecondary education for students of all economic, racial, and social groups.

(a) Strong supports for alignment to state goals and expectations to see rising scores in the Rising Star initiative: Once the State assessment is aligned to the Common Core State Standards, the expectation is to see a steady increase in these scores. The amount of growth expected within the grant cycle is the difference in percentage points between the State's goal and the baseline score for each subgroup. For those subgroups already achieving or surpassing the State's 2015-2016 goals, goals were set based upon prior achievement history within that district.

The overall subgroups consist of very few students, lack of diverse student populations into the summative assessments and growth status.

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading and math on the ISAT and PSAE: The State's goal is to

decrease the achievement gaps by 1/2 of current levels over six years. The consortium goals mirror that of the State's, and is not overly ambitious in nature.

(c) Increasing high school graduation rates: The State's goal is to achieve a 90% overall graduation rate in the next six years and to

reduce by 1/2 the difference from 90% for each student subgroup's graduation rate. The consortium goals mirror that of the State's.

(d) Increasing college enrollment:

The goals are equal to the state metric and ESEA targets. Basic performance information provides for achievable annual rates of growth within the LEA, with ambitious structure around those students who are in the target co-hort and sub-groups.

Good detail on how to target and decrease achievement gaps.

Strong research for math/language arts and data based performance outcomes.

Wide gaps exist among diverse populations, although the consortium is on track for showing improvements; especially with the Asian population.

Blacks tend to lag behind, but is testing better. More exploration is needed around the incorporation of diversity and how it will connect into the plan.

No real data to track solid outcomes, on some portions of the application due to lack of benchmarking from the state.

The vision for college and career readiness is aligned to the plan in a significant way, in that the key goals maintain the hardest to reach groups/schools will be on track to transition into postsecondary education.

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 | 14 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

LEA documents and presents qualified data to support a clear, concise track record demonstrated by being recognized as a "spotlight school".

The approach in selecting schools to advance as student learning and achievement school is rigorous in methodology. Selected schools had to meet AYP, and at least 60% are from low-income households, Unity Point achieved honor roll status each year from 2006-2011. Progress and sustained movement on achievement test is evidenced by subgroups with reading increases of 3% and Math having gradual increases to 92.3% which meets or exceeds the state standards. EE scores have significant gains showing 33.8% in 2009 to 59.5% in 2011, and 69.1% presently.

Specifically, there is concern for inconsistent data among races with black students not making performance outcomes as expected. ISAT math grades 3-8 varies from school to school. Raw student data suggests that there are a few strong schools in the LEA, while others are maintaining. A high level of advancing student learning and other learning outcomes support achievable and significant reforms in low performing schools. Performance data instructs and informs the learning in accordance with "best practice" for improved student performance outcomes that target specific and needed achievement gaps. A clear record of growth over 4 years is present with exhaustive and extensive data/graphs and charts to support a clear record of success. Unity Point a spotlight school, EE scores show gains of 12% at Marion CUSD. Special Education groups aligned with Marion CUSD2 during past 5 years to reduce Educational Environment Codes, these show significant gains of 11 %

Significant gains at Murphysboro decreased gaps among subgroups; significantly with black/white groups and the Low Income Groups (2001-2012) .

America Competes engagement platform used to address elements, and to impact quality assurance of data to inform growth in personalized learning environments.

The extent to which the applicant has demonstrated success is within co-hort models and sub-groups of learners. All stakeholders are able to access student performance data for complete and specific targeted performance outcomes. This in turn, informs the process of what achievement gaps must be met and closed within the LEA, as addressed by the Educational LEA consortium.

Levels of achievement well above the state average was maintained with an overall increase of the district composite ISAT score from 89% to

90% students that meet or exceed state standards

. The most significant success story is the increase in math achievement, a 36% percentage change from 62.5% in 2008 to 85% in 2011.

. This includes an 8% increase for the Economically Disadvantaged for the 3 years they were a subgroup and a decrease of 45% in the Gap between the White and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups.

A comprehensive implemented plan to address the Response to Intervention movement during the 2007-2008 school year (See *Marion Multi-tier Interventions Attachment 6*) in academic and behavioral domains. Universal screeners assisted the identification of needed student interventions. Student interventions were implemented and summative reading and mathematics scores began to improve. Currently, the school district displays continued growth; however, the growth target is slightly less than the national target

to meet Annual Yearly Progress. However, when using a growth model approach, the district displayed a 12% gain from 2007-2012 in the area of reading and an 3% gain from 2007-2012 in the area of mathematics for students meeting and/or exceeding Illinois State Standards; thus, reinforcing progress made by Response to Intervention teams.

The extent to which the applicant has demonstrated succes is within co-hort models and sub-groups of learners. All stakeholders are able to access student performance data for complete and specific targeted performance outcomes. This in turn, informs the process of what achievement gaps must be met and closed within the LEA, as addressed by the Educational LEA consortium.

Summative assessments shows areas where the achievement gaps are decreasing, but subgroups such as Asians show gaps.

Specific methodology indicates some scores are not available for review however there are significant goals for improvement:

Achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools - Murphysboro is in Academic Watch status and has made significant improvement in decreasing the gap between subgroups, especially in the Black/White group (from 32% to 10%), Low Income/Non Low Income (from 24% to 12%), and IEP/Non IEP (46% to 42%). [See attached graphs for 1999-2012 data].

Marion has two schools in Academic Watch status, one in Early Warning, yet two additional schools are on the 2011 Honor Roll.

Trends show a reduction in achievement gaps between the Black/White groups and the Low Income and Non Low Income groups.

Data availability - Parents in all consortium districts have access to their child's academic progress, grades, missing assignments, attendance and discipline date through (SIS) parent portals. Parents of grade 1-8 students receive a STAR and/or Easy CBM progress report for reading at the end of each grading period. Skills based kindergarten report card was implemented during the 2011-2012 school year. Frequent formative assessments mark students' progress throughout the school year. Previously, kindergarten progress was only reported to parents three times per school year beginning in December. Student progress is now being reported electronically through district's (SIS) systems.

Therefore, all Parents/Caregivers including noncustodial parents have access to their child's progress.

A clear record of success is demonstrated through the evidence that supports increasing equity among students and communicating those key goals to parents and other stakeholders.

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

5

4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Transparency ensues within the LEA in its process and practices, including the public's by school, and actual school-level expenditures to expand upon ongoing significant student support:

Updates websites and links associated with school CRDR District/school level data collection for 2011-2012. All information is consistent and complete and is found on the Federal CRDC website.

All personnel salaries at the school level staff are justified and aligned with regards to structure and alignment of staff salaries.

Actual non-personal expenditures denote a strong commitment to quality assurances and standards.

A clear process is in place for transparency, availability of data information, and communication of information to vital stakeholders including community members, and key local leaders. This is further balanced and evidenced by presenting such information to key groups of stakeholders in a consistent, timely manner through broadcasting of school board meetings in real time, opening communications to a larger audience, and completing summative information to be distributed throughout the LEA.

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

10

7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

There is sufficient and effective evidence to support that the applicant has met the requirement of successful conditions of sufficient autonomy under State, legal, and other requirements.

Specifically, the LEA addresses the shareholders as the State of Illinois, the state representatives, the parents, and students, academic and

administrative leaders who comprise the whole of the managerial force behind the consortium and district initiatives. Each district encompasses a wide range of roles and responsibilities for the necessary engagement and involvement of incorporating student personal learning environments as described in the application. The applicant has far-reaching goals and strategies to implement within the plan's structure as an effort to both analyze and reform the current educational structure.

The four core assurances are deep and bound by the competence of the human capital required to invest in the application of the plan's deliverables. The State describes in detail, as a governing member of PARCC, and common core standards, the evidence required for autonomy to the LEA consortium and district-wide learning programs for stronger student achievement performance outcomes. This underpinning foundation is a core support to the flexibility of the applicant's proposal. A vital component of success to any plan is the willingness of the partnerships to focus and works together for the common good.

The evidence required of the LEA who has the burden of proof, is clear, concise, and practical for the timeline and deliverables assured within the context of the high quality plan. This is evidenced by successful state conditions, America COMPETES, and ownership of the reform by the adaptation of "Frameworks for Teaching". (Danielson, 2007). Further supports include, (INTASC) and (NBPTS).

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

10

9

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Documentation and evidence support the alignment of meaning stakeholder engagement throughout the proposed plan initiative. Teachers and principals noted the scope of work for improvement in the RFA and held several meetings to inform the process. The stakeholders uses contracts in an effort to enter in agreement with unions, committee and curriculum councils, board of education, and consortium districts to support the grant proceedures.

(i) Concsensus concerning the administration and collective bargain agent reach agreement, and proceedes onto Illinois State Board of Education, Southern Illinois University, Southern Illinois Health Care, and local mayors. Strong constructive measures to integrate and invite civic partners such as business and parents into the meetings and teacher/parent sessions, School improvements around mastery and use of technology, along with alignment from the grant writing team that formulated goals around intercultural environment and community feedback. Supports include:

- The superintendents, principal, and technology director lead alignment with "the scope of work", neighboring districts are contacted, and building level administrators went to work to cover the MOU, included in the growth section.

-The collective bargaining of union membership;supported the RFA, and met alongside several parent/teachers committee meetings.

-Daily information and reflection on the plan is shared throughout a 2 month timeframe. The plan is coherent and competent based on the representation of parents, parent and teacher organizations, the business community, and government entities.

The ways in which key stakeholders were informed included: school board meetings broadcast in real time, changing the location of school board meetings to garner more attendance, informing school boards of current initiatives that clearly focused on creating and designing more meaningful opportunities for learning. A structure was set in place as addressed in the plan for more meaningful and successful performance outcomes, closing achievement gaps, and identifying measures of core competencies to the learning environment. (i) There are letters of support from the LEA unions to further justify the grant implementation. (B) A plethora of letters and documents signify buy-in from the stakeholders involved in assisting with the plan's implementation and process of delivery within the school climate and structure.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has demonstrated evidence of a high quality plan based on the following outcomes: Several expert recognized documentations of philosophies of education, theory based- and well researched models including the National Center of Universal Design, 5 essentials, Illinois Pathways initiatives, High Quality Instructional LRMI/Learing Registry, STEM education, and Remote Educational Programs: Transforming of Educational Landscapes by deeply developed foundational academic, behavior, and social measures constructed for changing populations, and 21st Century Learning components built into the closing of identified needs and gaps structures. Evidence for comprehensive educational framework to interact and intersect with flipped and blended technology classrooms. Where the plan is vague is in did not address the tools included for deliverables of closing significant needs and gaps.

This high quality plan details the stakeholders vison, key goals, time frame, deliverables, but not in a clearly organized way. However, the measures for implementation across spectrums of diverse learners is adequate; given vast skill gaps for closure, remediation, and career and college readiness, along with graduating on time. The successful conditons aggressively enact bold educational reforms that is tied to legislative measures, a foundation of the performance evaluations for all highly effective administrators and instructors, thus impacting the outcomes of the students. The rationale resonates with research suggesting the single most important factor in a child's success is a highly

effective instructor, much analysis of the plan is based on reforming of teacher preparation and licensure, educational evaluations and policy, educational assessments, formative assessments, and benchmark standards:

As further evidenced, local CCSS implementations encompass PARCC and Common Core State Standards,

A "Framework for Teaching" model that is repleted throughout the LEA.,

INTASC and the National Board for Professional Teaching links to a multitentant of all types of personalized learning schema.

A clear model for understanding student needs, gaps, and achievements is based on the techonologies being ready to find context and content to meet those needs, and to further faciliatate integrated data, easy access to information, and presenting information that is actionable and useful. This criteria is met in a way that justifies the plan proposal. Devices used for personalized learning is not clearly evident in specific detail for this section of the grant.

One caution, that the school districts participating align to those objectives, and reflect on what is being piloted, that reviews of that information and data is tracked for best practices and procedural outcomes. This crieterion is not perfectly clear in the grant application.

Key strategies center on personal learning environments such as allowing students to identify and take control over their knowledge, expanding learner choice, and showing evidence of skills in sub-groups where gaps in math and Language exists. IIRC report card for schools, and Illinois Shared Learning Environment and Collaborative reporting through dashboard are embedded in the applicant's proposal to shift and close gaps by reporting what needs to be closed and closely monitored.

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

| | Available | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 16 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Students have access to both horizontal and vertical key component activities such as individual group and research work, case studies, IMSA trainings, and ongoing student support systems that provide high profitability of learning outcomes through thoughtful learning stages that allow students to have a voice in their education and provides real time feedback from instructors. Diversity not a key factor and cultures and context should be specifically addressed and measured. The elements of the process are not well-defined for the connectivity needed to implement the content and within what context.

College and career ready embedded modules and learning software to create Individual Learning Plans and ISLE learning Maps, that will open a world of findings to the business to work ready world. An innovative and create "do not let weeds grow in my garden approach" coupled alongside new activities such as Wise Ways where students are consulted and advised for dual credits. Still, the implementation process for this lacks specific details in what this might eventually look like in the plan.

Blended instructional strategies and flipped classrooms, students strong use of ongoing technological methods that include but are not limited to on-line tutorials for learning and achievement. Guest speakers, take-away activities, book study circles, co-hort models, individual and group skills, STEM trainings, and other discovery tools and resources all align for stronger, deeper, learning outcomes and higher qualities of learning for each individual student.

While diversity is addressed through data/graphs and charts to close gaps and overcome barriers, not much is stated in terms of resources, materials or supplies for a more diversified intensive learning module. The PLE's and the PARCC and other standards need to be addressed in more detail and structure the actual maintenance and skills that introduce students to more diverse learning populations and cultures of knowledge and learning.

. On-going feedback for college and career ready standards is utilized through classroom level instructions, mentorships, and innovative ongoing special programs such as a Movable Feast 4 day mini-conference, professionals and professional learning communities will inspire research and adoption of career technology such as STEM and Illinois pathways for school to work structures.

A myriad of personalized learning and instruction that provides adequate time and resources with high quality coaching staff that insures that graduation and career readiness skills as defined are implemented and achieved. A strong group of academic and administrative team captains who sit on state boards and create guiding policies of practice sit on the leadership team, this gives confidence that the accomplishments for high need students has been a tried and tested practice throughout this school LEA. A strong track record of growth is already in place with (4) solid years of student and school growth, with minority exceptions in some areas of the district. Overall, graduation requirements are solid.

Mechanisms to provide coaching and peer-mentoring, with highly effective teachers to review data, to identify and address failures, and to

restructure efforts promptly and evaluatively is evidenced sufficiently and completely through the improvement process. The quality of measure of investment shows time, talent, resource, both human capacity, and resource tools, to affirm the Rising Star system in order to integrate a solid and comprehensive plan that is innovative and achievable.

A high quality plan offers the key goals and strategies along with tasks for student learning, and key implementations to identify areas of need and to improve educational and structural practice. It is creative in design and mechanism and graphically designed based on solid research and methods that have shown significant growth factors, To implement a high leverage and instructional plan, it integrates and establishes strong policies and procedures for learning along with efficient professional development and confirmation that strategies are indeed successful.

Strong evidence supports that mechanisms are in place to track and support overall achievement outcomes for student based learning and measurements for personalized learning options. The plan outline defines and tracks strategic measures and outcomes for learning based on targeted individual student data.

Supports are in place for frequent use of student data to determine "next steps" in the student learning. This is best supported by the implementation of college and career ready standards and goals that align to core competencies based within the curriculum modules of instruction.

Regular and on-going feedback within the structure of the plan with the support of co-hort and learning groups, along with strong peer-mentoring, and other mentoring strategies, provides instantly for available content compliments that deliver on high instructional tools and resources for value added classroom benefits.

Strong key goals are in place to benefit and inform teachers, principals, parents, and other stake-holders to determine best practice for career-ready standards and graduation achievements. The use of instructor and teacher evaluations are evident, although how the measurements will ensue is not totally clear.

Accommodations are appropriate and measureable and demonstrates an understanding of how to best focus student's current knowledge into deeper, more accelerated learning. Curriculum mapping is a core component of the accommodations of high strategies for high need students and vital for the turn-around of low performing schools.

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

20

19

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A high quality plan is in place with strong evidence of research and best practice to inform and train the systems that will improve school progress.

Personalized learning plans are evidenced as they revolve around the student and provide high quality areas of identifying and immediately addressing failures. The restructured efforts are given out promptly to assure that the student stays on task and has a comprehensive path for improvement and learning outcomes, the student has a voice and choice in his/her options for learning and time on task. There is a recognition that the child is fully engaged partner in his/her learning and education.

The student is able to create and design to some degree the learning environment through peer co-hort groups/structures, project based learning, alignment and adjustment of common core standards and PARCC, alongside action based learning, many modalities of technology such as moodle, flipped classrooms, and blended learning,

Allows complete control to give the student control of his/her learning destiny through careful analysis by the teacher/ mentor to guide the student into college and career ready interests and structures for staying on track to graduate on task and on time. Infrastructure supports Illinois career pathways, STEM, and additional career specific design modules. Teachers are engaged in the process through offering various field trips and workshops that strategically align career focus to in class assignments.

Monitoring tools are in place to inform the progress of each student as connected to the teacher and the classroom, and to those supportive guides/mentors who will work to create performance modification to close any achievement gaps. Common Core Assessments and standards will shift the classroom focus to align with the steps that will improve collective educator practice, completeness, and effectiveness. Tools of support embedded into the learning process will assist to guide and direct further knowledge based skills. There is enough tools and data to impact positively on the collective school culture and climate for continued student growth, and that in turn will create school growth models of achievement. Items such as discussions, project based learning, action plans, and other curriculum embedded practices will improve the process and cycle of learning, and close achievement gaps.

In addition, the applicant has a high resolve to implement a plan that is well-structured, well-research, and will result in specific, measureable, reliable, performance outcomes for teaching and learning, It is a collaborative structure that should both engage and retain the learner, and spurn his/her interest in school to work modules, and career- readiness for the 21st Century: this is best reflected in the LEA's adoption of Core Curriculum Based standards and shifts in learning environments across the plan implementation. The teaching and

learning process, as outlined, is ambitious, yet achievable. The analysis of results should strengthen speciality areas such as special education.

Teachers are encouraged to go to professional development to learn how to make on-line tutorials for significant and increased student support. The teaching strategic plan is developed that consists of shared vision and buy-into key stakeholders and first commitment to school level team as identified with each school implementation.

Teachers will learn step by step process of early signs of significant failures, disengagement, retention, and other manageable classroom issues. Professional Learning Communities will inform promising practices, and the lead team will provide solid significant structures and models of support to achieve high goals and significant standards for growth in evaluations for teachers and principals. It is clear the plan adds a strategy of professional development growth as a means to model the community of ongoing learning. Teachers will have some ownership over the data system and adopt a common platform and shared learning collaborative dashboard and report card for learning maps, assessment, demographic assessment and information to dig deep into the OER by participating in Meta-tagging focus groups. This is a key component worthy of strengthening the Learning Environment Systems.

Adopting common data information, vocabulary, and significant college and career ready standards show much promise for horizontal and vertical sharing of reflection. It is vital that a plan show some pathway to a reflective response to the Learning environments both as a state, district, and local academic environment, To build highly effective structures, the communication between entities must be collaborative and may abound in different technology formats. An integrated format such as online collaboration and portfolio 21st Century skills are an appropriate start in achieving the goals. The Feedback via PERA and the 5 Essentials will allow the teacher the ability to redefine his/her role and to expand the knowledge base thus impacting authentic learning outcomes, and growth of teacher measurements and performance methods. A transformative professional development is likely to add a universal design for leading and teaching to both inform and include data-driven decision making skills.

The ability to create and share new data resources must come from building the tool, and allowing for the clarity of understanding to adopt competency based practiced reports, To develop and publish standard based report cards may take time, and may be met with resistance, but in the long run will differentiate teachers who implement change, and high quality learning environments, and those who do not create such results. A direct correlation between teacher effectiveness and student growth is published and credible research, To adopt standards and assessments that hold teachers responsible for student outcomes is imperative, A teacher evaluation model must be in place to recruit qualified, and the best of those in the educational field. The plan finalizes sequences whereby adult educational leaders are held to a higher standard of quality and they must adhere to the Illinois Survey of Learning Conditions.

There must be a willingness to align best practice, academic research, knowledge based instruction, and the tools of the trade into a coherent piece of learning, this falls under the overarching umbrella of IMPACT Illinois and a consortium that operates under a high quality plan that clearly and sufficiently address ambitious but achievable merits.

This plan aligns the resources of technology, flexible tools of instruction, action based learning, deep curriculum embedded content for all subject areas, including career and technical readiness, and a unique culture and climate of autonomy that leads teachers and students through viable systemic change, the annual philosophical review as recorded in the documentation bears to the fact that there is sufficient oversight on the policies and protocols to implement a plan that utilizes a creative design and structure of learning that allows for tool to remove barriers, empower all learners, and achieve results.

It appears a corporate culture and climate exists between entities for comprehensive buy-into the school climate change along with creating information and data that informs change, report cards for schools, and efficient and effective evaluative systems. One point of weakness, there was not enough specific information to really understand and comprehend what teacher and/or administrative effectiveness might look like moving forward into the structure of the plan implementation. The Illinois system of evaluation was mentioned, but did not uniformly summarize how that tool might be designed to increase the collective educational effectiveness of individual teachers.

Training systems and practices outlined use piloting structures that should provide information to inform if the process is successful in performance measures being accelerated, and to integrate platforms necessary to close achievement gaps, while this lacks some evidence, the open sources of data, and applications of programs being able to interface should allow the measurable performance benchmarks to align with, a technology tool which supports ongoing measurable achievements. The drawback is the freeing up of resources to develop and further support the implementation of learning itself, while technology informs instruction, it cannot itself personalize the instruction.

No clear plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from (what tool) to measure the scope of highly effective teachers and principals and in hard to staff schools, with specific content areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| | | |

| | | |
|---|----|----|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15 | 13 |
|---|----|----|

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A high quality comprehensive IMPACT Illinois consortium models a quality assessment of operational structures that develop practices, policies, and rules necessary for accelerating instruction ,and achieving tremendous growth models based on the transformation of the educational landscape.

IASB promotes teaching philosophy as a foundation, Leadership teams provide support through project management of the model that every student, educator, classroom and school have what they need and when they need it.

Sufficient flexibility and autonomy through professional development such as teacher lead workshops, peer observations, and coaching in the classroom all of which significantly impacts the goals and vision outlined in the deliverables. The systemic change is measurable, reliable, and consistent in confirmation of the state's call for an integrated approach to learning models with a comprehensive approach. The consortium is a comprehensive approach charged with roles and responsibilities of the human capital, alongside the creation of policy and procedures to support it.

This provides the infrastructure needed to support the implementation of a comprehensive, bold, extensive plan that delivers on forming the leadership necessary to give students the opportunities needed for success and high performance outcomes. The vision for this particular school reform shows initiatives based on other RTTT awards; and a thoughtful, meaningful implementation of process going through key stakeholders responsible for schedules, academic calendars, and personnel decisions:

Organizational structure is competent and complete; well-structured, and diverse, as documented by LEA, Consortium model, and grant administrator, director of performance and professional development, implementation assistant, and strong assigned leadership roles and responsibilities. Teams in schools to provide content and data analysis to inform the process and scope of learning within the school and classrooms. Director for Performance Development, LEA leadership, Implementation Assistant, Leaders to align direction of the Rising Star framework. Professional Learning Communities providing PERA team, STEM Education, Family and Community Engagement, Climate and Cultural supports and research teams for Personal Learning environment research.

Autonomy is well devised and delivered by program implementation that gains strength from the context of policies and procedures that surround and encompass it, professional learning communities, and professional development structures that support exceptional administrators and teachers. More to the point, local units are able to design and create staffing models, budgets, and school calendars and schedules, and can modify if needed, to assure flexibility.

Great models of support for identification of train the trainer, delivery of coaching and mentoring skills, identification of teacher and student leader experts, facilitation of design for learning structures, analysis of assessment results, and identified strengths and weakness for students to improve, alongside the offerings of dual credit and credit recovery coursework. In addition, development and holds accountable students for student learning, preparation for college and career-readiness can occur outside the classroom.

Dual credits, certifications, AP, and other academic strategies are utilized so the student may achieve at a higher rate of knowledge than dictated by the classroom structure. Evidence of pilot programs and existing programs give the student a way to demonstrate mastery of key concepts of knowledge through assessments, and other styles of learning for career-readiness such as STEM, remote programs, and standards based reporting. Vague and lack of specific details around the remote program of learning and the process of how it is to work.

The ability to train teachers and to identify with teacher and student learner experts, is a unique prospect of the plan, the use of a student expert to lead a co-hort group is one innovative way an instructional practice provides for slow or disabled learners. The peer tutor/mentor is a good use of making the curriculum more effective, if it is used to inform the process, to observe and reflect on the standards in a myriad of ways, and to align and compare such strategies around assessments. It remains unclear how this opportunity (in the plan) best impacts student learning.

There should be more development in the plan around students with disabilities, and ESL learners, exactly how the LEA will impact this unique group of learners remains unclear.

It becomes a high quality plan based on qualitative and quantitative data alongside formative feedback, assessment, higher order thinking skills, engagement of student learners, the opportunities to check for problems, to revise, edit, and measure awareness of the ongoing process as a living document, with informed participant's (stakeholders) to determine the overall effectiveness of the plan implementation and its implementation of double timelines based on high quality content, materials, and leveraged resources.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA supports personal learning by assuring all learners , educators, and parents have available the tools and resources necessary to be efficient and effective in deliverables to further impact specific, measurable, and achievable goals.</p> <p>SIF interoperability to commence through the grant director/SLT's through June 2014-December 2016. Servers and software and associated program cost for retention of seats occurs through various internet bandwidths, 2 computer labs, 2 access carts, I pads for checkout, along with the internet speeds to support and improve the educational delivery system. It is dependent on the technology and resource tools availability in each school. 2012-2013 school year is committed to professional development of staff training for technology, blended-technology, and flipped classroom improvement systems.</p> <p>Two FTE tech supports are available in some schools, and on-site, along with an on-line help desk, and tech mentors. This is a high quality delivery system of Atomic anytime, anyplace learning and best aligns students to be successful across any platform. Software and AP wireless devices area in several LEA schools, Reading Eggs, Reading Plus, are programs students may utilize at home. This myriad of various on-line learning tools ensures a student can create and design a learning platform, anytime, anywhere, and students are encouraged to do on-line learning at home.</p> <p>The list and types of bandwidths such as 10m fiber connections, T1 lines, and Lan speed: 1000 mb/s, all signify the intent to distance learning, and substantial monies through Title 1 and Reap grants have been utilized through 2012, with additional commitment to purchase technology systems in 2012-2013. A huge commitment to upgrade and implement technology, even more time off to train teachers, in fact does increase the validity of the overall plan implementation to provide on deliverables for all students across all diverse populations. One area not addressed how to best implement distance learning technology across rural areas without significant bandwidths. SIF agent is in place for data operability in open data format.</p> | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 13 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Much of the success of the strategy that involves continuous school improvement is structured in the overall links to the applicants project goals and opportunities that will be shared publically through the use of a variety of measures such as newsletters, moodle, facebook, websites, and other social technology, The staff investments include coordinators, coaches, and co-hort models, that will allow for much ongoing flexibility within the context of the school setting, Team builders and team leaders will guide the local operations from the ground-up, while other leaders from the district and consortium level will provide the sound and reasonable management organizational structure of driving the school improvement and plan per district level. The monitoring and measuring of the qualified funding of race to the top is a flexible sequence to link capital to resources of best use for rigorous improvement within the confines of the plan implementation.</p> <p>The strategy provides timely feedback as evidenced in key strategies at the district and school level to promote revision and feedback in specific goal areas such as student achievement by the use of leveraging scheduleing, curriculum, budgets and staff evaluations. Project goals will be reviewed monthly to be revisited and revised for clarification and ongoing significance through data analysis and team project coordinators. Site visits will inform the process and evaluative tools; this strategy provides evidence of a support structure in place for sustained systemic valuation by the staff.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 4 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In a smart and powerful way the applicant addresses the key strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The school leadership team will be a focused target group that will meet monthly to address any review and revise any measures or conditons that assess the quality of the plan's implementation. It is a clear-cut process that allows for dialogue and discussion for the continued high quality method needed to continue to implement a plan, and to tweak it, as needed. The use of looking at evaluation tools of school strengths will reflect best and promising practices. The flexibility of the structure of the plan and the extent to which it has impact will lie in the hands of the stakeholders to assess and keep it on track for the supportive strengths needed to improve overall school performance measures and performance outcomes.</p> <p>Communicatoin strategies include newsletters, portfolios, scorecards for the tracking of support models, along with using a school</p> | | |

leadership team (SLT) that meetings at least monthly to review leading indicators, outcome data, measures for conditions and learning and measures that assess quality of implementation, Recognition of each school's strengths, Research and adoption of effective practices, along with time for review and modification as communicated through principals to staff members, often through the use of lead mentors to assuage the environment and key leaders.

Identification of areas in need of improved practice are substantial and promising:

Design and publish a path for improvement of these practices by implementing a school reform plan that includes a learning environment plan,

Implement high-leverage instructional and classroom management practices in the classrooms, and communicate the information to parents through blackboard, or technology, instant messages, or bulletin boards, data systems, etc.

Establish an early warning signs protocol for high needs students including a student support team that meets regularly to communicate ongoing strategies for interventions.

Build strong, effective leadership by each principal to improve student achievement and lead the school improvement plan by keeping key stakeholders informed through data systems, school-wide meetings, board meetings, parent and community meetings, and or newsletters, articles, tweets, or other forms of communication.

Process. and address the content of the information with all stakeholders through monthly meetings, alongside school meeting that inform best practices.

District leadership will provide principals flexibility in scheduling, curriculum alignment, budgeting, and evaluating staff and informing the stakeholders adequately.

Ensure implementation of comprehensive school reform within each district, that should be communicated through various policies and procedures on an on-going basis.

Alignment of curriculum, instructional strategies and assessment to the Common Core State Standards,

Alignment of professional development for sustainability of school reform, the development of teacher leaders, and increased time for collaboration, that can be communicated in a face-to-face setting in the school environment, or in a social arena.

Improvement of transitions from middle school to high school and from high school to post-secondary school and the workforce,

Improvement of behavioral supports to decrease out-of-school suspension and the loss of instructional time,

Development of teacher and principal performance evaluation systems that incorporates student growth,

Increase the number of highly effective teachers and principals, and

Development of meaningful relationships with parents and the community.

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Sufficient and succinct performance measures as stated in the plan connect best practices along three conditional areas to form the foundational conditions of targeted personal learning: Monitoring and measuring will be conducted at each school through a process manager, and the team will work to focus and have difficult discussions around key strategies for school improvement. The internal coach will serve as the liaison to drive, accelerate and sustain continuous improvement. The ISTAC assists with interventions and supports to provide external coaches (PBIS) and project Choices project to align to the construct. This process is utilized to hold accountable progress towards effective practice.

Teacher learning and peer-reviews: research based and constructed information centers around highly effective teachers and across consecutive school years. One drawback is that the state does not recognize the terms "highly" effective teachers, or "effective" teachers. Therefore, it is incomplete in terms of not being able to offer significant data for analysis.

Student Support: Developing rigorous capacity for student support includes strong evidence and researched based methodology based

on Schmoker, and Danielson, who are known educational leaders and experts whose research is well-regarded. The foundation of research best practices indicates a high standard of quality that is adopted by the group of stakeholders and leaders responsible for the implementation of raising the bar of excellence for students to go higher, and achieve more in school.

The evaluative measures justify the core in accordance with the Illinois Race to the Top-Phase 3 Application. Research can be an effective tool in assisting in the benchmarking process and is being aligned, in this application, alongside assessments for a balanced system. Many of the measures are already in wide-use in the district. A strong component of this core is found in historical and longitudinal data for these three areas.

Formative assessments are used to give immediate feedback, students are learning as they are in the process of doing, and growth occurs in the immediate reflection of the learning structure, that is value-added, as students increase achievement with 'ahha" moments of learning. A good tasking of this model comes from collaboration among all colleagues for a deeper understanding of the learning process, and that sets in motion confidence and motivation.

The measures/tasks over time, if insufficient to gauge the implementation process has formal factors to indicate the use of Rising Star's Indicators for Effective Practice, if it does not work over time, each direct liason, process manager, and internal coach will be responsible for indicators of action used to measure each measurable outcome each month by communicating and providing a common language to identify gaps and measures.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Professional learning incorporates Hybrid 3 day summit, Consortium districts to fund the lead by leaders forums and presentations for a joint summit. Leadership teams create and develop all protocols to ensure the quality of the implementation is upheld, strong summative justification for training the trainer, and securing best costs for event, it is an ongoing cost. Highly structured and competent model of transformative professional development , sequenced, and multi-modal to be delivered by experts where by teachers work in team settings to articulate PLC's vertically and hizontally. Conclusive evidence for funding to travel, supplies, resources and provision of learning space to construct professional development models.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Budget supports external foundations of LEA, State and other Federal funds.

All funds are significant and achieve personell, fringe benefits, travel equipment and supplies. Total direct costs seem reasonable for the total costs of lines 1-8. Indirect costs builds the capacity for ongoing student success, preparing students for college and careers, and sustains preparing students for college and career ready endeavors.

The cost and budget are reasonable given the scope of work and the development of the project initiatives: project-level budgets and narratives allow a strong framework for planning among all consortium districts. It is a little unclear how the budget narrative will be broken into foundations for some parts of development strategies, but overall, there are many ways the budget supports concentrated areas of work within the timeframe.

The descriptions of the funds are replete with informaton that supports sufficient college and career readiness and teaching and leading priorities along with leadership and management trainings.

Funding is sufficient and clear and concise in providing for activities that create and enhance stronger professional frameworks.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Long-term sustainability is convincing as the fiscal entities provide both internal and external sources of support which will lead to a coalition of partnerships over the 4 year grant period. The maintenance of effort and reforms allow many collaborative efforts to further provide broad-based forms of the initiatives that can be repleted. A grant team framework with appropriate stakeholders will influence the policy and implementation by leveraging new and existing programs and create the process for sustainabilility beyond the grant period.

Protecting and maintaining core policies and programs are significant in nature and the budget and sustainability portion must have a quality assurance system to support the integration of state and federal funding. There is significant evidence to justify the use of human capital as a key component of the protocols and procedures to implement a successful plan. however not enough detail is given to the grant oversight as a process to sustain systemic change.

For example:

Teacher leaders and mentors who assist with planning, leading PLC's, researching, and teaching workshops will be the integral change agents in the implementation stage and will then provide the backbone of the integration support system.

Emphasis is on foundational elements throughout the proposal.

The elements of a high quality plan offers the sustainability necessary to carry the goals through to completion, but overall there is a lack of specific, measurable, achievable goals and deliverables sustained in a timely manner.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

All parties and key stakeholders are established through building sturdy, on-going partnerships through the Governor, the state of Illinois, the state representatives, the administrative team, core civic groups, students, parents, and the community. These roles and responsibilities of each entity-along with the outgoing dissemination of information in a variety of social media platforms more than meets or exceeds the expectation of partnerships, School reform within each district will be measured and addressed throughout various mechanisms in place for such collaborations. The transition into postsecondary education is supported by and through the Illinois State Board of Education, to keep it moving.

Extensive charts/graphs and data to state that the competitive preference priority meets and exceeds the goals and key components of the RTTT in a variety of composite measures. It meets and exceeds AYP over (4) years for math and English/language arts. There is an accerated component of growth throughout the school district sand consortium to lead the initiatives into the future and to sustain current and future school-wide programs that will be of high benefit to the students. Information is based on researched best theory and indicators of high quality achievement is outlined through specific content that confirms performance measures:

consistent growth in college and career ready standards,

consistent growth in ECA in both math and English,

consistent growth in number of students who participate in free and reduced lunch programs,

consistent growth in the subgroups that propose one measure of career-readiness through math and reading benchmarks.

A key strategy that is admirable is the ongoing corrections for improvement as developed and detailed through "ambitious yet achievable" performance measures that adopt and fosters "data-driven" components. This is an identity of assessments for the school and community that aligns seamlessly into evaluative supports for better student outcomes.

Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Powerful plan supports core educational assurances that align seamlessly through consortium lead agenda items that support and strengthen created learning environments and focus on student growth models as informed by specific, measurable, attainable, achievable

and timely goals. Low performers are coached and mentored for appropriate core completions. Plan highlights deep dive and personalization of strategies which complements learning styles and types of learning embedded into the classroom setting. Personalized learning is evidenced by technology, flipped classrooms, blended-learning, and strong highly effective leaders and teachers in a teacher-centered with instruction, teacher learner-voice and choice, learners as co-designers, and teachers as collaborators and partners in side by side learning context.

1) Accelerated learning is supported through complete and comprehensive PLA's and other personalized based resources and tools that creates a pattern of specific learning for each student through a complete learning plan, that allows the student both flexibility and innovation beyond the school walls. The deep dive into learning comes through significant and substantive supports of peer-mentorships, collaborative partnerships, action plans, student tutorials, and other tools such as moodle, alignment to common core standards, and PERA, induction and mentoring teams, SLC/ISLE and STEM teams, along with definite responses to intervention and implementations of giving students the ability to earn dual credits upon mastery of the content. One weak area, or where plan could be more concise is within the realm of students with special needs, or those who are ESL students.

2) Career and college readiness standards are recognized and greatly supported throughout the plan through various implementations: school wide training modules, the ability to experiment, Math and Technology bringing research to practice, designs for technical and career-embedded clusters, along with transitional components to secondary education through college alliances and partnerships.

3) The teacher effectiveness is both evaluative and strategic in terms of outcomes for high quality and experienced teachers. The research based plan well documents the ongoing theory of best practices in the educational realm, and the implementation of teacher leaders, and train the trainer, websites, and other time on task features highlights the strengths of various proofs of models of teacher effectiveness that include teacher portfolios.

4) A number one priority of the plan is given to responding immediately to those students who are falling through the cracks, and strong objectives are in place to remediate and reassess the learning of those who have rates that are below-average. A timeframe for quick turnaround to address those students who need intervention is both pro-active and collaborative with all stakeholders, this collaboration involving all stakeholders gives a strong method of removing barriers and empowering learners across all diverse student populations.

The plan more than meets the expectation of being ambitious yet achievable, and there are excellent experts who sit on state boards that have established and designed the plan for implementation of a rigorous and continuous process of school improvement. This along with the Illinois Pathways that clearly provides a roadmap for school to work, and career-embedded modules and conceptualized learning structures,

| | | |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 176 |
|-------|-----|-----|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0859IL-2 for Unity Point CCSD #140

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 8 |

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant described and has begun a systematic approach to reforming educational practice within a holistic school reform support system. For example, for core educational assurance area #1, the applicant reports that they are in the second year of aligning curriculum, designing instructional units, formative assessments, teacher evaluation, and student growth indicators that

are designed with college- and career- ready standards at all grades. For core educational assurance area #2, it is noted, in other sections of the application, that the district will adopt a common data and technology platform, the Shared Learning Collaborative utilizing the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE) dashboard and Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC), to incorporate the shared data infrastructure and state-level enhancements and extensions to support personalized learning and access to high quality resources. The data dashboard and learning maps will provide current demographic, assessment, and interest data. Regarding educational assurance area #3, the applicant notes throughout sections of the application, that they will improve educator quality and effectiveness through several initiatives. These include the establishment of redesigned performance evaluation systems; programs to attract effective educators to High Poverty High Minority schools; and induction and mentoring programs. For educational assurance area #4, the applicant demonstrates throughout the application that they have set ambitious yet attainable annual goals to be attained over the course of several years through aggressive implementation of the proposed plan. In a subsequent section of the narrative, the applicant provided substantial, detailed charts outlining the student performance measures, all of which either meet or exceed state targets. This effort is also supported by their demonstrated track record of aggressively addressing avenues to turn around the lowest-performing schools in their individual districts.

The applicant's effort to communicate a clear and creditable approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity is enforced by the planning for personalized learning that is based on student academic interest. For example, knowing that developing personalized learning plans that engage students in areas of academic interest increases intrinsic self-motivation and articulating this as an essential element in the reform vision sets the stage for concerted efforts toward ensuring that this occurs. It is worthy to note that attention to student academic interest is clearly addressed in subsequent sections of the proposal and is a strong factor in the personalized learning goals of students.

The applicant receives a high rating.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In response to this selection criterion, the applicant has demonstrated significant commitment to the development and implementation of the reform proposal. The lead school district invited the other districts to apply as the IMPACT ILLINOIS Consortium. Leadership representation (superintendent, assistant superintendent, building principals, teacher association president, district technology director and high school's vocational director) from each district met to review the eligibility requirements, selection criteria, and scope of work. Also, the administrative teams for each LEA met with unions and school boards to determine their level of commitment. By majority, a consensus was reached for each LEA that all schools would participate in the competition. Such assurances display tremendous investment in time, human capital, technology and other resources, and collaboration of a wide variety of state, district, and community stakeholders. Specifically, the applicant has met the requirements for this selection criteria by:

- a. Reporting that all LEAs invited to participate enjoy strong support of all their schools, school boards, and unions and all schools in the LEAs have elected to participate;
- b. Providing a complete listing of all schools that will participate;
- c. Including in Chart A(2)(c) the total number of participating students (7,134), participating students from low income families (3,560), participating students from high needs students (2,292), and participating educators (426). The large numbers of students from low income families and high needs students represent significant challenges and show the applicant's determination to aggressively pursue high goals for the students in their consortium.

The applicant receives a high rating for this selection criterion.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a detailed logic model to support their application with many interwoven, supportive process steps. As part of their high-quality plan (Vision of School Reform - Action Plan), the applicant notes key goals, activities, implementation steps, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible. Specifically, the applicant organized its plan according to leading categories that it will undertake. The first of these is Leadership and Management: Build Capacity for Successful

Implementation. In this effort, the applicant will develop protocols to ensure quality of implementation success of the grant activities, establish a system for on-going communication and engagement of stakeholders, and develop models for delivering high-quality professional development. In Teacher Practice: Build Highly Effective Classroom Learning Environment, the applicant will personalize training for teachers in pro-social classroom management and instructional strategies. In addition, they will adopt standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy, as well as build data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction. Other categories include Preparing Students for College and Career Learning, refining student plans and developing formative assessments and Student Support, establishing a multi-tiered student support system. The efforts are wide-reaching and comprehensive.

In terms of impact, it is noteworthy that the applicant intends for all schools in all districts to participate in the grant activities. As such, all schools will be scaling up to reach 100% of the outcome goal during the time frame of the grant. Specifically, all students in all grades in the consortium will participate. Annual and end-of-grant performance goals will include the subjects of math and reading. It is noted that 32% of the participating students are high-need and 50% come from low-income families. It is not clear where the two non RTT-3 schools to be included for testing for replication will come from since 100% of schools in the selected districts will be participating schools in the grant.

This is a substantial undertaking and demonstrates significant commitment to this proposal. The applicant's response to this selection criterion falls within the high range of scores.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has met the requirements for this selection criterion. The proposal includes provided ambitious yet achievable overall and student subgroup annual goals for each participating LEA. The applicant indicates that the consortium will aggressively implement these goals during the 2013-14 school year and expect to see significant advancements in scores in the third and fourth years of the grant cycle. Specifically, for schools and subgroups who are currently high achieving, the goals are less aggressive and these subgroups will see the least amount of change. For those subgroups with the lowest scores (Black, Hispanic, IEP, LEP and Low-Income), goals are more aggressive, expecting more significant change.

a) Performance on summative assessments. Once the State assessment is aligned to the Common Core State Standards, the consortium expects to see a steady increase in these scores. The consortium used the State's overall and subgroup goals for 2015-2016 as their goals. The amount of growth expected within the grant cycle is noted to be the difference in percentage points between the State's goal and the baseline score for each subgroup. For those subgroups already achieving or surpassing the State's 2015-2016 goals, goals were set based upon prior achievement history within that district.

b) Decreasing achievement gaps. The applicant's high goal is the same as the State's goal is to decrease the achievement gaps by 1/2 of current levels over six years.

(c) Increasing high school graduation rates. The applicant's high goal is the same as the State's goal which is to achieve a 90% overall graduation rate in the next six years and to reduce by 1/2 the difference from 90% for each student subgroup's graduation rate. .

(d) Increasing college enrollment. Currently, the high schools in the consortium do not have a way to collect this data. However, the applicant has aggressively addressed this area. The high schools in the proposal have adopted a clearinghouse to begin collecting this data in order to provide this data within 60 days.

The applicant has set high expectations for improved student outcomes The applicant receives a high rating on this selection criterion.

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 10 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

It is apparent that the applicant has demonstrated a record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. Specifically, review of the data charts provided reveal that two of the school districts (Unity Point and Giant City) have demonstrated significant success in the past four years of advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. In Unity Point, progress is noted in all

Illinois State Achievement Tests Reading subgroups with an average increase of 3% from 2009 to 2012. Math saw a gradual increase to the 2012 composite of 92.3% meets or exceeds state standards. For Giant City, from 2008 to 2011, a high level of achievement well above the state average was maintained with an overall increase of the district composite ISAT score from 89% to 90% students that meet or exceed state standards. In math achievement, a significant improvement was noted from 62.5% in 2008 to 85% in 2011. When looking at comparison charts with state scores, these schools have consistently ranked above state AYP student achievement targets. The other two districts show some gains, most measurably in ethnic and disability subgroups displaying improvements in increasing equity in learning. For example, Marion displayed a 12% gain from 2007-2012 in the area of reading and an 3% gain from 2007-2012 in the area of math for students meeting and/or exceeding Illinois State Standards; thus, reinforcing progress made by Response to Intervention teams. It is reported Marion worked cooperatively with the Williamson County Special Education Cooperative during the past five years to reduce Educational Environmental (EE) codes (Least Restrictive Environment) and thus increase student performance. The EE codes have improved from 38% to 49.8% during these five years. It is noted that Murphysboro is in Academic Watch status and has made significant improvement in decreasing the gap between subgroups, especially in the Black/White group (from 32% to 10%), Low Income/Non Low Income (from 24% to 12%), and IEP/Non IEP (46% to 42%) from 1999 to 2012. High school graduation and college enrollment rates for the two high schools in this proposal were not included.

The applicant indicates a variety of data and information sources available to parents at various times throughout the year. However, information or examples of how students, parents, and educators could use this data to inform, and improve participation, instruction, and services was not provided to give meaningful use to this information.

This selection criterion receives a mid-range rating.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It is apparent that the applicant is engaged in a concerted effort to provide a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments. For example, several significant steps have been made to increase transparency and access to local Board of Education decisions and actions, as well as outreach to the community via presentations concerning school district information. Some examples include broadcasting school board meetings in real time, changing the location of school board meetings to a venue that allows for increased audience members, sending a board summary to all staff members the morning after board meetings, and presenting district information to key local civic groups. Specific to sub-criteria (a)-(d), the applicant does make these four categories of school-level expenditures publically and completely available through the use of district web links to the Federal CRDC website for this information. A screen shot of this web link is provided in the supplemental information. This access is available to anyone who chooses to peruse the district website for the information and contains a wealth of information providing a great deal of transparency.

This criterion is rated in the high range.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes several favorable conditions under which the LEA has great leeway in conditions and autonomy to implement personalized learning environments. For example, while the state establishes long-term goals and learning standards, the local district has great flexibility in how, what, and within what timeline the students are taught the standards and how to meet the graduation requirements. In addition, the state has authorized the use of "remote educational programs" and the use of a remote educational plan, which is a personalized learning plan that details individualized achievement goals and the methods for instructional delivery that could be outside of the school setting and school day. This provides a great deal of flexibility to allow for local autonomy of instructional design and practice.

The applicant rates in the high range on this criterion.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

It is apparent that the applicant sought meaningful input from a wide variety of stakeholders as they developed this grant proposal. For example, the applicant provides many letters of support from state and regional educational agencies and local community agencies. The applicant sufficiently described the process to include significant input from the districts and schools involved including central administration, principals, teachers, and other education and related professionals and community-

based organizations. As an example of their commitment, the applicant reports that the invited districts communicated nearly daily for two months to review data, discuss goals, and share information. Throughout the process, teams met at all LEA's to provide input for the proposal and to form the IMPACT ILLINOIS Consortium. Also, since there is significant distance among these rural districts, virtual meetings using Adobe Connect were part of the communication tools.

It is not clear how much input that students and families (beyond teacher/parent committees) provided in this process as direct discussions with these populations were not specifically mentioned.

For (B)(4)(a)(i), documentation was provided that teacher association agreements were obtained from all participating districts.

This application receives a mid-range rating for this criterion.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
|--|---|---|

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided an overview of each district's status in regard to implementation of personalized learning environments. The overview lacked common elements among districts. For example, in one district (Unity Point) technology status was described while in another (Giant City), the professional learning community district level vision map was explained. Also, lack of continuity was noted in current practice among districts. It seems that each school district has implemented their own district plan for personalizing learning. For example, Unity Point is in year three of prototyping a model in which students over multiple grade levels can be placed into any one of 19 different schedules. Giant City reports that personalized learning environments must evolve from Stage One (2012-13 status) to Stage Three to facilitate the best possible engaged learning atmosphere. It is not specified what Stage 2 and 3 entail. Marion has developed a professional learning community district level vision with the goals of completing capacity building training, showing evidence of data analysis indicating educational gaps related to their focus topic, developing a three year plan to close the gap, and revising the plan as needed. Murphysboro has identified some areas of success as a result of changes such as Response to Intervention, inclusion of special education students, and changing or modifying schedules. It is the belief of Murphysboro that sustainable change is realized with long range systemic planning. Currently, district stakeholders follow the District Improvement Plan and weave in their own plan with multiple steps over multiple years.

It is unclear how this information was gathered or if an organized needs assessment tool to standardized essential components of personalized learning environments was used. A succinct high-quality plan indicating key goals (projected end result), activities and rationale, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible was not presented.

The criterion receives a low rating.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided much information on research-based strategies and practices that may be used to personalize the learning environment well as current supportive structures that are in place in the applicant's state and districts. For example, some of these supportive structures include the Illinois Pathways Initiative, STEM Learning Exchange, Remote Educational Plans, and Student Supportive Services. The applicant provided a plan with components with key goals, activities, implementation steps, deliverables, timelines and responsible parties. However, the applicant needs to clearly link these components with the sub-criteria: i) understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals; (ii) identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals; (iii) are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest; and (iv) access and expose to diverse cultures, context, perspectives or (v) training to develop self-directing skills. The applicant did aptly note that social-emotional skills would be taught (leads to self-directing behaviors).

(b) Key activities of Goal 1 of the plan reach toward the intent of this sub-criterion and include avenues for a personalized learning plan based on student needs through a variety of instructional approaches and environments. For example, (i-iii) including high-quality and digital content, (iv) frequent formative feedback, and (v) accommodations for special needs students based on the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

(c) Opportunities for students to acclimate to the learning technology offered to them are specified in the plan. For example, districts will

create student led Technology Squads to provide basic computer maintenance and skills to students The Technology Squads will provide mentoring for new students. However, it is not specified that a central goal of this training effort is to enable students to track and manage their learning.

The applicant receives a mid-range score on this criterion.

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

20

12

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant provided a comprehensive, detailed plan for this selection criterion to demonstrate that all participating educators will engage in training and in professional learning communities that support student personalized learning of college- and career- ready standards. For example, they described activities to include (i-ii) project-based authentic learning opportunities, (iii) mastery/competency-based progression/pacing, use of progress data to drive informed instructional focus, teacher practice, and measurement of student progress toward meeting standards, and (iv) use of feedback from teacher/principal evaluations to improve instructional practice as students work toward college- and career-ready standards. The plan included achievable goals, activities, implementation steps, deliverables, timelines, and responsible parties.

(b) The applicant presented a sufficient plan to use a common data and technology platform (Shared Learning Collaborative) utilizing the Illinois Shared Learning Environment dashboard and the Illinois Interactive Report Card provided by the state to deliver data to inform and accelerate student progress. (i) The applicant reports that this platform is multi-dimensional, (iii) able to sync different sources of student data including assessment and interest data, and provide current data per students, and (ii) aligns college -and career- ready standards to appropriate content and resources. Related professional development activities are included for teachers, students, and parents to access college- and career ready aligned applications, resources, and data. Implementation steps and timelines are dependent upon state initiation.

(c) The applicant discusses continuous improvement in the teaching/learning process through the use of a state-initiated model called Rising Star. Although several researched-based components of continuous improvement such as teacher effectiveness, formative and summative assessments, and curriculum mapping are discussed, the applicant does not adequately address the use of the district's teacher evaluation system to improve individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate for continuous school improvement.

(d) The applicant attempts to reach toward the essence of this sub-criterion, a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. The applicant developed a plan for evaluating effective teaching and teacher improvement. While evaluating effective teaching and teacher improvement should increase the number of effective teachers and principals, more specific information is needed to clearly show how the applicant plans to ensure that effective and highly effective educators are working with an increasing number of students.

The applicant receives a mid-range rating on this criterion.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15 | 6 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

For this selection criteria, a high-quality plan for polices and infrastructure is required to support project implementation. All of the components of a high-quality plan (outlining key goals, activities and rationale, timeline, deliverables, and parties responsible) are not present in the response to this selection criterion. However, some of the necessary information is included. Specifically:

(a) The applicant has provided sufficient information for organizing the consortium. For example, they intend to organize the governance structure by allotting new positions including a Grant Administrator responsible for grant oversight and compliance, a Director for Performance and Professional Development, and they will assign leadership roles of current staff in districts to form a Grant Leadership Team.

(b) The applicant indicates that school leadership teams will be formed within the structure of the Rising Star model of continuous improvement and will embed professional development communities within these teams. Although it is generally

stated that parameters of autonomy will be defined and agreed upon, it is not clear how much autonomy the teams will have or if the principal will retain sole decision-making over areas such as instructional grouping, class size, team teaching, teaching methods and materials, individualized instruction and evaluating results.

(c) The applicant reports that districts will have the flexibility to allow for STEM Learning Exchanges, remote educational programs, and standards-based reporting. However, additional clarification is needed to ascertain if these approaches address the essence of this sub-criteria which is allowance for credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic.

(d) The applicant indicates that the districts have flexibility in designing an assessment program that uses appropriate methods and instruments and may include achievement tests, proficiency tests, and teacher-made tests. While there are plans to provide training to facilitate redesigning personalized curriculum to provide learners flexibility in demonstrating mastery, more descriptive information is needed to determine if this meets the intent of this sub-criterion which is to allow students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

(e) The applicant has supplied various topics of training that will be provided for teachers as they teach diverse learners. For example, many of these employ digital learning as well as provisions for training in Universal Design for Learning. Others include what seems to be a random selection of topics.

The applicant receives a mid-range rating on this criterion.

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|--|----|---|

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) A partial plan (activities, materials to purchase, timeline, and person responsible) is provided to support project implementation. A clear goal, is ensure that activities and deliverables are provided in an equitable manner among districts so that all students and parents have equal access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school, is lacking to address this selection criterion. It is noted that teachers and students are provided technology supports within the school setting in each district. Robust discussion of supports for students and parents outside of the classroom is minimal, and offerings of various online learning tools are inconsistent, varying from district to district.

(b) Some districts report the availability of technology support more than others. Additional planning is needed to ensure equitable support in all districts.

(c) & (d) A partial plan (activities, materials to purchase, timeline, and person responsible) is provided to indicate that the applicant intends to institute an infrastructure to allow for open data format in interoperable data systems. Discussion of this is needed in the narrative.

The applicant receives a mid-range score on this criterion.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 7 |

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided information on a research-based process for providing rigorous continuous improvement that is grounded in the state-provided, web-based Rising Star model of continuous improvement. This model is designed for school improvement purposes for the districts in the state. However, the information provided in the application is insufficient to determine how the model is applied to the grant project's goals and investments. Specifically, the information provided describes principles and activities of a research model and does not address details of monitoring the proposed grants' targeted activities and investments such as in professional development, technology, and staff.

The applicant receives a mid-range rating on this criterion.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant shared appropriate avenues to be used for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. For example, they plan to use multiple sources to garner input and inform parents of continuous improvement

efforts including meetings and print and digital media sources. School level stakeholder meetings will occur twice per year and systems are in place for engaging communities agencies in supporting student learning, as needed. However, the information provided is worded to ensure that the applicant is meeting state initiatives for school reform. Information targeted specifically to, and directly addressing, the proposed grant activities and progress is lacking.

The applicant receives a low mid-range score on this criterion.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup.

(a) Research-supported rationales were provided for selecting each measure. The applicant provided charts showing that, looking at performance measures over the entire consortium, overall there were a sufficient number of performance measures to meet the requirements of the criterion. Specifically, these include teacher and principal measures of effectiveness, benchmark assessments for reading and math, formative assessments, attendance, discipline, and number of students failing one or more courses during first year in high school. Also included were a school and district survey (Illinois Survey of Learning Conditions measuring certain indicators of school success) and the state-initiated Rising Star Continuous Improvement Integrated Plan (part of the annual district review of their strategic plan). The applicant notes several performance measures will begin their baseline data during the 2012-2013 school year, including teacher and principal effectiveness and use of the Illinois Survey of Learning Conditions. A timeline was not established for development and use of formative assessments other than this will be accomplished during the grant period. It is noted that some districts (particularly Union Point and Giant City) has a significantly lower number of performance measures than those with more grades (Murphysboro and Marion).

(b) The applicant provided adequate information to determine how the measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. For example, benchmark assessments for reading and math will be administered periodically throughout the school year to be used to evaluate student growth.

(c) The applicant did not address how it will review and improve a performance measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress; however, the applicant has consistently stated throughout the application that data will be gathered frequently and used for continuous program improvement.

The applicant receives a mid-range rating on the selection criterion.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes efforts to evaluate effectiveness using both quantitative and qualitative data such as teacher logs/reflections, observations, surveys, inventories to measure effectiveness of professional development, use of technology, and improve teacher practice and student behaviors. The narrative includes a general statement that that the results will be used to refine curriculum to improve program models. Specific information on the expected improvements and types of results anticipated is not present.

The applicant receives a mid-range rating on this selection criterion.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a well-developed, reasonable, and sufficient budget thoroughly explaining costs relative to all grant expenditures by overall budget costs per year. (i) The total request for the four year grant period is \$19,999,828.50. Funds from other sources total \$30,000 for the four-year period. This budget includes the salaries and fringe benefits for three positions: a Grant Administrator, a Director for Performance and Professional Development, and an Implementation Administrative Assistant. The proposal intends to fund these three projects: Leadership, Management, and Communication:

Establish the Organizational Efficacy to Implement Professional Learning Environments, College & Career Readiness: Learning & Teaching/Leading, and Supportive Services. Additional budgetary breakdowns are described for the three proposal projects by year. The budgetary breakdowns do provide sufficient itemization to demonstrate how costs were calculated. It should be noted that this includes a separate itemized budget for the third project, Supportive Services, which is to be addressed through the Competitive Preference Priority, although it is included in the total budget for the grant. (ii) There is a one-time cost documented for three laptop computers to be used for program planning.

The applicant receives a high rating on this selection criterion.

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
|--|----|---|

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant described a framework whereby they could maintain sustainability of grant activities and projects beyond the funding years. This framework includes using trained staff through train-the-trainer models, building-level mentors, and knowledgeable leaders to sustain the practices and procedures developed during the grant period. In addition, the applicant will continue to avail themselves of the progressive state initiatives and partnerships in place and in use during the grant period. The applicant notes that funding for the fourth year involves creating transitional structures for continuity of systems and programs to scale the innovation through spread and shift. The applicant did not provide the components of a high-quality plan for sustainability (goals, specific activities and rationale, timeline, deliverables, and parties responsible), nor was a sustainability budget (optional) provided that could further illustrate their sustainability plans.

The applicant receives a mid-range rating for this selection criterion.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 9 |

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has developed a noteworthy project to integrate community resources in a partnership designed to supplement and support the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools in the grant.

1. The Consortium will provide much-needed support through an Immediate Mobile Parent and Child Team (IMPACT) by partnering with the Illinois CATCH on to Health Consortium which includes partners from all local health departments in the lower 16 counties of Illinois; including Southern Illinois Healthcare, Jackson County Health Department, and Center for Rural Health and Social Service Development.
2. The applicant notes that the goal of this office is to serve as a home to all health and wellness integrated services for students and families. Ten population-level desired results for students have been selected to include: student attendance, grade level retention, decreased number of school suspensions, identification of most recent discipline incidents, identify days of lost instruction, increase pro-social and decrease anti-social behaviors as followed with the California Healthy Kid survey, identification and referral to meet mental health needs, increase percentage of students with chronic health issues who are activity monitored by a school nurse, determine Body Mass Index (BMI) of students entering kindergarten and sixth grade, and increase participation rates in vision, hearing, and dental screenings.
3. (a) The applicant provided a detailed chart outlining the performance measures, persons responsible, applicable populations, activities, and timelines per year over the four year grant period. (b) The applicant does not clearly state that the data will be used to target its resources for participating students with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty (including highly mobile students), family instability, or other child welfare issues. However, the applicant does indicate that the project will provide individualized and group student support services for those student with significant physical, behavioral, and mental health needs. (c) The applicant states that the project will begin with the school districts of Unity Point and Giant City, districts who do not have a systematic infrastructure to adequately address student and family targeted needs. The project will be later expanded to support services already in place at Marion and Murphysboro in subsequent grant years. (d) The applicant has set appropriate and high-reaching target goals for improvements in the selected indicators.
4. The applicant intends to integrate educational and other services through professional development topics to include such topics as social determinates of health, poverty and school performance, brain-based learning, cultural competency, and educator completion of health/education related surveys of individual student needs. School teams will

track individual students to ensure services were provided.

5. (a) The School Leadership Teams will establish a timely referral process for students, families, and faculty to access the services offered; (b) The district level School Leadership Team will use the School Health Index assessment to create appropriate service offerings; (c) The California Healthy Kids Survey and the Devereaux Health Student Strengths Survey objectives will be used for the evaluation effort; and (d) Individualized family support services will be provided for families with significant physical, behavior, social, mental or environment health needs. The needs will be identified through self-referral, a referral by school staff, or in conjunction with student incidents such as absenteeism, grade retention, discipline issues, or lack of basic living skills; (e) Teachers and principals will complete process evaluations at least once per year to discuss challenges and opportunities.
6. The applicant has provided ambitious yet achievable performance measures as enumerated in sub-criterion (2) and desired results for students was included in their comprehensive plan. A combination of observational and survey methods will be used to determine effectiveness of desired outcomes. Teachers and school administrators will complete evaluations surveys and/or interviews at least once per year.

The applicant receives a high rating on the competitive preference priority.

Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has met the intent of Absolute Priority I: Personalized Learning Environments. The applicant has sufficiently demonstrated how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significant improvement learning and teaching. For example, relevant to (1) adopting standards and assessments, the applicant is actively engaged in the process of developing teaching instructional units that are aligned with state college- and career- ready standards. For personalization of the learning environment, the applicant enjoys several favorable conditions under which they have great leeway in conditions and autonomy to implement personalized learning environments. For example, while the state establishes long-term goals and learning standards, the local district has great flexibility in how, what, and within what timeline the students are taught the standards and how to meet the graduation requirements. In addition, the state has authorized the use of "remote educational programs" and the use of a remote educational plan, which is a personalized learning plan that details individualized achievement goals and the methods for instructional delivery that could be outside of the school setting and school day. These are significantly favorable conditions which have allowed the applicant the ability to design innovative personal learning environments.

In meeting core educational assurance area (2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and informing teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction, the applicant describes the proactive use of a common data and technology platform (Shared Learning Collaborative). Using this innovative platform, the Illinois Shared Learning Environment dashboard, and the Illinois Interactive Report Card provided by the state, the applicant can quickly and accurately deliver data to inform and accelerate student progress. This platform is multi-dimensional, able to sync different sources of student data including assessment and interest data, provide current data per students, and aligns college- and career- ready standards to appropriate content and resources. Appropriately aligned professional development activities are included for teachers, students, and parents to access college- and career- ready aligned applications, resources, and data. Implementation steps and timelines are dependent upon state initiation of the platform.

For educational assurance area (3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed the most, the applicant discussed several innovative strategies. These included a detailed plan to demonstrate that all participating educators will engage in appropriately aligned training and in effective professional learning communities that support student personalized learning of college- and career- ready standards. For example, they described robust activities to include project-based authentic learning opportunities, mastery/competency-based progression/pacing, use of progress data to drive informed instructional focus, teacher practice, measurement of student progress toward meeting standards, and use feedback from teacher/principal evaluations to improve instructional practice. Also, the applicant targets continuous improvement in the teaching/learning process through the use of a state-initiated model, Rising Star. Several researched-based components of continuous improvement of Rising Star are discussed including teacher effectiveness. The applicant has also developed a sufficient plan for evaluating effective teaching and teacher improvement to ensure that effective and highly effective educators are developed and working with participating students. Providing such supports and effective professional development programs will enable the applicant to be competitive in recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals. In addition, by closely monitoring student progress on a frequent basis, as is

planned in the program design, the applicant can assign effective teaching resources to the neediest and most challenging of student participants to ensure that all students are working towards high goals.

Concerning educational assurance area (4), turning around lowest-achieving schools, the applicant has provided substantial, detailed charts outlining the student performance measures, all of which either meet or exceed state targets. In addition, the applicant has established a wide range of performance indicators that will ensure that all schools, including the lowest-performing schools, will demonstrate continuous educational improvement. Specifically, these include teacher and principal measures of effectiveness, benchmark assessments for reading and math, formative assessments, attendance, discipline, and number of students failing one or more courses during first year in high school. Also included are a school and district survey (Illinois Survey of Learning Conditions measuring certain indicators of school success) and the state-initiated Rising Star Continuous Improvement Integrated Plan (part of the annual district review of their strategic plan). The applicant notes several performance measures will begin their baseline data during the 2012-2013 school year, including teacher and principal effectiveness and use of the Illinois Survey of Learning Conditions. Also, the applicant provided adequate information to determine how the measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action. For example, the applicant will administer benchmark assessments for reading and math periodically throughout the school year to be used to evaluate student growth. All of these measures will contribute to the goal of on-going growth in student achievement.

In providing these services and supports, the applicant expects to see student achievement accelerate, student learning deepen by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase in the effectiveness of educators; expanded student access to the most effective educators; decreased achievement gaps across student groups; and increase in the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

The applicant has met the requirement of Priority 1.

| | | |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 141 |
|-------|-----|-----|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0859IL-3 for Unity Point CCSD #140

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A limited description of how the district's vision recognizes four core educational assurance areas was provided. The district identified that they are embarking on the 2nd year of work toward implementing the Common Core State Standards. This work includes: aligning curriculum, designing units and assessments. No definition of "high-leverage strategies" was provided; therefore, this description is unclear.

Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining highly effective teachers/principals is another core educational assurance area. The district provided a limited description of how it will target this assurance. The district noted information about the development of a school leadership team (SLT) which will "execute a school improvement plan (SIP)." No reference as to what is included in the SIP was included.

The district describes the SLT as the group who will monitor progress and review "leading indicators, outcome data, measuring of conditions for learning and measures that assess quality of implementation;" however, no discussion of building a data system to measure student growth was presented.

It is unclear how the district will target the process of "turning around the Nation's lowest-achieving schools." No evidence pertaining to how the district meets the definition of a high -need school district was provided.

Overall, the plan briefly described strategies that would approach the goals of accelerating student achievement and deepen learning. No evidence of providing equity through personalized student support based on student academic interests were provided.

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

10

5

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

14 schools from 3 schools districts were selected to participate in the IMPACT ILLINOIS Consortium. The process adequately described a meeting of multiple stakeholders within each school district as well as unions and school boards. The consortium received a majority of consensus for participation. No description was provided as to how the individual schools were selected within each school district. No specific information pertaining to how individual schools met the eligibility requirements was provided; however, the proposal included collective information for the consortium: 32% of the students are of high need where as 50% came from low-income families. The proposal provided an appropriate description of the total number of participating students & educators, and a total number of participating students who are high need.

It was noted that all of the schools in the consortium would participate in all grant initiatives. A rationale was not provided as to why all schools were selected and no evidence was provided as to how the grade level span would support a high level implementation proposal.

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

10

8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The school district welcomed 2 non-RTTT3 schools into the consortium. It is believed by the consortium that this will serve as a process for "testing the water for replication." No further information was provided regarding scaling up of the RTTT3 schools. In addition, all of the schools in the consortium were selected; therefore, no specific scaling up initiatives were identified. It is unclear what is meant by a "R & D element."

A high quality plan requires that the school district provide information related to: goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. This information was presented in the District's School Action Reform Plan. Consortia goals were identified and aligned to the State of Illinois RTTT3 goals.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Goals were established for each of the participating schools within the consortia by individual subgroups as well as the overall growth of schools through performance targets. Charts on pages 23 - 57 indicate performance targets from 2010 until 2017 on state standardized testing ISAT in grades 3 - 8 in Reading and Math as well as grade 11 PSAT in math and reading as well as projected graduation rate targets for Marian and Murphysboro school districts. All targets are aligned to statewide goals and included achievement gap target goals as well. The response is limited in how the consortium goals will meet the aggressive projected targets. No evidence is provided as to the expected outcome for each of the different initiatives. It is unclear as to if these goals are realistic.

No college enrollment information for any of the districts in the consortia is available at this time; however, within 60 days of the submission of this proposal the high schools involved in this consortium will have adopted a clearinghouse to begin collecting this data. There is a concern regarding the Murphysboro CUSD186 graduation enrollment rate of 100% as being unrealistic. No rationale was provided as to why this is an appropriate goal.

The specific details of this plan are lacking in section A - Vision.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 8 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Each of the three school districts in the consortium have demonstrated academic successes over the past four years. The Unity Point School has provided evidence of a successful track record over the past several years by achieving the status of an Illinois Honor Roll School from 2006 - 2011 and being recognized as a Spotlight School for being a high poverty school who has documented efforts to close the achievement gap (Free - reduced lunch: 62.5% to 60% passing state tests). In Giant City, the district achieved a high level of achievement from 2008 - 2011 by performing above the state average. Murphysboro also made improvements in decreasing the gaps between: black/white (32% to 10%) , low income/non low income (24% to 12%), IEP/Non IEP (46% to 42%) even though the district is in Academic Watch status.</p> <p>An overview of district reforms was provided; however, the descriptions and activities lack significant detail. Due to the lack of information pertaining to specific reforms, it is difficult to evaluate the reforms as ambitious.</p> <p>Overall, the data provided was limited and the information was not disaggregated by all grade levels and/or subjects. No high school specific data was provided.</p> <p>Information pertaining to data availability was only provided for Murphysboro; therefore, support for making student performance data available is significantly lacking. Future plans were not discussed in terms of providing student performance data to stakeholders.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 4 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district demonstrates appropriate strategies to provide a high level of transparency. Each of the four categories of school - level expenditures are provided on the district website for the public to download, copy, and/or print. Contracts over \$25,000 are also available on the district website for the public. The district budget can also be publicly reviewed via the district's websites. District increased transparency in providing information to the public through the Board of Education. The consortium has plans to present district information to key local civic groups identified within the proposal. Information related to transparency of expenditures for instruction is not discussed in this section; therefore, evidence is lacking for this action.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal reports that Illinois state law does not restrict school districts from implementing personalized learning. Rather, it is reported that the state promotes personalized learning within school districts. Significant autonomy is provided through the state by promoting remote educational programs, allowing students in grade 7 or 8 to take courses that will count toward graduation, and providing dual credit for high school students enrolled in accelerated learning opportunities. However, it is unclear if these initiatives are being pursued as part of the personalized learning initiatives within this consortium.</p> <p>This consortium outlined general state initiatives that Illinois is supporting through RTTT3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Personalized learning opportunities through areas of personal interest are targeted through STEM initiatives, STEM learning exchanges the Illinois Pathways Initiative. 2. The description of the Rising Star Continuous Improvement Process is vague and lacking clarity. It is unclear as to the specific details of the process. 3. The Illinois Shared Learning Environment will provide a technology platform to support personalized learning. | | |

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium reported having evidence of support from the collective bargaining representation. The district provided evidence of extensive district stakeholder involvement. The consortiums also provided evidence of soliciting feedback from town mayors, and discussions were held with outside community organizations and groups: Southern Illinois University, Southern Illinois Healthcare, Jackson County Health Department, etc... Unique strategies were implemented to maintain on-going support and dialog through virtual meetings. It is reported that the three school districts communicated nearly daily to review data, discuss goals, and share information. No reference to involving families and students was made; therefore, soliciting this feedback was not documented. Although discussions with agencies and groups as well as district administration were documented, no evidence of revisions being made were provided. Letters were provided in the proposal from mayor endorsement as well as endorsements by community groups, organizations, and agencies.</p> | | |
| (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
| <p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Components of a high quality plan include goals, rationale, activities, timelines, persons responsible, and deliverables. Limited information was provided for each of the 4 school districts in regard to their specific personalized learning initiatives. Concise and detailed timelines were not provided for any of the districts. While the Marion CUSD provided an attachment of district teams, Murphysboro, Unity, and Giant City have not identified the persons responsible for implementation. Unity discussed using student technological devices and allowing teachers to begin "to experiment with Personalize Learning Environments." This description is lacking examples how teachers are using the devices to personalize student instruction.</p> <p>Some unique and ambitious reforms were noted in the descriptions such as Giant city's initiative to move toward "true academic choice and freedom;" however, this initiative is not described in any form of comprehensive detail. Murphysboro is the only district in the state utilizing data provided by the IlliniCloud; however, there is no identified plan for how the data will be used when identifying specific needs and gaps.</p> <p>A description of the specific needs and gaps were undocumented and vague at best. This response is very limited in that the components of a high quality plan were not addressed.</p> | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 10 |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Components of a high quality plan include goals, rationale, activities, timelines, persons responsible, and deliverables. This proposal shares a significant amount of theory, research, and provides a thorough description for each component of highly effective classrooms, personalized sequence of instructional content. The transition from the theory to the practical is the necessary missing component. Although vague, a timeline is presented. The activities listed under the implementation category are extensive; however, while all related, they do not all coherently align in a sequential fashion to each of the elements identified within highly effective classrooms, personalized sequence of instructional content, and student support system. The timeline is very general for the comprehensive list of implementation steps. Information is not provided as to what will be accomplished in year 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the grant. The district identified a list of persons responsible for implementation.</p> <p>The proposal identified 4 elements of highly effective classrooms: Universal Design for Learning, Blending Learning Environment, Student Involved Formative Assessments, Positive Classroom Management. The proposal further identifies a personalized sequence of instructional content: Universal Blended Strategies, Illinois Shared Learning Environment, High Quality Instructional Content, STEM Education, Illinois Pathways Initiative, STEM Learning Exchanges, Remote Educational Programs. Finally, student support systems were also identified. No specific evidence was provided to promote access and exposure to diverse cultures and contexts. No accommodations to ensure that students were on track toward meeting graduation requirements were noted. Mechanics to track student progress and success were not discussed in any fluent detail.</p> <p>The responses provided were very strong in providing generalized steps to provide students with: deep learning experiences,</p> | | |

keeping learning at the core, and providing high quality instructional approaches. This is evident through lists provided within the implementation step table as well as the steps outlined in activity 1 and 2. The proposal also included some examples of utilizing technology to support student learning such as Bring Your Own Device and providing a flipped classroom learning experience which would allow for "24/7" learning. The response was very limited in supporting the consortium's ability to track and monitor student performance, updating student performance, management systems for managing learning.

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

20

9

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Throughout this response, the use of recurrent unfamiliar acronyms make these descriptions unclear. A comprehensive plan of curriculum mapping, curriculum revision, and utilizing aligned assessments was presented throughout the response. Activities, deliverables, timelines, and the responsible parties were identified for three of the four goals:

Goal 1. Personalizing training for teachers in pro-social classroom management and high leverage instructional strategies through Professional Learning Communities. A definitions was not provided for the term "high leverage".

Goal 2. Build data systems that measure student growth and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction. The graphic used to model a personalized learning experience through the Illinois Shared Learning Environment was effective.

Goal 4. Evaluate effective teaching and leading to improve instruction and increase capacity to personalize learning environments.

There were no specifically outlined elements of a high quality plan for the 3rd identified goal: To develop and execute a continuous improvement process. Contained within this response are inferences to providing students with multiple attempts to demonstrate mastery and pursue learning of their own academic interest. "Student goals are revisited and revised....they actively participate in the design of their own learning by choosing what they learn."

Descriptions of district level teams, school level mentor,school level teams and technology teams were provided in the response. However, information pertaining to ways in which community and parents will be engaging in this process was limited. The impact of the teacher and principal evaluation system was not documented. It can be inferred in goal 3 that through the teachers' actions of individualizing instruction, mapping, and continually revising student plans that the student will be taught by a highly effective educator; however, no direct correlation is established. Again, this response is well presented with theory and it is evident that the district comprehends best practices; however, it is absent of practical implementation practices.

Evidence of integrating technology into an environment where College and Career readiness is valued was provided. Professional learning communities were identified and professional development opportunities for teachers to create "personalized learning environments" were discussed. Although a data system used to track and monitor students was identified a discussion pertaining to the alignment of specific resources to specific student needs was not described. Focusing on closing the achievement gaps of groups of students was lacking.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A LEA Central Office was supported by the assignment of new and existing positions. The Grant Leadership Team would be responsible for implementation, development, professional development, and performance management systems. This section outlined the persons responsible for the oversight of the overall grant. Evidence of district autonomy was presented. Districts will have autonomy and flexibility to select materials, resources, schedule adjustment for "peer collaboration, data meetings, and student intervention and multi-tiered systems of support." No evidence of autonomy over: school level budgets, staffing, or personnel decisions were specifically identified.

Lists of supports, expectations, and procedures were provided; however, this list did not include a rationale, timeline, list of responsible persons, or goals. No reference to students being provided with multiple opportunities of mastery, opportunities for students to earn credit based mastery, or adaptable resources.

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

10

3

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

District technological infrastructure and preparedness for the PARCC assessment was addressed in a general timeline and persons responsible, activities, and necessary materials were all outlined. The response included a reference to parent supports in the Marion School District; however, evidence of supporting parent communication in the other districts was not discussed. This response was very limited in regard to ensuring that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support. Interoperable data systems was undocumented; however, equity in technological access was touched upon by identifying the availability of the specific resources within each building. Overall, this was a limited response and did not meet the criteria outlined in a high quality plan. In Giant City, no specific resources were identified regarding equity and availability of technological resources other than teachers all having their own school laptops. Marian noted that programs such as Reading Eggs and Reading Plus were implemented. Murphysboro identified FastMath, Plato Learning Solutions, and the Unity School identified BrainPOP, Discovery Streaming, and STI Assessment. However, personalized learning instructional strategies, techniques or ways in which the technology could be used in personalized learning environments was not presented.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 8 |

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A well thought out list of activities and rationale was provided to establish a system for monitoring progress of the grant proposal. Persons responsible for parts of the implementation were identified such as district liaison, grant leadership team, coaches for Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports; however, more description is needed as it pertains to personalized learning. Although the foundation for a system of continuous improvement is outlined, steps to provide regular, timely feedback as well as a formal system of revision needs to be further explained. The district identified ongoing corrections and improvements such as: reviewing predictive data such as attendance and behavior, identify an immediately address failure, adopt procedures for data driven decision making; however, the "how" was not presented. District and school team work and communication was addressed but the district did not identify how public information was going to be shared effectively.

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

5

1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This response identifies on-going sources of communication; however, persons responsible to oversee the initiatives were not identified. The response does identify how parents would be informed about the reform process; however, considerations for communication barriers were not addressed. Timelines were not specifically outlined over the course of the four year grant. Desirable outcomes also need to be further defined.

The district identified using the website, social media sites, newspapers, assemblies, newsletters and community forums to communicate with families. The stakeholder meetings will be held two times a year; however, a definition of "stakeholder" was not provided. The district also identified the important of ensuring that school level systems were in place for identifying student needs with community support agencies; however, no plan for organizing such a strategy was provided. Overall, this response is limited.

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Twelve performance measures were identified. A well thought out rationale supported by additional research was provided for most all of the performance measure rationales. The research provided supported the reason why each measure was identified. This was a very strong reflection. Elements include a moderate level of descriptions pertaining to how timely

feedback will guide the implementation process such as: monthly data reviews of formative assessments, attendance data will be reviewed in weekly PLC meetings, review of rising star improvement plan in the annual district review.

Performance targets were identified for each of the performance measures. A reflection of disciplinary suspensions was the age appropriate non-cognitive indicator identified. High School performance measures included focusing on the FAFSA submission sub-group, two behavioral goals of reducing incidents of truancy and out of school suspensions, as well as college and career readiness as assessed by course performance indicators and 9th and 10th grade level benchmarks. Many of the 12 performance indicators span all students K -12; however the greatest concentration centers on elementary and middle school aged students. All performance targets are ambitious yet achievable and realistic.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
|---|---|---|

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district provided a list of resources involving teachers to evaluate the overall plan's effectiveness. Items such as: review of artifacts, in-class observations, having Leadership Teams work with Professional Learning Community Teams to review the data. However, the list is limited. No evidence of an analysis of technology, staff, money, and other resources are evaluated in this plan. In addition, community partnerships, district modifications, or decision making structures are not addressed in any capacity.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 6 |

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Detailed descriptions of Project 1: Leadership, Management and Communication and Project 2: College and Career Readiness were provided. The budgeted items will support the RTTTD grant initiative to support assurance one - personalized learning environments. Funds are targeted to professional development for College and Career Readiness standard developments, Common Core State Standard Assessments, infrastructure and hardware for data systems, RTTT3 state initiative training, and technological devices/software. Identification of expenditures as one-time investments or on-going operational costs were provided in Table 4 - 1 (Project level Itemized Costs). The identified funds are aligned to personalized learning initiatives. The projected costs appear reasonable; however, the lack of a targeted, clearly defined initiative for personalized learning throughout the proposal leads to a vague understanding of the appropriateness of the developed budget.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium identified that in the 4th year of the plan, the needs of the consortium stabilize and staffing decreases. The initiative should become self-sufficient. The district identified "a small supply fee [that] will be assessed for repair and replacement of equipment;" however, an amount is not specified. No budget projections were provided for years 5, 6, or 7. In the proposed budget, there were numerous on-going expenses identified; however, there is no concrete plan as to how those expenses will be addressed in years 5, 6, or 7. It is assumed that those positions will be eliminated based upon the consortium stabilizing their needs. Although a train the trainer model was identified as a resource for sustainability, no resources were allocated for future support beyond year 4. It is unrealistic that no additional funds will be needed to support the project's goals after the term of the grant.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 7 |

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The competitive priority will target the physical health of elementary aged students identified in the consortium. The Coordinated Approach to Child Health (CATCH) was identified as the primary change strategy. The consortium will target 2 of the school districts because of their inability to adequately address student and family "physical, social, emotional, and mental

health needs." This is an appropriate system for school identification. A needs assessment process was identified through the School Health Index assessments. As such, a comprehensive evaluation system of the services was not supported.

Throughout the implementation of the services, the consortium will collect data to evaluate student absenteeism, grade retention, discipline issues, and student attachment to school. Based upon this data, individualized supports will be provided to students or group of students with significant physical, behavioral, or mental health needs. Appropriate sources of data collection will be utilized such as surveys, interviews, conferences, and tracking population level. Targeted goals were identified for 2011 - 2017 (post-grant). Performance measures and desired results are effectively outlined in the proposal. A specific data management system was not identified; however, it was noted that "population level desired results data tracking". A thorough description was not provided.

Ambitious and achievable performance measures, a timeline, and performance targets were provided for each of the 6 performance measures. Although a referral process will be established for students, families, and faculty, information pertaining to all stakeholder professional and information sharing was limited. This proposal provided a timeline overview.

Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Although the step-by-step organization regarding personalized learning plans were unclear, it was evident that the district had a strong theoretical and research based understanding of personalized learning environments. The "nuts and bolts" of the plan were vague. Even though outlined plans did not meet the criteria of a "highly qualified plan" in many responses, the understanding of personalized learning was woven throughout every response.

Throughout the proposal elements of the 4 assurances were present: adopting standards and assessments through common benchmarks and the adoption of the Common Core State Standards; building a data system through the support of the Illinois data management system; recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers was evident in the adoption of performance based teacher and principal evaluation as well as professional development and coaching support for teaching staff. In addition, goals were set for students to benefit from being taught by highly effective teachers as a performance measure. Turning around the lowest performing schools was evident in the growth of this consortium over the past 4 years as well as the projected performance targets established for grades 3 - 8 and grade 9, 10, and 11 as well as sub-groups within that grade span. The consortium boasts over a 50% low in-come family rate.

The proposal lacked direct evidence of a relationship between the effectiveness of educators through the principal and teacher evaluation process; however, descriptions provided outlined the elements of highly effective educators. The proposal addressed decreasing achievement gaps through the use of professional learning communities, data tracking, mapping practices, student choice in learning as well as student accountability as a means to arrive at those results. Limited information was provided regarding practices of tracking high school and post-secondary enrollment rates; however, the consortium has indicated a dedication to pursue those endeavors. Work toward aligning and designing curriculum to the CCSS was provided.

References to personalized learning were evident in every section throughout this proposal. References to digital learning adaptive software were included within the consortium overall budget even though it was not a focused element throughout the proposal descriptions. Using technology to provide students with individualized learning choice was a theme in many parts of this proposal.

| | | |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 110 |
|-------|-----|-----|

