



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #09500K-1 for Western Heights Public School

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas and articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. Each element is addressed, however, it is not adequately addressed. Throughout the plan student achievement is emphasized, however, the "personalized student support" is supported by resources the district plans to purchase and implement. The resources are certainly something that can be used as part of the plan, however, the applicant does not fully articulate a high-quality plan. Therefore, a score of 6 is awarded.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant conveys a well-defined plan for creating learning environments designed to significantly improve learning and teaching district-wide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system utilized a data-driven approach to select schools. (a) • The data revealed a 5 year mobility rate among - 70 percent of the district's students and a 1-year mobility rate among 15 percent of the students. (a) • The students move from one school to another school across the district. (a) • A few reasons identified include: eviction, guardianship, switching schools within the district, voluntary change in residence, moving from one parent to another or moving from one relative to another (a) • All schools within the district are identified for inclusion in the plan. (b) • The application contains all essential elements: number of students, number of participating students from low-income, high-needs, participating educators.(c) • A table is given by the applicant with details regarding the diversity across the district. The table provides a list of characteristic related to each population group. The applicant fails to provides sources for the data presented in the table, as well as a source for the characteristics developed, therefore two points are deducted from the total available points of 10 , to arrive at the rating of 8 for this element. | | |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant articulates a sound plan that coherently describes the changes planned to improve student learning outcomes through personalization learning strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities defined in the application are achievable; however, they are not ambitious. Achieving only a 10% increase on academic performance annually will not achieve the desired results in a timely manner. • Deliverables are specific with timelines and responsible parties noticeably defined. • The applicant articulates that the district is committed to increasing the number of students who are proficient in language arts/reading and mathematics as measured by the Oklahoma School Testing Program. | | |

The applicant is awarded 8 points on a 10 point scale.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The overarching goal of the district is to improve student outcomes. The plan encompasses a comprehensive approach to not only improve, but sustain the academic achievement accomplished across all student groups and ensures that they are college and career ready. Not only will the students meet their goals, they will tailored to meet their own personalized interests. Performance on summative assessments: Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests (OCCT's) - student growth will be determined by a 4% increase yearly on the OPI (Oklahoma Performance Index). The activities planned are well developed with specific details regarding the deliverables, time frame and who is responsible.

- Provide teacher-based key performance indicator (KPI) is planned to be used - a clearer view of the plan and how this will be implemented is needed
- The Oklahoma State Department of Education (FY 2012 Assessment Data) indicates that an achievement gap exists in Math & Reading for all students versus sub-groups
- Graduation rates are currently at 63% overall and the system plans to raise that to 73% over the next five years. This is an achievable goal and a sound plan is outlined to make it happen, however, it is not an ambitious goal.
- College enrollment baseline is established at 40% which leaves the district with a need for raising the bar. The plan is reasonable which is stated to be 60% within 5 years. This is not an ambitious goal.

Based upon the goals and outcomes outlined the system is awarded a 6 on this element.

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 | 11 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district has a high quality record of evidence regarding accomplishing working with individual students and whole groups of children. It is evidence that the district strives to individualize how it works with each individual student in realizing their potential. The thorough approach involves a plan to provide differentiated learning. The past record of the district has demonstrated modest results with the differentiated model. Through the use of the RTT funds the district plans to put into place activities and personnel which will dramatically increase the results. High student turnover in the district due to family circumstances requires the district to be vigilant about collecting and utilizing data on students. Prior to the development of a plan to keep track of this data, the system was only able to establish 50% of students routinely qualified for free/reduced lunch status compared to the current 90% of students that now qualify each year. In the first year of the program implementation, Western Heights ran an audit that demonstrated an \$800,000 dollar increase in state funding for economically disadvantaged students. The system has ambitious plans outlined to duplicate this type of reform across the district which includes formative assessments, growth models, and a cohort model approach. The district reports that it already provides data to students, parents, and educators through its web-based dashboard. In addition, all performance data is currently managed by a specialized data consultant. Western Heights was the first district to implement the Zone Integration Server (Spring 2004), SIF Agents (Spring 2004), Data Warehouse (Fall 2004), Dashboard Suite (Fall 2004), and Custom Reporting Services for Pearson Chancery SMS (February 2004).

The plan states the districts past accomplishments. A score of 11 is assigned on a 15 point scale.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant adequately details efforts the school district employs to assure stakeholders they are practicing a high level of transparency by:

- defines current practices and policies used across the district
- outlines the districts practices used to ensure compliance with federal and state requirements for personnel records
- salaries for instructional staff and teachers are made available to the public upon request
- by stating upon request it sends a message or makes the impression there may be a few salaries the public could question
- brief explanations for each of the required elements is given
- a comprehensive description is needed to assure a high-level of transparency

A score of 3 is awarded for transparency evidence presented by the applicant.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- Conditions exist in the Western Heights Public School System to assure that there is sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments needed for district-wide improvement.
- The Superintendent of Western Heights Public Schools under the regulatory authority of the Western Heights Public School Board is granted authority to guide and lead the school district.
- Information described in the application includes duties and responsibilities of the school district leaders and board of education members.
- Operational philosophy of the board is provided.
- Applicant fails to articulate details concerning the climate and culture of the district which would apply insight into the true working relationship that exists with regulatory agencies, the school board, superintendent, school leaders/administrators and the community. Providing details related to the working relationships would provide insight into the assurance that this
- Based upon the evidence provided, a score of 5 is awarded.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
|---|----|---|

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A plan to engage stakeholders and gain their support is evident in the plan. The applicant explains that the district regularly collects survey data in order to gauge perceptions and feelings regarding the learning environment—from teachers, students, and parents to inform, guide and to evaluate policy decisions.

In the development of this plan a community-wide survey sponsored by the district and its community partners posed a set of questions including (but not limited to): “What do you see as the most important problems and needs facing families and children in this area?” Hundreds of responses were solicited and received. The responses indicate that the district’s goals and objectives outlined in this proposal are congruent with community, results included: school failure and dropout, languages barriers in education, early childhood education, character development, school-based support services, including counseling and nursing, and dental services.

Required element: (ii) For LEAs without collective bargaining representation, at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of

teachers from participating schools support the proposal. A letter of support from the local education association is included in the appendix, however, there is no evidence regarding 70 percent or more of the teachers are in support of the proposal.

Letters of support from universities, community colleges, city government and state government, as well as one business is included. Additional support is needed from external stakeholders in order to provide convincing evidence. The district is awarded a 6 on a 10 point scale.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
|--|---|---|

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The district outlines a plan for the implementation of personalized learning environments at the elementary school level. The applicant details a plan to meet the unique needs, strengths and weaknesses of individual grade bands, subject-specific curriculum content, schools, ect. in order to fully implement Personalized Learning Environments for all Western Heights students. Additional information is needed to avoid confusion. The opening narrative describes elementary only and no evidence for the middle or upper grades is provided. The plan must include the connection with college and careers, which clearly would entail all grade levels. Therefore, a score of 2 on a 5 point scale is awarded.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Clear evidence from the applicant is not provided in regards to how the district will include parents.
- A key element is unclear; student and how they will specifically be included.
- It is unclear how the applicant plans to engage and empower all learners.
- Based upon the lack of evidence in regards to student involvement, it is unclear in regards to how the school system will provide for student involvement and engagement towards their success in regards to accomplishing their own college and career goals.
- The emphasis of the applicants plan is on high school students; however, the applicant does not refer to high school students in the introductory portion of the application.
- The applicant fails to establish a connection in the early-grades in order to foster the opportunity for students to connect what they are learning with college and with careers.
- The district fails to make the connection regarding personalized learning with college and career ready standards and college and career graduation requirements.

Personalizing the learning environment for each individual student requires a plan to develop that students' academic plan, as well as college and career ready plan. The applicant does not make a clear case in regards to college and careers; therefore, a score of 13 is awarded.

| | | |
|---|----|----|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 14 |
|---|----|----|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Ongoing professional development is an integral component of the district's comprehensive efforts to improve teaching and learning and to support rigorous academic standards for students. The system offers monthly professional development that is a noteworthy. Common Core Learning Standards-focused professional development and if offered monthly and will continue to be offered utilizing third party trainers by

the district. The plan describes a strong plan which demonstrates the districts commitment to and understanding of the important of professional development. It is unclear how the district plans to specifically provide professional development regarding access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career goals. Therefore, a score of 14 is awarded.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15 | 12 |
| <p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district Superintendent will "quarterback" the efforts of the district to (a) recruit highly motivated and qualified personnel; (b) implement a fair and effective hiring process; (c) provide compensation commensurate with those of similar institutions within the region; (d) gain and maintain commitment to organizational goals; (e) encourage good performance through rewards and incentives; (f) make available resources to do the job; (g) orient and train new employees; (h) provide ongoing professional development opportunities; and (i) support organizational change through effective personnel management.</p> <p>The school based leadership teams show no evidence of teacher involvement which is critical for teacher buy-in.</p> <p>The project approach includes mastery-based learning and performance measurement, which embraces competency-based progression and pace. Mastery-based learning is a teaching method built upon the concept that student progression through a course should be dependent on proficiency—not the amount of time spent on academic work. This element specifies the element of mastery standards of multiple times in multiple and comparable ways.</p> <p>The applicant refers to a GEPA, but it is not clearly defined. A score of 12 is awarded.</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A plan of communication and the various mediums to be used is presented. All students across the district, as well as parents, educators and other stakeholders—regardless of income—will have access to the necessary content, tools and other resources provided through this project both in- and out-of school.</p> <p>The district outlines an ambitious plan regarding using information technology systems that will allow parents and students to have an extensive amount of technical support available.</p> <p>A parent portal will provide access to parents regarding students academic achievement and an equal system will be available for student use. The applicant explains that the system will allow users to export information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems. The applicant does not make it clear how this open data format would be useful in this reform. A score of 7 is awarded.</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>Western Heights has adopted a district-wide effort to improve the performance of all schools regardless of current data. This district-wide approach pushes all educators, administrators, support staff as well as those engaged in community partnerships to work toward a 10% growth in academic performance annually. Two years ago, the districts' motto was changed to read "Intent on 10%." Through the continuous improvement process for this RTTD initiative has a strong plan to integrate these existing efforts and incorporate new elements that provide for the ongoing gathering of both quantitative and qualitative performance feedback. Additional feedback measures outlined include: Informal</p> | | |

feedback, monthly progress reports, and formal quarterly reports will be reviewed during regularly scheduled meetings for the purpose of using this information to refine, strengthen and improve the project approach as appropriate. The Project Director will schedule regular meetings with Consortium members and will meet with the Western Heights Superintendent on a weekly basis to discuss project progress. The Advisory Council will review quarterly progress reports and provide suggestions for refining, strengthening and improving the project approach as appropriate. A score of 13 is awarded.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 Extensive policies are in place to support and insure engagement with parents and other community stakeholders. The district, in consultation with teachers, principals, program administrators, and parents of participating children, have developed and agreed upon this parent/community involvement policy. Reasonable strategies are outlined to communicate with other internal and external stakeholders. The applicant is awarded a 4.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
|--|---|---|

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicants plan includes a total of ten performance measures that are adequate and achievable. (a)
- Performance measures presented by the applicant are standards-based and used by the State of Oklahoma to assess student progress. (b)
- The following narrative taken directly from the applicants grant proposal reads:
 - “The standards above clarify for teachers, students and parents how we evaluate student work, and they explain for students what we expect of them. Based on formative and summative evaluation results, the Project Advisory Council will review the measures annually to ensure that they are effectively measuring implementation progress. In the event that any measure is shown insufficient to gauge implementation progress the Advisory Council will coordinate changes with the State of Kentucky Department of Education.” (b)
- This narrative conveys misperception and raises concerns regarding the integrity of the proposal submitted by the applicant.
- The applicant is in the state of Oklahoma and states at the introduction of item (b) they will use the State of Oklahoma performance measures. The reference to the state of Kentucky discredits the plan presented by the applicant; therefore a score of 0 is awarded.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 The district plans to hire a third-party evaluator to work with the U.S. Department of Education Evaluator, the Project Advisory Council and the School-based Leadership teams to evaluate the effectiveness of this initiative. The evaluator will work closely with the DOE-appointed Evaluator, the Advisory Council and individual schools to implement a plan of action that streamlines the collection of data (both quantitative and qualitative) that contribute to the reporting of the degree to which the RTTTD initiative has achieved its intended goals, objectives and outcomes. The evaluator will prepare quarterly programmatic and financial progress, which will be reviewed by the Project Advisory Council. Information and performance feedback from these reports will not only provide multiple feedback loops, but will serve as a basis for refining, strengthening and improving the project approach as appropriate, in order to ensure an ongoing process of continuous improvement. Each school-based Leadership Team shall appoint an individual to oversee and manage data collection at each school site. This individual will be responsible for sharing this data in a timely manner with the Evaluator and others as necessary. The third-party evaluator will ensure compliance with all reporting requirements including submission to the Department of Education an annual report that includes a description of progress to date on goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, and budgets, and a comparison of actual performance to the annual targets established in the application for each performance measure. The district would need to have buy-in from all the stakeholders and assure that they are informed and understand the data, and this is not mentioned in the plan, therefore, a score of 2 is awarded.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district plans to contribute just under \$1.5 million over the next 4 years to support their RTTT proposal.

According to the narrative the local support will total approximately \$353,101 a year from the district's general operating budget.

The district appears to be operating a tight budget, which raises concern regarding where they will be able to cut back or what they will eliminate in order to use these funds for this proposal.

The district states they will maintain compliance with open bid laws.

Based upon the evidence presented a score of 7 is awarded.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district has a plan that is sustainable and reasonable to continue to contribute resource beyond the grant-funded project period.

The Project Advisory Council will prepare a sustainability plan within six months of the start of the project period. This plan will include identification of potential local, state and federal funding sources, as well as possible local sources of community support (e.g., in-kind donations, funds, supplies and materials, volunteers, etc.). This narrative refers to what will be done after the proposal is put into place. The district does not provide a plan as requested. Therefore, a score of 3 is awarded.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- A lack of evidence is provided by the applicant in regards to partnerships they have established in order to augment the school's resources to facilitate the effective implementation of their plan.
- In the appendix the applicant provides letters of support, however, only one letter from Mizuni refers to a partnership. The partnership described in the letter is in regards to a technology partnership, however it is not adequately described in the grant application or the letter of support.
- The competitive preference priority is an item the applicant does not address individually.
- A score of 2 is awarded for the competitive preference priority.

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant conveys a well-defined plan for creating learning environments designed to significantly improve learning and teaching district-wide.
- The system utilized a data-driven approach to select schools for participation in the plan.
- The data revealed a 5 year mobility rate among - 70 percent of the district's students and a 1-year mobility rate among 15 percent of the students.
- All schools within the district are identified for inclusion in the plan.
- The application contains all essential elements: number of students, number of participating students from low-income, high-needs, participating educators.

- Performance measures presented by the applicant are standards-based and used by the State of Oklahoma to assess student progress.
- A sound plan is sound plan is described to improve student through personalization learning strategies.
- Activities defined in the application are achievable; however, they are not ambitious. Achieving only a 10% increase on academic performance annually will not achieve the desired results in a timely manner.
- Deliverables are specific with timelines and responsible parties noticeably defined.
- The applicant articulates that the district is committed to increasing the number of students who are proficient in language arts/reading and mathematics as measured by the Oklahoma School Testing Program.
- The applicants plan includes a total of ten performance measures that are adequate and achievable.
- Performance measures presented by the applicant are standards-based and used by the State of Oklahoma to assess student progress.

| | | |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 132 |
|-------|-----|-----|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0950OK-2 for Western Heights Public School

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, Western Heights, an independent school district outside Oklahoma City, describes a coherent and comprehensive reform vision that employs three elements – an integrated data system, a predictive modeling system, and training for students, parents and educators in both systems – which together will allow for the development of personalized learning plans for each student. Data-targeted interventions will be used to accelerate student achievement for all; multiple methods of instructional delivery and demonstration of mastery will deepen student learning for all; and supports will be targeted to the highest-need students using the integrated data system, ensuring increased equity.

The applicant scaffolds this plan on prior work in the four core educational assurance areas:

- Standards and Assessments – the district has already been engaged in the work of moving towards the Common Core Standards adopted by the state of Oklahoma, and will continue this work throughout the grant period; the applicant has built a system of multiple assessments (presented in Section B) that allow tracking of student progress and real-time intervention;
- Educator Quality – the district has implemented educator evaluation systems, and will continue to improve these systems throughout the grant period; the applicant presents a strong, multi-faceted professional development plan (described in Section C) that will allow educators to become effective implementers of the proposed instructional improvement system;
- Data Use – the district has been commended for its innovative, “early-adopter” use of technology to make its data systems interoperable and provide actionable data to educators in a timely manner;
- Turning Around Low-Performing Schools – most of the district’s schools are classified as Title I eligible or almost-Title I-eligible, thus the district has conducted a needs analysis of non-academic factors and found indicators, such as attendance, that are correlated to performance; these indicators will be integrated in an early warning system for educators and parents in the current project.

The applicant describes in Section C the development of a district-wide model curriculum based on the Common Core Standards, and an online system, the SideKick Planner, that will provide resources and activities that relate to a student’s

specific needs. However, the applicant does not describe, in this section or elsewhere in the application, the specific common and individual tasks that will be used to improve student performance. Also in Section C, the applicant describes a program of professional development that will allow teachers to offer a variety of learning options adapted to different student learning styles. However, the applicant does not address how activities assigned to students will be based on student academic interests.

In summary, the applicant presents a strong proposal for data-driven instructional improvement that is personalized to student needs; however, it is not clear what specific interventions or activities will be used, or how these will be linked to student academic interests. Thus the application is awarded high-range, but not full, points for this section.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that all eight schools in the district – four elementary, two middle, one 9th grade academy, and one high school – will participate in the proposed project. The applicant clearly lists all the schools in the district, and provides numbers of participating students (total, low-income, and high-need) for all schools and broken out by each participating school. The applicant indicates that all 3800 students in the district, including the 3165 (83.3%) students that are low-income, and the 2223 students that high-need, will be included in the proposed project.

As the applicant includes all schools in the district in the grant, and provides a clear and cohesive evidence chart, the application is awarded full points for this section.

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

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium has collectively planned to include and engage all students in all schools in the district in the project. Since all students will be included from the inception, no plan is presented for expansion, as none is needed.

The applicant makes a strong case for including all schools in the district, explaining that the academic and non-academic challenges (high poverty, high ethnic diversity, high mobility, low literacy, and low language fluency) that pervade the students and families in the district exist equally in all the schools of the district. Including all schools allows the applicant to take a comprehensive approach to the improvement of student outcomes.

All schools (8), educators (165), and students (3800), including all 3165 low-income students, in the district will participate in grant activities. All schools are listed, and the numbers of participating students are provided, including numbers broken out by low-income and high-need.

Since all schools in the district are engaged in the consortium, and all students in all schools in the district will be included in the implementation, the application is awarded full points for this section.

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

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents goals in each of the areas specified in this section, but concerns arise based on the tables provided by the applicant addressing each area. Specific comments about each area are provided below.

(a) Academic proficiency and growth – The applicant describes the Oklahoma Performance Index (OPI) as the measure of student performance, and sets a goal of growth in the OPI by 4% each year for all schools overall and for several specific subject areas. This seems achievable, if not necessarily ambitious. However, the applicant does not provide goals by subgroup, despite the clear indication by the applicant of three major ethnic subgroups (White, Hispanic, and African American) and a large percentage of low-income, high-need, and English Language Learner (ELL) students in its schools.

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps – The applicant provides gap closing goals for African-American students as compared to all students. However, from other data presented by the applicant, it is clear that the Hispanic students in the district also show an achievement gap compared to all students, yet gap-closing goals are not provided for this population. Next, the applicant indicates that the data in the chart represents “an analysis of OPI measures”; however, it is not clear how the numbers in this chart correspond to the OPI calculation provided in chart (A)(4)(a). Also, the applicant provides subcategories of gap closing goals by subject area, but not by grade band. Finally, the RTTT-D application indicates that gaps should be measured between each sub-population and the highest achieving population in the state; such a population is not indicated, nor does the applicant explain why the average of all students in the district is used as the gap comparator rather than the highest-achieving population in the state.

(c) Graduation rates – The applicant provides goals for improving graduation rates overall and by subgroup; these seem achievable but not necessarily ambitious.

(d) College enrollment rates – The applicant provides goals for improving college enrollment rates overall and by subgroup; these appear to be ambitious yet achievable, though discordant with the graduation rate goals in (A)(4)(c).

In summary, the applicant provides goals for each area specified in the criteria; however, the ambitious yet achievable nature of these goals varies by area, state targets are never indicated, and data is not always provided for all relevant subgroups. Therefore the application is awarded low-range points for this section.

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 | 0 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant mentions in the narrative that the district has taken steps to implement a differentiated learning plan for students to “modest results”, but provides no data at all on the districts’ past record in any area, whether of student learning outcomes, achievement gaps, graduation rates, or college enrollment rates.</p> <p>(b) The applicant describes the implementation of two systems in its low-performing schools aimed at improving student achievement: a data interoperability system, JetNet, that allows the districts’ schools to integrate multiple data sources into one data warehouse; and a data-tracking system of Dashboards that allow individual teachers and parents to track student achievement. While screenshots of these data systems are provided in the appendix to the application, it is not clear from the applicant’s narrative how much of this system has already been developed and implemented, and how much remains to be done through the grant funds requested. Most significantly, however, the applicant provides no data on how currently implemented systems are making a difference in low-performing schools, making it impossible to judge whether the interventions described resulted in ambitious and significant changes.</p> <p>(c) The applicant describes an integrated data system that allows the tracking of multiple indicators, by district, school, student, and teacher, available through a web interface to educators, school leaders, parents, and students, but it is unclear from the applicant’s narrative, both in this section and throughout the application, whether this system has been implemented or is still in development. The applicant indicates that student performance data is already made available to students, parents, and educators through a web portal; whether this data is yet in a state that informs and improves participation, instruction, and services, however, remains unclear.</p> <p>Since the applicant provides no data to demonstrate the district’s prior record of student achievement, and the status of implementation of the various proposed elements of the integrated data system described remains vague, it is impossible to determine whether the applicant has a clear record of success in any of the criterion areas. The applicant fails to address this criterion in its entirety, therefore the application is awarded no points for this section.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant indicates that the district makes personnel salary tables available via the district’s website, and publishes this information to the local newspaper. The applicant further indicates that all actual personnel salaries at the school level for all staff, instructional staff only, and teachers only are “available upon request”, though the applicant does not provide details about how members of the public might request these items. With respect to actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level, the applicant indicates that these are made available monthly to the School Board and reported in the yearly audit. School board meetings are open to the public, in accordance with Oklahoma state law; in addition, the district makes board meeting agendas available 72 hours before the meeting, and minutes available a week after the meeting, through its public website.</p> <p>Since the applicant indicates that all of the “at a minimum” required information is made publicly available, but only some of it is available at all times to the public through the district website while the rest is only “available upon request” with no further information provided on how to request this information, the application is awarded mid-range points for this section.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 10 |

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a system of school governance led by the district's Board of Education, with the Board delegating decision-making authority for most school-level decisions to the Superintendent while retaining approval authority for financing and personnel decisions. The applicant indicates that the Board is elected by the people of the district and given legal authority by Oklahoma state statute to control, manage, and govern the schools of the district. The applicant explains that the Board has developed a comprehensive statement of policies and regulations to be used as a guide for the operation of the schools, and presents some excerpts from this document that indicate this body has sufficient autonomy to operate under state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements.

Further, the applicant indicates that the desire of the Board is to embody their principles in a way that gives effective direction to the school, but does not impede school leaders' efforts toward school improvement. Thus, in addition to the autonomy granted to the Board through Oklahoma state statute, the Board itself grants significant flexibility and autonomy to the Superintendent and other school leaders to conduct school activities to improve student outcomes. Since the applicant describes a system in which successful conditions and sufficient autonomy is provided to implement the personalized learning systems described in the applicant's proposal, the application is awarded full points for this section.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
|---|----|---|

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that a community-wide survey sponsored by the district and its community partners was distributed to teachers, parents, and students specifically requesting input on identifying the highest needs of the district prior to creating the grant proposal. The applicant indicates that the district collected hundreds of responses to this survey; a few examples of identified needs are presented to illustrate the alignment of community-identified needs with those addressed by the RTTT-D grant proposal. The applicant does not provide a sample survey in the application.

The applicant also indicates that it conducts, as part of its Title I school activities, an annual district-wide parental assessment survey. Responses from the most recent distribution of this survey also support the need for proposed grant outcomes such as greater accessibility to student records and school resources, as well as the need for extended school time and social supports, which the applicant indicates will be addressed through a partnership with the local YMCA. However, the applicant does not provide a sample of this survey or sample responses to this survey in the application, nor is a letter of support from the YMCA included in the application.

In the appendix, the applicant provides proof of submission of the application to both the State Education Agency and the Mayor's office with adequate time periods (at least 10 days) for providing comments. The applicant also provides four letters of support in the appendix, from: the teacher's union (Western Heights Education Association); the Mizuni organization, which provides technical support to the district in its data initiatives; Oklahoma City Community College, a district partner in providing college and career services to students; and Oklahoma State University, where the project director is employed. While these letters are helpful, they are not sufficient to show evidence for a broad base of support across all stakeholders. Specifically, there are no letters from parents, students, parent organizations or student organizations, local businesses, or community organizations. It is especially concerning that several academic and social service providers, who are mentioned in the proposal by name as district partners, have not provided letters of support.

In summary, the applicant describes a survey approach to gathering parent and educator input; however, sample surveys are not provided. While the local teacher's association provides a letter of support, no such letters are provided from local businesses, community organizations, or parents' organizations. Since it is unclear whether the proposal has a significant level of support from all stakeholders, and the demonstrated support is limited to just a few letters from district partners, the application is awarded low-range points for this section.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant explains that the logic undergirding the reform proposal is the implementation of an enhanced assessment system, encompassing both criterion-based summative tests and norm-based adaptive formative tests, combined with "Common Language", a web-based program currently in development by the district that provides "an extensive curriculum map that matches and aligns all skills and objectives from each grade in a vertical and horizontal matrix". The assessments will be used by district educators to identify student needs, while the web program will be used to identify curriculum and resources that appropriately address those needs. This is a solid logic model.

The applicant goes on to present a high-quality plan to assess the current status of implementation of this system. The plan includes five goals: Identify needs, strengths, weaknesses, and resources of and for schools, educators, and administrators; measure student performance; analyze student performance data, prepare status report; and develop an action plan to ensure

implementation of personalized learning environments. Each goal is associated with appropriate activities, deliverables, and responsible parties; also, all of these elements are aligned to a reasonable timeline. This is a sound plan for assessing the status of both the applicant's current work as well as the current district needs for students.

Since the applicant both aptly describes a coherent logic model and presents an appropriate high-quality plan to assess the status of implementation and of current student needs, the application is awarded full points for this section.

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 presents a high-quality plan for improving learning centered on four goals: improving the academic performance of all students; providing students, parents, and educators the ability to create and track individualized instruction plans for students; improving the college and career readiness of all students; and using a predictive model to track and correct graduation trajectories. Each goal is associated with appropriate activities, deliverables, and responsible parties; also, all of these elements are aligned to a reasonable timeline. Taken together, these goals present a coherent way of addressing the creation of personalized learning environments designed to improve student learning outcomes. The applicant also addresses some of the specific criteria listed in this section; comments on the applicant's approaches to addressing the specific criteria are provided below.

(a)

(a)(i) The applicant describes an interdisciplinary curriculum, Career Choices, that will allow students to explore the value of their academic outcomes and link them to their post-high-school graduation plans;

(a)(ii) The applicant describes a web-based performance tracker, SideKick Planner, that will provide students with a dashboard of their own data that will allow them to track their trajectory towards college and career readiness, help them create a 10-year plan of achievement, and provide guidance on specific instructional strategies that will target their unique needs;

(a)(iii) The applicant does not address how the plan will allow students to be involved in deep learning experiences that will be linked to their own areas of academic interest;

(a)(iv) The applicant does not address how the plan will allow students to have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives;

(a)(v) The applicant describes how student data tracking and individual education plans will be used to assure that students master critical academic content, but does not address how they will develop the associated skills and traits listed in this criterion.

(b)

(b)(i) The applicant describes a web-based performance tracker, SideKick Planner, that will provide students with access to a dashboard of their own data that will allow them to track their trajectory towards college and career readiness, help them create a 10-year plan of achievement, and provide guidance on specific instructional strategies that will target their unique needs;

(b)(ii) The applicant does not address how the plan will allow students access to a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments;

(b)(iii) The applicant states that the district has already developed a district-wide model curriculum for all grade levels and all disciplines, full of rich content linked to college and career ready standards, that is available to all teachers via the district's intranet so it can be assigned to students based on need. The applicant does not mention whether this curriculum is, or will be made, available directly to students;

(b)(iv) The applicant describes the planned development of an integrated data system that will allow the tracking of multiple indicators, by district, school, student, and teacher, available through a web interface to educators, school leaders, parents, and students, which will be used to create individualized education plans (IEP) for each student based on their academic needs. Student progress will be tracked through multiple norm-referenced adaptive formative assessments that will allow continuous adjustment of instruction to meet current student needs;

(b)(v) The applicant describes a system of small group work, one-on one tutoring, and online learning programs and

interventions to support progression only when mastery is achieved. These services are already targeted to high-need students using IEPs.

(c)

The applicant clearly describes the need for student training in order for interventions to be effective, and describes a multi-faceted training program for students involving formal training sessions, use-based skill development, and IT staff technical support in school and online.

Points for this section are awarded thus: since there are 10 criteria and 20 points, each criterion is assigned 2 points. Since the accounting provided above indicates that 5 out of 10 criteria are fully addressed, two criteria are partly addressed, and three criteria are not addressed adequately, the application is awarded $(5 \times 2) + (2 \times 1) + (3 \times 0) = 12$ points for this section.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It appears from the narrative that the table presenting the applicant's plan to improve teaching has mistakenly been placed at the end of Section D. However, upon examining this table, it is clear that the applicant presents a high-quality plan for improving teaching centered on four goals: increasing the effectiveness of district educators through directed professional development; ensuring that all teachers practice differentiated planning for all students; using evaluation to improve the effectiveness of educators and school leaders; and implementing an effective pay for performance system district-wide. Each goal is associated with appropriate activities, deliverables, and responsible parties; also, all of these elements are aligned to a reasonable timeline. Taken together, these goals present a coherent way of addressing the improvement of educator and school leader capacity to use personalized learning strategies to improve student learning outcomes. The applicant also addresses some of the specific criteria listed in this section; comments on the applicant's approaches to addressing the specific criteria are provided below.

(a)

The applicant states that all educators will participate in the following set of professional development (PD) activities: ongoing district-provided PD on the integrated data system, curriculum database, Common Language software program; and Common Core Standards; further PD on Common Core Standards implementation through a third-party provider; and peer to peer Professional Learning Communities. The applicant also provides a clear plan of how this PD will be provided to educators, including using the expertise of the co-Principal Investigators (co-PI's) and graduate assistants for the project to provide literacy integration PD. In addition, the applicant addresses the specific criteria as follows:

(a) (i) the data system and Common Core PD will address the implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that allow all students to achieve college and career ready standards;

(a) (ii) the curriculum database and Common Language PD will address the adaptation of content and instruction in response to student needs; however, though the applicant restates the criterion in the narrative, the applicant never addresses how instruction will be adapted to student academic interests, nor are examples provided of optimal learning approaches that will be implemented;

(a) (iii) the data system and curriculum database PD will address measuring student progress and using the data to inform improvement of student progress and educator practice;

(a) (iv) the applicant indicates that evaluation systems are already an integral component of district practice. The applicant also indicates that the district is in the midst of improving their existing systems to the "Oklahoma Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Evaluation" or TLE. Teacher retention, promotion, and incentive pay will be determined through the evaluations conducted via TLE. The applicant explains that the rich array of performance data gathered through this system will be used to develop plans to improve educator effectiveness, though (other than the general descriptions of professional development resources provided to all educators mentioned above) no specifics are provided about how supports and interventions will be provided to educators in need of improvement.

(b)

The applicant states that all educators will have access to an integrated database of student data; a curriculum database; and the Common Language software program; all educators will participate in the set of PD activities mentioned above to learn how to use these resources. Specifically,

(b) (i) robust student data gathered from regular, ongoing assessments, a curriculum database aligned to the Common Core standards, and alignment of assessment results to curricular intervention strategies through the Common Language program, will all be made available to educators and school leaders;

(b) (ii) through a district partnership with local IHEs, educators will have access to a broad range of high-quality online and live instruction resources aligned with college and career ready standards; educator participation in Professional Learning Communities will allow them to work with peers and school leaders to create and share new resources;

(b) (iii) teachers, parents, students, and counselors will meet together as a team to articulate an academic plan aligned to the specific needs of the students, including direction, timelines, resources, and milestones as well as responsible parties for reaching each goal; the project’s evaluation plan includes a survey to assess how well students are being matched with necessary resources.

(c)

(c) (i) The applicant indicates that the district is in the midst of improving their existing systems to the “Oklahoma Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Evaluation” or TLE; the rich array of performance data gathered through this system will be used to develop plans to improve educator and school leader effectiveness and school culture and climate, while a combination of data from the evaluation system and district-wide surveys will be used to inform district School Improvement Plans.

(c) (ii) The applicant indicates that professional development will be provided to school leaders through partnerships with local IHEs and contracts with consultants and vendors. This PD will include the appropriate use of the new TLE evaluation system; creating a superintendent evaluation system; and the effective implementation of differentiated learning.

(d)

The applicant does not present a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals; no goals, deliverables, timelines, or responsible parties are indicated. The applicant does present several specific activities that will be used to ensure and evaluate the effectiveness of the PD delivered to educators and school leaders, which indirectly addresses how the applicant will increase the number of effective and highly effective teachers and school leaders available to the district. The applicant does not specifically mention how this plan will extend to hard-to-staff schools, subjects, or specialty areas.

Points for this section are awarded thus: since there are 10 criteria and 20 points, each criteria is assigned 2 points. Since the accounting provided above indicates that 7 out of 10 criteria are fully addressed, 2 more are partially addressed, and one is not addressed adequately, the application is awarded $(7 \times 2) + (2 \times 1) + (1 \times 0) = 16$ points for this section.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant describes, and supports with an organizational chart provided in the appendix, the structure of the district central office and how various personnel will provide support and services to all schools. Nine specific positions are identified by the applicant, with their associated services to all schools:

- Superintendent – personnel management to recruit, hire, and retain qualified staff
- Principal Investigator – program research and assessment
- Director of Curriculum and Instruction – educator professional development coordination
- Director of Community Services – parental engagement
- Project Director – district implementation supervision
- Field Data Coordinator – direction of data initiatives
- Instructional Integration Specialist – strategies to link data elements to instructional interventions
- Student Transition Specialist – facilitate student transitions across schools
- Evaluator – document progress of project and evaluate achievement of project goals

The applicant further explains that the set of individuals above will work together as the Project Advisory Council to coordinate their individual efforts across all schools in the district.

(b) The applicant indicates that the Project Advisory Council, in combination with the school based leadership teams, will oversee and manage the implementation of the proposal at each school. The applicant indicates that these groups will have the necessary flexibility and autonomy in schedules, staffing, roles, and budgets to effectively implement the proposal at all schools.

(c) The applicant describes a district approach to student progression that is based on demonstrated mastery. Curriculum is

hinged on assessments that determine proficiency; students are only allowed to progress upon demonstrating proficiency; students are not allowed to “give up” on any of the required competencies.

(d) The applicant indicates that students are provided multiple opportunities, including multiple assessments, labs, problems, and activities, that allow the student to demonstrate competency and move forward in the curriculum. These approaches are provided to students at multiple times throughout the school year, linked to specific competencies and not to seat time.

(e) The applicant indicates that the district addresses adaptability and accessibility of learning resources and instructional practices for all students through the use of language translation services, assistive devices, and modifications to instruction dependent on individual student needs, particularly for high-need, ELL, and SpEd students. In addition, the applicant indicates that a special effort will be made through the project to recruit students and families identified as high-need through the district’s multiple data collections to receive special services to support their growth, including the use of school-based social workers and the provision of specialized tutoring for such students.

The applicant thoroughly and comprehensively addresses the criteria in this section; the application is thus awarded full points for this section.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant explains that the district has determined, through evidence of ubiquitous social media use, that all students and parents in the district, regardless of income, have access to personal cell phones, and personal or public computers, which are already used by students and parents for social and personal communications. As a result, the district has devised a program of information distribution based both on physical elements, such as newsletters, brochures and flyers, but also on electronic messaging systems, such as text messaging, emails, social medial networks, and electronic newsletters. This multi-faceted approach is designed to reach all students and parents regardless of their specific preference for receiving information. Students and parents will be notified of appropriate tools, content and resources through these messaging systems; such resources will be made available on and offline to all students and parents.

(b) The applicant describes a multi-faceted plan for providing technical support to students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders, including school-hosted orientation sessions, on-site training and technical support services during regular school hours, anytime/anywhere access to training information and technical support through the district website, and peer to peer support through School Leadership Teams (for parents, educators, and other stakeholders) and Professional Learning Communities (for educators and school leaders).

(c) The applicant indicates that the district utilizes password-protected data access portals (Parent Portal and Grapeseed Viewer) to allow parents and students access to individual student information. These portals allow users to export information in an open data format, which then allows users to import and manipulate the data in other electronic learning systems.

(d) The applicant describes in Section B the consistent, district-wide implementation of an interoperable data system known as JetNet that will allow all schools in the district to access student, instructional, social services, HR, and budget data through a single integrated system. The applicant’s narrative leaves unclear how much of this implementation is already complete, and how much remains to be completed through RTTT-D grant-funded activities.

The applicant comprehensively addresses the majority of the criteria for this section, though it remains unclear from the narrative, in this section or elsewhere in the application, the status of implementation of the integrated data system that will allow the tracking of student progress and provision of personalized learning plans. Thus the application is awarded high-range, but not full, points for this section.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a strategy for continuous improvement that includes community members, students, parents, educators, and school leaders in implementing ongoing corrections and improvements to their district plans. Specific strategies include:

- community surveys and meetings, used by collaborating agencies to assess current needs and offer solutions;
- informal feedback, monthly progress reports and formal quarterly reports for the project, used by the Project Advisory

- Council to make adjustments to current plans; and
- regular meetings of consortia leadership, used by the project director, superintendent, and consortium members to discuss project progress and adjust plans.

The multi-faceted approach towards continuous improvement is strong; in addition, in Section (C)(2), the applicant directly addresses how investments in professional development will be monitored and adjusted throughout the grant period and beyond. The application is awarded full points for this section.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a plan for regular stakeholder communications through School Leadership Team meetings, monthly updates provided on school and district websites, and quarterly newsletters distributed both physically and through electronic means such as email, as well as parent-specific communications provided in addition to these processes through regular phone and in-person conferences with teachers, and email and fax alerts of student progress. This plan is comprehensive and multi-faceted; the application is awarded full points for this section.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes 13 performance measures in the application's charts, but describes only 10 of them (leaving out the pK-3 grade band measures) in the narrative. For the 10 measures described in the narrative, the applicant does provide appropriate rationale for each applicant-proposed measure. The applicant indicates that all measures will provide formatting leading information, as each is standards-based, approved by the State Department of Education of Oklahoma, and each will indicate to school and district leadership their current success levels in improving student performance. Further, the applicant indicates that measures will be reviewed annually based on formative and summative evaluation results, and if insufficient, adjusted in collaboration with the Project Advisory Council and the State Department of Education. Strangely, the department of education of the state of Kentucky is mentioned in this section, rather than the state of Oklahoma; no reason is given by the applicant for this switch.

Specific comments are provided below, by grade-band, with respect to the ambitious yet achievable nature of the specific performance measures indicated by the applicant, as well as the quality of the annual targets specified and the appropriateness of the subgroups identified for each measure.

- All students – Three measures. The applicant indicates that Oklahoma does not currently have a method to determine the effectiveness status of teachers and principals, but that performance measures are specified for years following the expected implementation of a new evaluation system (TLE) that will allow determination of effectiveness status. The targets for both teachers and principals are reasonable, if less than ambitious; still, it makes sense that the applicant would wish to err on the side of conservative estimates given the inability to identify any solid baseline numbers at this time. There appears to be an error in the all participating students numbers for highly effective principals, since these numbers do not match the breakouts by grade bands. Also, the applicant appears to not include highly effective numbers in its effective numbers; it seems that the applicant is suggesting through the numbers provided that as the numbers of highly effective educators increases, the numbers of effective educations will undergo a concomitant decrease. The applicant also includes as a third measure in this section the percent of students achieving adequate academic growth in a single year. However, the numbers presented in the chart represent the percent growth in the number of students achieving adequate academic growth, not the number of students itself. No baseline numbers are provided by the applicant for any of these measures.
- pK-3 grade band – Two measures. The applicant provides one academic and one non-academic measure in this grade band. The non-academic measure, Attendance/Mobility, has been shown through earlier district work to correlate with student success. The applicant-proposed targets are ambitious yet achievable, and are broken out by student subgroups. However, the indicator for attendance/mobility is not well described; since the number goes down, it is likely non-attendance and existence of mobility that are being tracked, which would allow the targets to make sense, yet this is never clarified by the applicant.
- 4-8 grade band – Three measures. The applicant provides targets for the on-track indicator, academic competency, and attendance/mobility rate for this grade band. While the applicant-proposed targets are all ambitious yet achievable and broken out by student subgroups, the applicant does not identify what specific measure will be used for the on-track indicator. Thus the numbers presented in that area are meaningless. Also, the indicator for attendance/mobility is not well described; since the number goes down, it is likely non-attendance and existence of mobility that are being tracked, which would allow the targets to make sense, yet this is never clarified by the applicant.
- 9-12 grade band – Five measures. The applicant provides targets for numbers of graduating seniors completing the

FAFSA, total numbers of students meeting an on-track indicator (that is again not specified), a proposed measure of career readiness (with no baseline data), academic competency for all students, and attendance/mobility rates for all students, for this grade band. While the applicant-proposed targets are all ambitious yet achievable and broken out by student subgroups, the applicant does not identify what specific measure will be used for the on-track indicator. Thus the numbers presented in that area are meaningless. Also, the indicator for attendance/mobility is not well described; since the number goes down, it is likely non-attendance and existence of mobility that are being tracked, which would allow the targets to make sense, yet this is never clarified by the applicant.

In summary, the applicant provides multiple measures and targets by grade band and student subgroup, provides rationale for most its measures and plans to improve measures if they are insufficient. However, the applicant does not provide: rationale for its pK-3 measures; baseline numbers for many of its measures; or valid descriptions of the on-track indicator, growth measure, or attendance/mobility measures. Due to these missing elements, the application is awarded mid-range points for this section.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that it will contract with a third-party evaluator to evaluate the effectiveness of its proposed activities. The applicant indicates that this third-party evaluator will prepare quarterly reports on programmatic and financial progress to inform an ongoing process of continuous improvement in all schools, as well as annual reports for accountability to project goals, timeline, activities, deliverables, budget and annual targets. The applicant explains that to achieve a cohesive evaluation of the project, the external evaluator will continuously coordinate efforts with the US Department of Education evaluator, the Project Advisory Council, and the School Leadership Teams. However, the applicant does not describe any specific activities or processes that will be undertaken to more productively use school resources to improve results. Therefore the application is awarded mid-range points for this section.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant indicates that the project will be supported over four years through RTTT-D funds (\$7,931,972) and funds from the District's general operating budget (\$1,412,403). The total amount of RTTT-D funds requested is within the allowable amount for the size of the district.

(b) The applicant presents the entire proposal as a single project. The applicant presents two budget tables with associated dollar amounts, narrative, and justification for the activities funded – one for the RTTT-D funds, and one for the district-provided funds. The costs as described in the budget narrative, including those for personnel, contractual services, equipment, travel, and supplies, are reasonable for the development and implementation of the applicant's project. However, a significant concern remains about the sufficiency of funds to implement all project activities. While the RTTT-D and district dollars are fully accounted for in the budget figures, the applicant does not mention in either budget the funding of four positions integral to the centralized support of its proposal: the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, the Director of Community Services, the Instruction Integration Specialist, and the Student Transition specialist. In the organizational chart provided in the appendix, three of these positions – the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, the Director of Community Services, and the Instruction Integration Specialist – are included; the Student Transition Specialist is never mentioned. Importantly, though the applicant budgets dollar amounts for the superintendent, principals, and administrative staff in the school that will be subsidized by the district, neither RTTT-D funds nor district funds are specifically allocated to these four positions. This is extremely concerning, since these positions will play a pivotal part in the success of the proposed activities.

(c)(i) The applicant indicates that the project will be supported over four years through RTTT-D funds (\$7,931,972) and funds from the District's general operating budget (\$1,412,403). The applicant does not identify any other financial support for project activities from foundation, State, or Federal sources.

(c)(ii) The applicant identifies the purchase of equipment and data system development costs as a one-time costs. All other costs are not specified by type; however, since the purchase of equipment and the development of a data system are specified as a one-time costs, it can be inferred that the applicant intends all remaining costs (such as professional development) to be ongoing. The applicant indicates that personnel salaries, professional development, and purchases of equipment and supplies are necessary to allow achievement of project goals.

In summary, the applicant provides budgets and budget narratives providing specific dollar amounts by category and justification for costs. However, the applicant does not identify any non-district or non-RTTT-D funds to support the project, and some key personnel costs seem to be missing from the total budget amounts. Therefore, the application is awarded mid-range points for this section.

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

10

9

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The applicant presents a plan for achieving the goal of sustainability based on the following three strategies:

- the district will commit to providing continuing resources;
- the Project Advisory Council will identify potential local, state, federal, and community sources of sustainability funding; and
- the accomplishment of the grant-funded goals will be tracked and reported to provide a record of success for future grant applications.

This plan includes activities, deliverables, and some time benchmarks, and identifies responsible parties aligned with the goal of sustainability, therefore the plan contains most of the aspects of a high-quality plan. The applicant also specifies a budget by year for the three years following the close of the grant period, indicating the level and source of funds to support sustainability. However, the applicant does not include support from state and local government leaders, nor is a clear timeline indicated for the activities that will allow the acquisition of supportive funding for program sustainability. Thus the application is awarded high-range, but not full, points for this section.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not specifically address the competitive preference priority in its proposal. In addition, while individual partnerships are mentioned as examples throughout the narrative, the applicant does not describe anywhere in the proposal how it has formed a "coherent and sustainable partnership" with any of these entities. Few letters of support are submitted with the proposal; many of the organizations listed as critical district partners, such as the YMCA, have not provided letters. The applicant never identifies: any indicators that would be tracked in collaboration between the partner organizations and the district; how the partnership would integrate education and other services for students; how the partnership and district would build the capacity of staff; or any performance measures at the population or student level. Thus the application is awarded no points for this section.

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant meets Absolute Priority 1 through its coherent and comprehensive reform vision that employs three elements – an integrated data system, a predictive modeling system, and training for students, parents and educators in both systems – which together will allow for the development of personalized learning plans for each student. Data-targeted interventions will be used to accelerate student achievement for all; multiple methods of instructional delivery and demonstration of mastery will deepen student learning for all; and supports will be targeted to the highest-need students using the integrated data system, ensuring increased equity. Specifically,

- In Section A, the applicant describes how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through personalized learning strategies

- and supports for students and educators that are aligned with the Common Core college- and career-ready standards;
- In Section C, the applicant describes how it will use a data-driven system of personalized learning to accelerate student achievement, decrease achievement gaps across student groups, increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers, and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student. Also in this section, the applicant describes a comprehensive plan of evaluation and professional development to increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators.

Though the applicant fails to provide the appropriate data in Section B to indicate a strong record of success in the past four years, the plan presented by the applicant does address include a description of how such data will be tracked and reported in the future. As a whole, the application meets absolute priority 1.

| | | |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 143 |
|-------|-----|-----|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #09500K-3 for Western Heights Public School

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 9 |

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a comprehensive and coherent vision for reform. Charts are well organized and present summative data proficiency and goals in a very clear understandable manner. The applicant provided data for a vision to decrease achievement gaps, increase graduation rates and college enrollment. The district demonstrates a solid understanding of the importance of technology to implement frequent accurate data analysis in order to provide successful personalized increases in student learning. The district described best practice activities and standards that are currently in place in the district and thoroughly outlines how they will put forth extended practices using the funding from the Race to the Top funding. Data tables contain current 2011 data through to the 2016/2017 school year. The proposed activities are reasonable and follow a logical sequenced timeline for implementation.

The plan is based upon data analysis and student academic needs. It is unclear as to whether the district has reform activities based upon student interest for all students. The plan does address advanced and college level courses for high school students, but as far as elementary and middle level student, the applicant lacks a rigorous plan addressing increasing student achievement based upon student generated academic interests. For this reason the applicant did not earn the highest number of points in this category. The applicant received an overall score of 9 for a well thought out plan addressing the remainder of the criteria required for this category.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All schools in the district have been selected to participate as part of the Race to the Top project. The district provides well organized charts naming the school districts, number of schools, student and staff participant numbers. The applicant's charts present all demographic data in clearly organized chart format. In addition the applicant's narratives thoroughly explain background information leading to the selection of all schools for the project. The number of low income families well exceeds the minimum requirements for eligibility. The applicant provides convincing documentation for numbers of high need students. They clearly emphasize a need for students who are high need as a result of migratory and mobility challenges. In addition, the applicant comprehensively provides supported documentation for addressing high needs dealing with poverty, diversity, literacy and the Limited English Proficient Population. The well documented narratives and charts that are presented in this

portion of the plan have earned the applicant a score of 10.

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

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides well rounded rationales for each of the reform activities that are presented. Goals are deemed credible and achievable. The applicant provides a table which describes each goal, activities connected to each goal, a timeline for each activity, and person responsible. The timelines and activities proposed to bring about change and increase student achievement appear reasonable and credible respectively. The applicant also provides well written narratives supporting all the information that is presented in the tables. The applicant earned a score of 10 for this category as a result of the clearly explained tables and narratives that were used to support the selection criteria.

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

10

9

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides annual summative information from the state Core Curriculum Tests in well organized tables. The data contains current student achievement baseline scores and projected increases through to the 2016-17 school year across the major content areas of Writing, Reading, Social Studies, English, Math, History and Sciences. Student sub group data demonstrating decreasing achievement gaps is also clearly presented in charted tables. Comprehensive graduate and college enrollment rates are also provided. The charts project achievable annual increases for all required categories. The applicant provides evidence of a sound understanding of data collection for school and district improvement. As a result the applicant has earned a score representing the higher end of the spectrum.(9)

In the vision the applicant states that the goal of the district is to increase student scores annually by 10%. The tables reflect annual learning increases between 3 and 5% annually. This appears confusing as it relates to providing supported documentation for ambitious goals. The applicant does not provide an explanation as to why the tables reflect lower percentages for annual student increases in learning. For this reason the applicant did not earn the full amount of points in this category.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Data demonstrating that the district has a clear record of success for the past 4 years is lacking in this category. There are no charts or narratives providing documented evidence of a clear track record of success in the required areas. The applicant states that significant reforms have been achieved in its persistently lowest-achieving schools but does not provide the data to substantiate the statement. The applicant included an appendix providing some limited examples/samples of individual academic printouts from their data system. This is insufficient information for providing appropriate support for demonstrating a clear track record of past successes. For this reason the applicant received a score at the lower end of the spectrum.

The applicant provided extensive documentation as to providing students, educators and parents with information, participation opportunities instruction, and services. The district has implemented an interoperable data framework system that stores all student information. This information is readily available to all stakeholders who have a need to know. The applicant earned a score of 3 in this category for the documentation described related to providing student demographic and performance data equitable to all.

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

5

4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided information that actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff, actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers, and actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level are presented to the public. The applicant provides information documenting that the district maintains a high level of transparency with regards to practices and investments.

The district receives a 4 in this category. There is no evidence provided for this category that the district is planning to evaluate and/or look to increase or improve upon current transparency in LEA processes, practice, and investments. For this reason the district did not receive the highest score possible in this category.

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

10

5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant cites the operational philosophy of their Board of Education. Evidence is provided giving the autonomy to the Board of Education as is recommended by the Superintendent. The proposal lacked any examples or specific instances that the district may have used the state implementation for extending autonomy for the purpose of personalizing learning environments. The applicant received a score of 5 for providing the basic information about the Board of Education Operational Philosophy. The documentation within the Board policy does not clearly state that autonomy is granted to the applicant for implementing the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. The applicant does not provide explicit information affirming that the applicant has sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments.

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

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided evidence that the district collected data from a survey with questions related to problems and needs facing families and children in the district. The data was used to assist with the formulation of goals for the Race to the Top proposal. The survey was sent to all teachers, students, and parents. The applicant did not document or expand upon the percentage or number of surveys that were returned. There are letters of support from the teacher association president, superintendent, board president, university leaders, and business and community leaders. The applicant earned 6 points for presenting the survey information and letters of support to meet the criteria in this category.

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

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The plan contains well organized charts that clearly state the goals with a rationale for each goal, activities tied to each goal, how the activity will be delivered, the timeline, and the person responsible for the activity. The applicant included a narrative explaining the rationale and implementation of the activities. The documentation is quite comprehensive. The goals, timelines and activities are achievable as well as credible. Data and documentation for the needs and gaps are clearly and coherently addressed. The applicant earned a score of 5 for comprehensively meeting the criteria for creating a high quality plan relative to the analysis of needs and gaps.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 20 |
| (C)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The applicant provides documentation that demonstrates how they have incorporated technology within the district to provide frequently updated data to all stakeholders who have a need to utilize the data to assist with personalizing student learning. There is evidence of concentrated efforts on the part of all staff members to stay updated with current college and career-ready standards on a K-12 level. The applicant has created a charted table that delineates goals for all students including high-need students related to meeting college-and career-ready standards and graduation requirements. The table lists goals, activities, timelines and persons responsible for the activities. The applicant incorporated convincing rationales for each of the goals and activities which supports credibility for the overall plan. The applicant earned a score of 20 as a result of the extensiveness provided to meet the criteria for this category.</p> | | |
| | | |

| | | |
|--|----|----|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 15 |
| <p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides an extensive list of professional development activities. The applicant lists goals specific to professional development. Reasonable rationales accompany the goals and activities. Timelines are embedded within the descriptions and rationales. The applicant states that the district is adopting the state's teacher and principal evaluation system. The plan accounts for frequent evaluator feedback to teachers and administrators. The applicant details professional development with copious examples which helps to provide credibility for the plan. The applicant earned a score of 15 for the completeness of the documentation provided in this section.</p> <p>The applicant did not provide documentation to support the plan to provide for increasing the number of highly effective teachers and principals in hart-to-staff schools, subjects and specialty areas. For this reason, the applicant did not earn the highest amount of point for this category</p> | | |

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15 | 11 |
| <p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant details the activities and leaders responsible for servicing and structuring the support to each of the schools and the district. Job descriptions are provided for each of the individuals responsible for the activities. The plan provides for school based Advisory Teams for each building. The activities described for each of the individuals and the leadership team are outlined in paragraph format. The applicant describes the district's philosophy or master based learning. There are limited examples of what this will look like in each of the schools. There are a few examples listed as to how the applicant plans to provide learning resources and instructional practices for students with disabilities and English learners. The applicant scored 11 points for the criteria presented in this category. The score earned is at the higher end for the stronger comprehensive descriptions presented for criteria a and b and minimal points for criteria c, d, and e</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The entire plan is built upon the extraordinary opportunities afforded to parents, students, teachers, and administrators for access to a district-wide interoperable data system. The applicant provides extensive documentation for the existence of the system as well as the intensive training provided to all. The applicant provides goals aligned to the success of the project, extensive rationales for the activities being implemented, detailed timelines, titles and names of persons assigned to the activities. The district provides documentation that the system is already in place along with credible activities to improve and expand access and use of the system. A detailed table with timeframes, deliverables, activities and responsible parties accompany the narratives. The applicant earned a score of 10 because of the extensive detail presented by the applicant to meet the required criteria for this category.</p> | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 15 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has described a detailed comprehensive plan for following through with a continuous improvement process. Throughout the entire plan the applicant has provided easy to read charts with detailed information. The tables describe the activities, deliverables, timeframes and person(s) responsible. The narratives contain the rationales which further provide the overall credibility for the plan. The applicant has listed an exhaustive source of committee involvement and a variety of articulation strategies using inhouse staff and external professionals. The applicant earned a score of 15 as a result of the detailed information found in the narratives and in the presented tables.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 5 |

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has documented specific strategies for ongoing communication and engagement. The plan accounts for achievable district-wide goals and site-based planning committees. Activities and training for those engaged in the process of communicating are clearly defined. The plan is well organized, clearly laid out, with reasonably scheduled timeframes, The plan contains a variety of activities for articulation and engagement, many of which have been utilized and found to be successful. It is evident that much thought has been given to those who will be responsible for the implementation and delivery of the activities. The district currently has widespread stakeholder engagement being practiced on a regular basis. The applicant has earned a score of 5 having justified meeting the all the criteria for this category.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant received a score of 3. The score is indicative of the overall comprehensive presentation. The applicant did not receive the highest number of points for this category for the following reasons:

- The applicant does not provide detailed completed rationales for the majority of performance measures. For 5 of the performance measures the applicant lists the word "required." The applicant does not provide additional explanations or definitions for the word "required."
- On the chart indicating the Performance measures for Grades PreK-3 and for grades 4-8, the methodology statement is incomplete.
- The applicant justifies that the performance measure addressed will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action as a result of being part of the state's standards and assessment program. The applicant does not provide further detailed explanations for how exactly the measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information.
- The applicant does provide minimal information that an Advisory Panel will be utilized to provide evidence using formative and summative evaluations as to how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern.
- The applicant does not detail a performance measure for addressing the physical well being, social emotional, or health/wellness needs of students as required at the appropriate grade bands.

The applicant presents the appropriate number performance measures.

For all students:

- The applicant provides detailed charted information and performance measures that demonstrate the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup whose teacher of record and principal are a highly effective teacher and a highly effective principal.
- In an organized table format the applicant clearly presents the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup whose teacher of record and principal are an effective teacher and an effective principal.

In the PreK-3 category the applicant provides detailed information addressing academic performance measures.

In the 4-8 category, the applicant provides extensive data in clearly organized charts to report the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator.

The applicant justifies for grades 4-8 proposing a performance measure to provide students with a plan for preparing students to master college and career ready standards.

In the 9-12 category:

- The applicant clearly list in chart format the number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form;
- The applicant clearly lists in chart format the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who is on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator.
- The applicant provides evidence by charting measures related to career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students who are or are on track to being career-ready.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant specifies that a third party will be employed to evaluate the effectiveness of the entire initiative in conjunction with an Advisory Council. The applicants plan provides documented evidence of goals and strategies related to technology, community support, and the modification of school and decision making structures. The applicant provides timelines such as quarterly programmatic and financial reports. The applicant presents a credible plan for focusing on the evaluation of all the timelines, deliverables, activities and funding put forth in the proposal. The applicant earned a total of 5 points for convincingly meeting the requirements set forth in this category</p> | | |

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget is well organized, detailed and appropriate for the investments proposed for the Race to the Top project. The budget clearly indicates one time costs and long term sustainability of the project. The applicant uses tables to clearly present the information. The applicant thoroughly explains how funding will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for operational costs. The budget supports the thought processes, overall goals, and goals related to personalizing student learning that are presented in the plan. The activities, interventions and strategies that will be funded are focused on maintaining long-term sustainability. The detail of the budget and the presentation of the budget in organized tables provide evidence that the district has taken extra steps to assure the sustainability of productive personalized learning environments. The applicant provides an adequate budget with reasonable and sufficient amounts to support the initiatives addressed in the proposal. Because the budget and rationales were presented in a comprehensive format the applicant earned a score of 10.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes a sound budget for a period of three years beyond the federal funding period accounting for budget assumptions, possible sources and uses of funds.</p> <p>The goals for the plan are clearly stated.</p> <p>There is documented evidence of proposed support from state and local government leaders and community sustainment. Persons and positions are assigned and documented as to the individuals and groups that will be responsible for maintaining and monitoring the sustainability plan.</p> <p>The applicant comprehensively details appropriate timelines in the sustainability plan for a 6 month reviews and updates of the effectiveness of the plan as well as a tracking system capable of accomplishing all formative and summative assessment activities of the project for the purpose of demonstrating the efficacy of the project process and its impact on the participating population.</p> <p>The goals, activities, timelines and deliverables are clearly articulated and presented as credible.</p> <p>The applicant presents a very complete and thorough plan for maintaining sustainability of the project goals and as a result earned a score of 10.</p> | | |

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 1 |

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant earned 1 point for providing overall general evidence addressing partnerships throughout various sections of the proposal.

The applicant does not detail how each partnership's involvement would assess needs and assets of participating students, identify and inventory needs and assets of the school community, create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students, support improved results, engage parents and families of participating students in both decision-making about solutions to improve results over time and in addressing student, family, and school needs, assess the applicant's progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems, and identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe desired results for students.

The applicant does not provide specific documented details dedicated to the requirements in this category; therefore the applicant earned a low score for lack of sufficient evidence for each of the criteria needed for this category.

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided interventions and programs throughout the proposal that are designed to decrease achievement gaps across student groups and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. The applicant has stressed the use of technology to achieve its goals. Throughout the proposal the applicant proposes to increase and personalize student learning through the purchase of research-based programs that have shown student gains in other districts with student demographics similar to the applicants' districts. In each of the plans that the applicant proposes there is evidence of adhering to college and career ready standards. The applicant provides coherent consistent evidence for personalized learning activities through the use of a cohort tracking system, data growth models, concentrated professional development, a schedule integrator system, and supported follow-up research. The applicant provides achievable current and proposed future decreases for achievement gaps across student groups, and provides charted data demonstrating proposed increased high school graduation rates.

| | | |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 166 |
|-------|-----|-----|