



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0931OR-1 for Woodburn School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant presents a conceptual framework as the guiding context for their reform vision, which is then followed by five initiatives that will be addressed within the vision. Rather than a coherent and comprehensive articulation of a vision for reform, the applicant presents a number of problematic grade level teaching and learning issues the district currently faces, and proposes strategies of how each can be remedied. While the applicant describes past efforts in each of the four core educational areas, continued efforts are presented in the form of targeted interventions rather than a holistic, comprehensive vision for educational reform.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides a clear description of how participants were selected for the proposed reform initiative. A complete list of participating schools is included, as is a chart with the total number of participating students; the number of participating students from low-income families; the number of participating students who are high-need; and the number of participating educators as required by selection criteria.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: All schools within the district will participate in the district's reform activities. The applicant does not present a high quality plan for translating efforts into meaningful district-wide reform however. The plan as presented lacks timelines and descriptions of persons responsible for specific activities. The applicant lists a number of statements that could alternately be construed as goals or deliverables however there is not a clear connection between these statements and the Theory of Action presented by the applicant.		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: The lack of a comprehensive vision makes it difficult to determine the impact of individual actions presented in areas such as decreasing the achievement gap, graduation rates, or college enrollments that are listed as criteria for LEA-wide improved student outcomes. In fact, the achievement gap and college enrollment are not listed as "problems or issues" by the applicant, although they are listed as desired outcomes. Generally, a lack of a focused vision and a high quality plan for implementation of a reform proposal makes it difficult to determine if the applicant will be successful in improving student learning and performance.		

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 applicant demonstrates a clear record of success in terms of high school students' improved achievement in reading and		

mathematics, with a subsequent decrease in the dropout rate and increases in graduation the rate. They attribute these successes to bilingual and biliterate teaching approaches. The applicant also improved the status of a low performing elementary school, citing movement of staff, intervention programs, professional development, and implementation of reforms. Insufficient information is provided regarding the nature of these efforts (e.g., the type of professional development, reforms, or interventions) and the specific performance issues they were meant to address. Similarly, more information is needed regarding the reforms underway at the four additional schools designated as low performing in the fall of 2012. Reasonable strategies for sharing performance data to students, parents, and educators have been established. In the case of students and parents, information is shared in a language they understand.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The district engages in extensive efforts to ensure transparency in processes, practices and investments. These include public budget meeting where proposed budgets are available and announcements about budget meetings (to include bilingual announcements) through mailings, and on the district's website. The applicant describes the means by which salaries and benefits for teachers, administrators, and other school personnel are made public. The total district budget is made public following approval.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant demonstrates sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement personalized learning opportunities. Some of these opportunities are offered by and/or supported by the State.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant details opportunities parents and community stakeholders were given to hear about and provide feedback to the district regarding the RTT-D proposal. Community support for the application is documented through letters of support. The applicant also states that there was support for the proposal and direct participation in development of the proposal by representatives of the licensed employee's and classified employees' unions. The signature of the licensed employee's union representative appears on the Application Assurances. There is no documentation of support from teachers in the application.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant documents past studies where gaps, particularly in language acquisition, were identified. A structure, in the form of state required Achievement Compacts and Achievement Compact advisory committees provide an avenue for the applicant to develop a high quality plan for an analysis of their current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the identification of needs and gaps. Even though the applicant has set goals for achievement through 2013, a broad high quality plan for analysis of needs and gaps, one that is related to the logic included in their conceptual framework is not presented.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant discusses a number of teaching and learning strategies to personalize the learning environment in order to increase the number of students who graduate college or career ready. Some of the initiatives (e.g. ensuring opportunities for deep learning in areas of the student's academic interest, exposing students to high quality content, and including digital learning content) are directly addressed though the applicant's proposed actions. Other areas under the selected criteria (e.g. exposing students to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning; helping students master critical academic

content) are not addressed. Also, the proposal does not discuss how the applicant will ensure that students have access to a variety of high-quality instructional approaches, nor is there discussion of accommodations for high need students or high-quality strategies to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or graduation requirements. Finally, although the applicant discusses a process for training parents to use the tools and resources provided to track student progress, there is no clear statement of how students themselves will be provided training and support to ensure that they understand how to use tools and resources in order to track and manage their learning.

The applicant does a commendable job of addressing learning issues specific to their district which do not necessarily fit within the selected criteria. There are several potentially good ideas that could improve learning and teaching however these do not constitute a cohesive and focused high quality plan which would include goals, timelines, activities, deliverables and person responsible for various activities.

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

20

2

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not present a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment that focuses on teaching and learning. While the applicant discusses a number of activities associated with improved learning and teaching, they do not sufficiently or consistently discuss the goals, person's responsible, and deliverables elements of a high quality plan.

Important selection criteria for this section of the application are not addressed or are inadequately address by activities proposed by the applicant. There is a limited and insufficient discussion of the role of school leaders or leadership teams in assessing and taking steps to improve individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate for the purpose of continuous school improvement. The applicant does not provide a clear, comprehensive, or convincing process that ensures teachers will be able adapt content and instruction that allows students to engage in common and individual tasks using optimal learning approaches. The applicant proposes inadequate activities for increasing teachers' capacity to frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (a discussion of making available data reflecting students' needs and interest is presented), and using these data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators. There is no discussion of how principals receive feedback regarding their practices or performance. It is not clear that an evaluation system for principals exists or that there is a plan for developing one, nor is it clear how or if principals receive professional development. The applicant proposes that teachers will create electronic units of study with accompanying formative assessments. There is no strong connection made between the development of the units and the use of high quality learning resources. Overall, there are major selection criteria for improving teaching and leading that have not been adequately addressed by the applicant.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There are a number of policies and practices discussed in the application that support the applicant's project, and a number of existing polices to support students' ability to demonstrate mastery in ways other than "seat time" in the classroom. The applicant has had success in using their position of autonomy to restructure their comprehensive high schools into smaller schools that enhanced their ability to offer a more personalized learning environment. They document experiences as well with autonomy in budget, curriculum, personnel and scheduling decisions. These activities bode well for their ability to have autonomy in further personalized learning environment efforts.

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

10

8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a plan to provide students and parents, particularly those with limited resources, with access to various technologies. The plan calls for tech support to assist those in needs. The technologies are meant to support learning and to enable parents and students to track performance progress. There is no discussion of the ability of students and parents to export information in an open format. The applicant does not address other stakeholders' use of technology-based tools and

learning resources, and while there is no discussion of tech support for educators, there is a suggestion that they are or will be familiar with available resources. The applicant states a capability for schools to use interoperable data systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant presents a sufficient plan to ensure ongoing monitoring and continuous improvement of the reform proposal. Both individuals and groups (e.g., Administrative Team, External Project Evaluator, Internal Data Analyst, and Advisory Council) will undertake responsibility for these efforts.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant delineates a number of communication tools (e.g., an overhauled website, direct mail, local cable, and a variety of media), in addition to a newly designed administrative structure to ensure communication with internal and external stakeholders. The applicant's plans should facilitate effective communication and engagement with both external entities (e.g. a diverse community, businesses, service organizations, and individuals who contribute the district's schools) and internal entities (e.g. internal data analyst, and elementary, middle school, and high school principals).		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: The applicant includes incomplete measurement charts and does not present rationales for selected measures, nor do they address how the measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information. Additionally, the applicant does not discuss how the measures will be reviewed and improved over time, if it is found to be insufficient as a measure of implementation progress.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: While the applicant presents a three-component evaluation plan, there is no explicit discussion of how this plan will evaluate the effectiveness of specific RTT-D funded activities or categories of activities. As part of the evaluation process the applicant refers to the review of goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and individuals included in the proposal. These elements of a high quality plan were not included in most instances when required throughout the proposal. There is no discussion of strategies that will be implemented to improve or more productively use time, staff, money or resources to improve results or decision-making processes.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The budget seems reasonable to sufficiently support activities and initiatives presented as part of the applicant's proposal. The applicant adequately identifies all funding sources and indicates one-time and ongoing funding. The applicant presents thoughtful rationales for investments and priorities.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not present a high quality plan for sustainability of project goals. Elements of a high quality plan, to include		

goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible are missing. There is a discussion which suggests that continued support for efforts proposed by the applicant may come from federal programs and partnership initiatives. Support may also be forthcoming from the state.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not submit a proposal for the Competitive Preference Priority.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant minimally meets Absolute Priority 1. The distinct has many good ideas and has had several successes in improving performances of students within the district. The proposal for RTT-D funds however is ill-conceived and poorly constructed. This is partly due to a lack of a clear and cohesive vision to address the problematic situations existing in the district that is innovative and forward looking. The lack of focus positioned the district to avail itself to a number of existing education initiatives, which could not be joined to form a coherent and comprehensive reform proposal. While all four core assurance areas are addressed in the applicant's proposal, there are several instances where proposed initiatives do not clearly address components of the selected criteria.		

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



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0931OR-2 for Woodburn School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant's plan is to serve 5,540 students in 11 schools with a large minority population. Of these, 76.2% of students are Hispanic, and 10% are students of Russian and Eastern European backgrounds. Applicant explained the district's recent history of educational reform that led to significant improvements in three areas: addressing the drop out rate and increasing participation in the district's International Baccalaureate program; implementation		

of "transformational" professional development for teacher leaders, principals, and district leaders; and, development of a rigorous teacher evaluation system.

In this plan, the applicant proposed five initiatives: having teachers develop instructional frameworks for best practices in the content areas across the different grade levels; improving math instruction for all teachers at the elementary level; implementing an International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program; increasing the number of secondary teachers with enough college credit hours to qualify as College Credit Now instructors in order to expand the districts dual/college credit program; and, providing every high school student and every K-8 family in the district with mobile learning device to extend and support instruction. Basic elements of a plan to develop and implement each reform initiative were largely absent.

While the initiatives presented were innovative and interesting, the applicant failed to provide a clear and credible approach to a comprehensive and coherent reform vision in addressing the four core educational assurance areas.

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

10

8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A full response to this section of the application was not included. Missing was a description of the process used to select participating schools although it is clear from the student demographic information provided that the district meets the competition's eligibility requirements.

The applicant does include a list (out of page sequence) of participating schools, number of participating educators, and number of participating students, a total of 5,540 students in 11 schools. Data indicates that the majority of students in participating schools, from 78.5% to 77.9%, come from low income families.

Data provided indicates that all students and all educators in participating schools will participate in the proposed plan. A list of participating schools and the number of students divided by subgroup in each school were provided.

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

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a vision for reform and improvement called *Theory of Action* that has defined the decision making process in the district. This vision is focused on an instructional core that focuses on what the applicant calls "our bi-literate, intercultural context."

The applicant's comprehensive and high quality plan outlines approaches that include learning collaboratively at all levels, prioritizing the use of data, aligning curriculum with a proficiency based approach, and articulating a belief that high achievement is expected for all students. The plan identifies components of its plan based on feedback from stakeholders that include the following.

- Problems or issues, such as the need to increase student performance in math as measured by the state assessment instrument
- Community assets, such as the strong partnerships developed with a community college and six regional universities
- Influential factors, such as the governor's goal of improving graduation and college enrollment rates

Desired results, such as enhancing a personalized learning environment that is flexible and allows students to either receive assistance or step ahead

A list of strategies and outcomes for implementing this plan is included. Elements of a high quality plan were addressed.

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

10

10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to serve 5,540 students in 11 schools. 76.2% of students are Hispanic, and 10% are students of Russian and Eastern European heritage. All schools in the district will be participating, and these include four elementary schools, two middle schools, and five secondary schools.

The applicant proposes five, well developed and comprehensive initiatives built on the four core educational assurance areas, which offers a logical and well articulated approach leading to accelerated student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity by personalized student support.

The following proposed approaches were noteworthy: addressing the language needs students of Russian and Eastern

European heritage; supporting an improving mathematics instruction by offering all elementary teachers two choices, either an extensive professional development in mathematics, or a specialization in mathematics certificate; beginning an International Baccalaureate program at the middle school level; expanding the district's dual high school/college program; offering English and technology classes for migrant parents, expanding pre-school classes to serve more families, serving more families in the district's literacy and math offerings, and expanding summer school programs.

Applicant provides a convincing argument on increasing the academic successes of all students including increases in student achievement of students with disabilities, Hispanic students, and limited English proficient students. Results for these groups over the last eight years and across all school levels as provided were laudable especially for students at the high school level. However, based on 2011-2012 data, problems remain; only 58.9% of Hispanics and 29.6% of students identified as English learners graduate from high school. The college enrollment rates for students from economic disadvantaged homes are 30%, 28% for Hispanic students, and 16% for students with disabilities.

Applicant outlined ambitious goals for decreasing achievement gaps and increasing graduation and college enrollment rates for all students including high need students. No information was provided on postsecondary degree attainment, which the applicant was not required to provide. However, such data could provide applicant with additional valuable information on the academic success of district graduates at the postsecondary level and could help district educators determine strengths and weaknesses of their academic programs. This especially important when curriculums center almost exclusively on state standards.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a clear record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching.

The applicant outlined a series of researched-based reforms based on the district's initiatives and described two of these initiatives: developing a bilingual program and converting the comprehensive high school to theme-based, small schools. Results from both initiatives are noteworthy. For example, the percentage of students entering high school as English proficient has increased 600% over the last seven years and 1400% for students with exceptionalities who were English learners. Results from the second initiative are equally impressive. High school students in the district have started outperforming students across the state based on state scores in reading for students who are English learners, students with disabilities, and Hispanic students. In math, students in the district from all subgroups outperform student subgroups across the state.

Following implementation of the high school initiative, the high school rate went from 10% to 3% within two years. Data for 2011-2012 has been negatively impacted, according to the applicant's statement, by an increase of newcomer students, identified as English learners, at the middle and high school levels. Performance for 2011-2012, also reflects changes by the state on raising passing scores for reading and math.

The applicant included information on how the district is making student performance data available to some students and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. The central components in schools' communication with parents and students includes early identification of the parents' home language, teacher/parent/student conferences, and letters sent home in addition to face to face conferences. Students who are English language track their own progress on a more regular basis through the use of student portfolios. At each school, language assessment teams composed of teachers, ESOL specialists, administrators, learning specialists, and parents meet semi-annually to discuss students' progress.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant explained that the budget process is "very transparent" adding that multiple public meeting are held, bilingual announcements are sent to every home announcing budget dates and times, and online announcements on the budget hearings are available on the district's website. Independent audits are made available to classified and licensed unions and

also to the public.

Although salary schedules for all employees as well as all other expenses are available on the district website, actual personnel salaries for all school-level instructional and support staff are not available. No mention was made on whether information on salaries schedules was sent to every home, whether provided by bilingual announcements or in other languages. It was unclear whether expenditures by school site were made public.

Applicant added that a series of informational sessions called "Budget 101" to explain elements of the budgeting process were planned and would be posted on the district website, but no mention of increasing public access to actual salaries for instructional staff, teachers, or non-personnel, school level expenditures was made.

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

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that the school district has significant autonomy by both district and state policies to implement the proposed plan. In addition, the district has the support of the Mid-Willamette Education Consortium and the Oregon University System, which award students college credit through the district's college credit program, Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate coursework

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

10

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states the application was built on the district's strategic plan, which received significant input from all stakeholders. Input for this proposal was solicited from district and community stakeholders through a series of meetings when gaps and suggestions were solicited and incorporated in making adaptations to this proposal. Although not directly stated, comments suggest that there was not enough time to involve all stakeholders and to solicit support given the application timeline.

The applicant does not discuss whether the district has collective bargaining representation. However, applicant stated that the district's strategic plan calls for regular significant input from teachers, students, staff, parents, and community. Additionally, applicant reported that a series of additional meetings were held to share the proposed plan with school district and community stakeholders and to solicit feedback. Representatives from two state employees' unions were among those who contributed feedback and support.

A list of stakeholder and stakeholders groups involved who were given the opportunity to provide feedback included:

- District's Board
- Woodburn Mayor
- State's Chief Education Officer
- State's Deputy Director for College and Career Readiness
- the district's advisory board
- Rotary Club
- Teaching Research Institute
- Silverton Health Network
- Western Oregon University and Pacific University.

Attachments included letters of support from the mayor, the state's Chief Education Officer, Pacific University, Oregon's Small Schools Initiative, CAPACES Leadership Institute, the Teaching Research Institute, the education dean at Western Oregon University, Silverton Health, the Woodburn Rotary Club, Woodburn Together organization, KMS Financial Services, and a State Farm insurance agent.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides an inadequate analysis and lack of evidence of the district's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the proposed reform including an explanation of identified needs and gaps to be addressed.

The applicant discussed the results of a district study showing positive results from a dual language program for Spanish-speaking English learners. No detailed information was offered except for the conclusion that the dual language program

yielded better results than an English Immersion program.

As part of the district's reform effort, the applicant stated working with educators across the state to review the district's goal setting and to track the district's progress on key student indicators, such as post-secondary enrollment, AP exam results, and 4-5 year graduation rates. Applicant stated that districts across the state, with the exception of the applicant's district, were criticized by the state's Chief Educational Officer for setting low standards. A provided chart indicated that the other districts' goals for improving graduation rates were set at 1% per year.

The applicant refers the reader to Appendix G, developed to to set goals across multiple levels, but no Appendix G was found in the application. The applicant failed to adequately address all elements of a high quality plan.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's approach to learning that will engage and empower learners especially the high number of high need students in the district's schools is incomplete. Both students and families appear almost absent from the discussion as educators struggle to identify goals and strategies that will lead to college and career readiness considering the district's past failures and increasing rigor from new state standards.

Although the applicant's plan has elements that will improve learning and teaching, certain elements of a high quality plan are missing. Applicant's failed to fully describe a plan for students to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest; to develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving; and to have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual learning.

The applicant's plan begins with adoption and implementation of national college and career readiness standards and the state's common core standards across the K-12 system. As outlined although not fully explained, these efforts include student ownership of learning, empowering parents in helping students set and achieve academic goals, improving student performance in STEM, creating interventions and acceleration for students, and increasing high school graduation, college readiness, college retention, and early access to college credit accrual.

The most promising elements of the applicant's plan include an academic focus on STEM across grade levels, expanded learning opportunities during the weekends and summer, expanding the district's IB program to middle school, assisting students and their families in navigating the college application process, and increasing the number of credit-retrieval courses.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The center of the applicant's response to teaching and learning is a commitment to the professional development of teachers. To accomplish implementation of a professional development component, the district pursued a partnership with the Washington Center for Educational Leadership to assist in developing activities for improving teaching and leading. Reference to the professional development of principals was not included in the applicant's response.

Examples of strategies developed included math professional development for elementary teachers, a proficiency system aligned with the Common Core Standards, development of an International Baccalaureate Middle School Program, development and use of native language reading assessments in Russian and Spanish, and identification of a cadre of teachers to lead technology initiatives across the district.

It is not completely clear how this professional development will support personalized learning environments, lead to the adaptation of content and instruction, or assist teachers to measure student progress. The important support related to improving teacher and principal practice and effectiveness by considering feedback from the district's educators' evaluation system was not addressed. Discussion on the use of assessment to inform instruction was limited to data on students' quantifiable progress on achievement data. The applicant stated that achievement data did not reflect many of the positive gains among students in the various subgroups; however, the district had made no effort to collect or analyze these "positive gains" in order to assess teacher effectiveness or student learning.

Although the applicant plans to develop online and digital resources and a standards aligned proficiency system so that teachers can have the tools and data needed, it does not appear that these tools are currently available.

The applicant states that all schools have student intervention teams who meet on a regular basis to discuss academic interventions. However, such efforts are limited to targeting students in need of academic interventions.

The district reviewed and updated its teacher evaluation system, aligned it with InTASC standards, and included student achievement as a major component. The expectation is that all students receive instruction from highly effective teachers, and no teacher can remain below a proficiency level for more than three years. Should a teacher not reach a proficiency level, a plan of assistance will be provided. No discussion was provided on what actions the district would take with consistently under-performing teachers.

New teachers are provided mentoring and participation in various new teacher activities using a New Teacher Center model. The district provides instructional coaches to all teachers for support through a partnership with Western Oregon University and Pacific University.

The applicant does not include information on identifying or providing support to effective or highly effective principals nor does applicant include a plan to provide effective or highly effective educators to hard-to-staff schools or in hard to staff subjects.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant bases having the practices, policies, and rules required to implement the proposed project on previous decisions made, such as when the district converted a comprehensive high school into autonomous small schools. The small school design provided for high levels of personalization founded on on a model of proficiency-based learning and assessment. The district implemented various autonomies that included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • autonomy over school schedules and calendars, personnel decisions, and school budgets; • autonomy of curriculum, which gave students the opportunity to earn credit based on mastery; and • autonomy of space and budget. <p>Learning resources and instructional practices were used or adapted to meet the needs of English learners, which constitute 70% of all students in the district. Students with disabilities, especially English learners with disabilities, have benefited from these changes based on student achievement data. Applicant adds that students in other subgroups including higher performing students (white, gifted and talented) have also demonstrated increased achievement.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that the school district has a strong commitment to empower students and families of all backgrounds and income levels.</p> <p>District schools hold a variety of events and activities designed to support student learning, for example, Family Math and Science Nights, Family Literacy events, Family University classes. Teachers routinely send children home with audio-tape or CD recordings of books, along with the players.</p> <p>The applicant plans to implement mobile learning technologies to expand learning opportunities, provide for school-home communication, and give parents and students access to online resources such as a grade-book system, which allows parents and students to track progress toward mastery through the different grade levels. It is unclear whether teachers, parents, or students currently have access or support to use the district's data system that tracks student performance data and local assessments or budget and instructional improvement system data.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

--	--	--

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant outlines a management system that includes an administrative structure, breakdowns of timelines and monitoring of activities, an advisory council that will review performance feedback, and use of an outside evaluator. Members of the administrative team will be responsible for day-to-day operations that includes monitoring timelines, the attainment of deliverables, and the impact of investment. Applicant outlined the responsibilities of each member of the administrative team, which includes an internal data analyst, an external evaluator, the project coordinator, a technician/trainer, and math specialist coaches.</p> <p>The evaluation framework will address three purposes: evaluation of implementation for the purposed of ongoing performance, feedback, and improvement; evaluation of the project as a whole; and supporting all reporting and accountability requirements.</p> <p>The applicants plan to publicly share information on the quality of the investment is limited to posting minutes of the advisory council's quarterly meetings on the district's website, in English, Spanish and Russian, and in yearly meetings by the council for the community.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant stated that there were various concerns voiced by stakeholders during the grantwriting process. These included a need more improved communication and opportunities to contribute to schools, concern about current strategies to update the community, and a need to improve the district's website. Based on this feedback, the original plan was modified to include an overhaul of the district's website and a plan to provide for on-going communication through a variety of sources (print, video, internet, radio).</p> <p>Applicant discussed the challenges in reaching all stakeholders given the diversity of the small community, which includes recent immigrants from Eastern Europe and Somali. One suggestion, provided by the mayor, was expansion of the district's Family University events to bring together all segments of the community. The applicant also plans to engage with existing partnerships, to develop new partnerships, and to collect information on parents' preferred means of communication and information sharing.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided 12 performance measures.</p> <p>Two performance measures were required of all applicants: (a) 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, and (b) the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, whose teacher of record and principal are an effective teacher and an effective principal. The applicant did not respond to these requirements.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant outlined a plan that included timely and regular feedback on progress, timelines, and monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed project through collaborative partnerships composed of an administrative structure, an advisory council, and an outside evaluator.</p> <p>The applicant provided a plan to improve communication with community partners, to nourish existing partnerships, to develop new partnerships, to seek feedback from parents on improving communication, to update the district website, and to increase the way the district posts information through increased use of technology.</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 applicant's overall budget summary includes a personnel item that constitutes almost 37% of the requested funds. The total amount requested is sufficient to support the proposed project since components of the plan require significant investment, such as developing an International Baccalaureate Middle School, providing all elementary teachers with math professional development, expanding the district's dual credit coursework, expansion of the district's Family University events, and website development and training.</p> <p>Funds from other sources total over \$7 million over the four-year grant period are listed. These were not directly identified although the applicant discusses in the narrative significant federal funding through Title I, Title IIA, Title III, and Carl Perkins funding. It is unclear whether the district's external partners are providing any direct funds to support the proposed project. One-time budget items, such as communication system improvements and staff development, were listed.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant discussed support from the district's partnerships with Pacific University, Western Oregon University, and Chemeketa Community College although a full discussion on their contributions was not included.</p> <p>The district is also working with a community organization applying to be an AmeriCorps site. The applicant discussed increased volunteerism among high school students and previous students to implement the district's Family University events.</p> <p>Additional efforts planned to provide long-term sustainability following the end of the grant period included use of current state and federal funds, seeking additional state funding, and actively seeking additional grant opportunities. The applicant failed to adequately address all elements of a high quality plan related to long-term sustainability of the proposed project.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan at times lacked coherence, and a couple of sections in the application offered inadequate responses. Discussion on the number of students being served by effective or highly effective teacher and principals was not included. This is an important question given that most students in the district are considered high need.

Other important questions were left unanswered. For example, there was little explanation on the low number of students who enrolled in college; for 2011-2012, only 28% of Hispanic students, 30% of students from disadvantaged background, and 16% of students with disabilities enrolled in college. The data provided on student performance prior to 2011-2012 was impressive, but there was little discussion on why most of these improvements were not reflected in the most current data.

The applicant's district has significant educational challenges since most students in the district come from economically disadvantaged homes, many are recent immigrants, and many have significant language issues. The applicant provided evidence that many of the students' educational needs are being addressed. There is a thoughtful respect paid to students' culture and background, there was evidence that the district has high expectations for students in the district, and the district has reached out to community in an effort to assist parents in supporting children's learning.

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



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0931OR-3 for Woodburn School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Core Educational Assurance Areas:

#1: Adopting standards and assessments...: This school district has a historical record of utilizing a "small school model" to reduce the dropout rate (10% to 3%) and creating an International Baccalaureate program. Initiative one, according to the grant writer, calls for "banded instructional loops" (K-12) to document student progress. Initiative four focuses on the creation of a "college-going culture" by increasing the number of dual-credit courses at the high school level along with increasing the number of high level teachers to become certified "College Credit Now" instructors. For students who are not attending a four-year college, the district seeks to expanding the "Career and Technical Education" program by providing education on different career options and to earn dual college/high school credit toward their career fields. Competition in the global economy was not directly addressed in this section (A-1).

#2: Building data systems...: In the introduction, the grant writer mentions on-going work in 2009 where teachers have developed "formative" assessments that are aligned with the CCSS. In initiative one they envision a K-12 system of "banded instructional loops" to provide empirical evidence of the student achievement of proficiencies of students. "Targeted, individualized intervention systems" will be utilized for students not meeting proficiency. Students who are meeting proficiency will not be left out. They will have "challenging curriculum and instruction" as well. OAKS, Aprenda, and a locally-developed Russian language exam will be in use due to this district's student composition of Hispanic students (76.2%) and students of Russian and Eastern European descent (10%). The tables in A-2 provided data on assessments in the students' first language.

#3: Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining...: Providing teachers with an opportunity to become certified "College Credit Now" instructors for dual-credit courses is one example of developing effective pedagogues. They will complete 28 credit hours. It is not stated if the teachers will receive an incentive for acquiring this certification. In initiative #2 elementary teachers "with strong math skills" will be able to earn an Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission-Approved Math Certificate. They (5) will then serve as instructional coaches.

#4: Turning around lowest achieving...: An International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program will be created as described in initiative #3.

Finally, in terms of "increasing equity through personalized student support" the grant writer describes a program that will provide each high school student and each K-8 family will receive a "mobile learning device," the summer program will be expanded to serve all K-12 students, and evening classes for migrant families will be provided through the Family University. There is mention of a literacy intervention program, but the sentence is incomplete so it is unclear what the program will offer to incoming kindergarten students.

Overall, the narrative provides an ambitious, but achievable plan for addressing student achievement, student learning, and increasing equity. Key goals are imbedded in the text, an empirical research based rationale is provided, activities are reasonable for implementation, deliverables are identified, and responsible parties for taking the lead in achieving the performance measures are identified. The vision is comprehensive and coherent.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) A description of the process...: The grant writer indicated that due to demonstrated success of previous reforms, input from administrators, teachers, families, community members, and schools staff were "all" on board to participate in the RTTT program if funded. The sites and process of gaining input was not provided in the narrative. The grant writer provided several tables:

- School participating: Four elementary, two middle, and five small high schools. It appears as if the entire school district is participating in this initiative.
- Eligibility Criteria: The school district lists twelve eligibility requirements that they have met.

(b) A list of the schools...: The names of the four elementary, two middle and five small high schools were listed in the table "Schools Participating."

(c) The total number of students....:

- Total number (5720) students is provided
- Low income students: Grant writer stated that "100%" of the students are eligible for free/reduced lunch
- High need students: In the table "Participating Students" the grant writer indicated: Elementary (2764); Middle (1201), and High (1572).
 - Poverty: 100% eligible for free/reduced lunch
 - Below grade level: No details in this section
 - At risk of not graduating: No details in this section
 - Homeless: No details in this section
 - Foster Care: No details in this section
 - Incarcerated in the past: No details in this section
 - Disabilities: No details in this section
 - English learners: No details in this section
- Participating educators: In the table "Participating Students" the grant writer indicated: Elementary (149); Middle (95); and High (89)

The grant writer provided a detailed table on school demographics. It was not in the A-2 section. It was in the A-3 section so I did not come across this until I read the A-3 section.

I am crediting this section with nine points out of a possible ten points. There were areas mentioned above that did not provide adequate explanation, but there was adequate explanation of the description in general terms, the list of schools was concise, and the total number of students is provided.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The grant writer identifies two theories for addressing LEA-wide reform and change: Theory of Action and Basic Logic Model (Kellogg Foundation). By combining the two theoretical frameworks, the district developed a graphic organizer that depicts their mission. This narrative is followed with a collection of bulleted statements under the categories of "Problems or issues," "Community Assets," "Influential Factors," and "Desired Results." Some of the bulleted statements provide details such as naming specific programs that are currently in place and naming specific people who are influential in school reform at the state level. At the end, a list of five outcomes are provided. The outcomes are identified under the column of "impacted outcomes" in a table "Strategies and Associated Outcomes." The strategies focus on development, expansion, improvement and increasing current and envisioned programs such as "development of native language reading assessments for all levels in Russian." Six of the eight "impacted outcomes" focus on (1) increasing performance on summative assessments; (2) decreased achievement gaps across all populations; and (3) Increased graduate rates."

The Logic Model serves as a means for tracking student learning outcome and developing an evaluation plan.

Since all of the schools appear to be participating in this reform (RTTT funded), there is no specific text that describes how the proposal will be "scaled up" to support change "beyond the participating schools."

In sum, the narrative and supporting data provides an ambitious, but achievable plan for addressing district-wide educational reform. Key goals are embedded in the theoretical frameworks, an empirical research based rationale is provided, activities are reasonable for implementation, deliverables are identified, and responsible parties for taking the lead in achieving the performance measures are identified. This is a high-quality plan.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school district will be moving from utilizing the OAKS statewide assessment to the SBAC in 2014-2015 academic year in math, reading, and writing. For Native language reading, they will use the Aprenda and a locally developed assessment for Russian. The data provided subgroups: economically disadvantaged, limited English proficient, Students with disabilities, Hispanic, English proficient Hispanic, and White. The proposed reforms call for reasonable increments of improvement within each subgroup between the baseline and SY 2016-17 (post grant). The projections for post grant achievement in all three areas (reading, math, and writing) indicate goals to achieve higher percentages, however, there continue to be projected gaps among the subgroups. For example, in reading the greatest gap projected in 2016-17 is between "students with disabilities (39) and English Proficient Hispanic and White Students (90). In math, the greatest gap projected in this same school year is between Students With Disabilities (45) and English Proficient Hispanic and White Students (80), and a gap between the same groups listed above in Writing. There is no assessment data to report for Native Language Reading (English, Spanish or Russian) for every subgroup except Whites for the period between 2010 and 2014. <p>(b) Decreasing achievement gaps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The identity subgroup and comparison category includes five sets e.g., Hispanic students vs. All Students. The goals set for decreasing the achievement gaps are ambitious but achievable. It appears that the initiative to provide additional certification for math teachers and to increase the number of instructional coaches is considered in decreasing the gaps in math. Students with disabilities appear once as a subgroup and comparison category. Hispanics appear twice. <p>(c) Graduation rates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No rates were provided (although it was optional so not expected) for SY 2012-11, there was a note regarding SY 2011-12 which states that the rates are pending final state verification. The increment of increase is 4% from SY 2012-2013 to SY 2016-17 (post grant) for all subgroups. The second set of statistics is for "4-year high school graduation rate including students taking optional 5th year through early college high school." There was no narrative accompanying this set of data so it is not clear on what this second set specifically means. The goals for graduation rates have different outcomes for the subgroups. the subgroup with the highest rate are White (85%) and lowest projected graduation rate are Limited English Proficiency (34%) in SY 2016-17. The same pattern can be seen in the second set of graduation rate data. <p>(d) College enrollment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goals set for college enrollment are ambitious yet achievable. The increment for achieving this between SY 2011-2012 and SY 2016-2017 ranges between 17% (Students with Disabilities) and 22% (Economically Disadvantaged and Hispanic). The greatest projected gap between the subgroups in SY 2016-2017 is White (55%) and Students With Disabilities (33%). Given the description of two forms of post-secondary goals described in an earlier section whereby students are being prepared to enter four-year college or enter a post-secondary program that is skill/vocation specific, it is not clear if the goals reflect this or not. They are also planning to increase their dual-credit offering so this may explain their projections as well. <p>In sum, the vision presented in this section is ambitious, but achievable. Each of the four sections provide ample evidence that the key goals, activities, and deliverables will be attained. An absence of a detailed description of the goals of graduation rates for subgroups and the discussion of college enrollment is noted.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) Improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps....:</p>		

- Raising student achievement: There is substantial empirical evidence that student achievement has been elevated. One initiative was presented in the narrative and statistical data was present to substantiate the claims which include:
 - 14 year old bilingual program: Long- and short-term benefits for ELLs in reading, math, and writing.
- High school graduation rates: The reorganization of comprehensive high schools into smaller autonomous, theme-based small schools has provided an effective avenue for personalized learning and school completion rates. A fifth year program was created which provides a means for students to complete high school and begin credit accumulation toward an Associates Degree at a local community college.
- College enrollment: The Fifth Year program, the International Bac. Program, and the Advanced Placement initiatives were presented as factors that have contributed to college enrollment.

(b) Achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools:

- Persistently lowest-achieving schools: Oregon is in waiver status from NCLB, but it uses a 1 - 5 point ranking system. This district's elementary school (Washington) moved from 1 to 3. The middle schools are ranked at levels 3 & 4. One high school has a 5 ranking, two have 4 rankings and the remaining two schools are at 1 and 2.

(c) Make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.

- Parent, teacher, and student conferences are conducted throughout the year during the evenings. Spanish, Somali, and Russian language translation is available.
- Radio updates: Spanish language radio station
- Intake procedure available for ELL students at Welcome Center in primary language
- English language proficiency is communicated via:
 - annual letters reporting progress to families
 - twice a year face-to-face conferences
 - portfolios created by students
 - Language assessment teams meet semi-annually at each school with teachers, ESOL specialists, and parents.

In sum, the narrative and data presented in this section demonstrates a clear record of success in the past four years. All of the requirements have been met and can be documented in the narrative.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district provides multiple ways to provide the public with information regarding expenditure of funds which include: public meetings with avenues for face-to-face interaction, questions, and commentary; On-line information is available; posted salary schedules of school level personnel; Budget 101, an informational session is also available to the public. The budget committee (school board members and community members) is held to high levels of accountability and responsiveness to the public. In sum, all of the requirements of this section were met with the appropriate data.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative and evidence provided in the proposal demonstrate the LEA's successful conditions and sufficient autonomy for implementation of the proposal.

Successful conditions: The evidence provided in this section demonstrates a positive climate for implementing personalized learning environments:

- State policies support the district in through the College Credit Now, Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate programs.
- Credit-by-proficiency practices (district and state support)

Sufficient autonomy: While the state is certainly supportive of the LEA, it provides a safe atmosphere for the LEA to develop and implement programs that are unique to the district with minimum intervention:

- Elementary grade-book system (for proficiency-based system)
- High schools move to CCSS proficiency-based grade book is currently in development
- Middle schools (Valor) uses a portfolio for student assessment

- District-wide move to use CCSS in a way that is individualized to the unique needs of the LEA
- Professional Learning Communities

In sum, the narrative and supporting evidence in this section provides adequate information regarding the working relationship between the state and LEA and it has been demonstrated that there is sufficient autonomy and successful conditions to meet the intent of this requirement.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The description of meaningful stakeholder engagement was exceptional. In addition to a detailed description of the support and feedback, the writer provided evidence from the stakeholders that speak positively to the proposal. There appears to be support of this proposal at multiple levels in this community.

(a) A description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in LEAs with collective bargaining representation, evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools

- Feedback through school and district improvement planning processes, meetings of site councils, Title One, School Improvement Planning. Would have been part of 4-day Strategic Planning, but the meeting is held in November after this proposal was due.
- Union feedback from Woodburn Education Association, Oregon School Employees Association was provided.
- Article in the local newspaper: Woodburn Independent asking for input and received email and phone calls.
- A list of ten stakeholders including education officers, Rotary Club, unionized agricultural workers, health providers, and two universities who provided feedback is provided.

(b) Letters of support from such key stakeholders...:

- A total of thirteen (13) letters were provided in the packet from parent organizations, early learning programs, the business community, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education. The letters are detailed in their support of the proposal and provide support as it relates directly to their entity's role in the community.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

There is a clear effort in place and in the future for implementing personalized learning environments. Evidence in other parts of the proposal have addressed this as well.

(a) A high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments:

- Ten-year longitudinal study at one school on English Language Acquisition rates was conducted by a principal.
- Senate Bill 1581 (achievement compacts) is currently enforced. Eight key student indicators are part of the Achievement Compacts
- WSD was the only entity in Oregon not included in a sharp criticism by the Chief Education Office (Randy Crew) in setting standards. Crew provided positive feedback. Randy Crew provided a letter of support that recognizes the "strong commitment" to WSD's efforts. He has visited the school district and is mentioned in the letter too.

(b) The logic behind the reform proposal

- College and career-readiness indicators (8) are included in the rationale and logic of the reform proposal.
- State-piloted Kindergarten readiness assessment and native Language reading assessments (Spanish, English, and Russian) at grades 3, 5, 8, 11, & 12 which are currently available will be tracked.
- Russian reading assessments will be developed with funding.

In sum, the narrative provides an analysis of the current status of implementing personalized learning environments and the logic is explained in detail. There was a marked absence of key elements of a timeline and targeted goals of a high, quality plan.

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



	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative and evidence provided for this section of the grant demonstrated a high quality plan that provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven key goals listed on page 59 with a detailed description that includes rationale, activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties for achieving each goal is provided in the narrative. • Specific activities that have a direct impact on student achievement in the classroom, on preparing students for college or careers, creating structures for families to have direct engagement with the schools and face-to-face relationships with the K-12 schools and post-secondary institutions; • Empirically-based rationale for developing strategies for achieving the seven goals; • Reasonable timeline (although one was not offered, but was inferred in the narrative); • Concrete deliverables in the form of proficiency-based gradebooks at all levels (K-12), expansion of existing programs such as Family University, childcare for migrant families as they partake in the programs (Family University), on-site math development classes, expanding current 21st Century endeavors, expanding After School programs to provide beyond migrant families, and mobile learning devices to all high school students and K-8 families to bridge the "digital divide" or "app gap." • A plan for parties responsible for implementing the activities was provided for each of the seven goals. In the area of learning, teachers and on-site administrators are accountable for achieving the outcomes set in the proposal. Programs are also in place for parents to take an active role in their children's education. The services provided in the programs like the After School initiative, Family University and summer programs recognize the lived experiences as migrant workers. Consequently, hours of service are expanded to provide ample opportunities for families to participate. Translation services are also provided in Spanish and Russian. There is even a program for Somali families. <p>Overall the credibility of this plan is excellent. There were no areas that were left unexplained or unsupported with evidence. It appears that this school district/LEA is fully prepared to implement a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching. In terms of students having "access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning," I did not read any specific details for a plan on expanding the worldviews or meaningful contact and interaction with diverse cultures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning, formative- and summative assessment, and personalized learning practices are at the center of the plan as described in this section. • Family, parent, and community support are fully recognized as a major factor for achieving the seven goals. High poverty and high-need students are fully acknowledged in the plan through the importance placed on face-to-face relationships between the schools and families, on the services provided for families to directly engage in their students' academic programs, and on providing technology for students and families to be at the center rather than on the margins. • Mechanisms are in place for meeting the challenges of high poverty and high need students as they work on increasing their proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics. A concerted effort is made at all levels such as the elementary level to prepare students for higher order mathematical thinking by developing strong numeracy skills. 		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
---	----	----

<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative and evidence provided for this section of the grant demonstrated an ambitious yet achievable high quality plan that provides a discussion of seven key areas -- professional development strategies; tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress; actionable data on student needs and interests; high quality learning resources; matching student needs, interests and resources; and increasing educator effectiveness. Embedded in the each of the seven sections are key goals, existing activities in current use that could be expanded and planned activities if funding is available and a rationale that is based on empirical evidence from data collected such as the participation of teachers in professional development activities. While an actual timeline is not provided, it is addressed in each of the seven sections. For example in the discussion of high quality learning resources is described in the narrative. There is reference to the development of electronic units of study by teachers beginning in February 2013. Each of the seven sections identifies specific deliverables that includes quantitative measures of student performance on proficiency assessment and teacher evaluation systems (TASC). Within all seven sections there is at least one plan for parties responsible for implementing the activities. Noticeably absent from the narrative was a detailed discussion of how participating school leaders such as principals and their assistants will operate. There is no doubt that administrators or school leaders are an integral part of teacher evaluation and developing reports for the district and state levels, but there was no clear indication of what their roles will be in the implementation of the grant in areas such as taking steps to improve school culture and climate. There was also a noticeable absence of how this district will increase</p>		
---	--	--

effectiveness in "hard-to-staff" schools. STEM and STEAM are both addressed in the section. Recognition of the arts in STEAM as an integral part of concerted cultivation of cultural capital. More details on the arts would have been welcomed by this reader. There is absence of a timeline and attention to the specific role of administrators and faculty in implementing the grant.

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>(a) Organizing the LEA central office...: In the first statement of this section, it is established that the LEA currently operates with rules, practices, and policies that facilitate personalized learning. They refer to the OSSI model to support this statement. It is not clear what the role of the LEA's central office is in the supporting and providing services beyond the formation of small theme-based schools.</p> <p>(b) Providing school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy...: The narrative in this section emphasizes the centrality of autonomy in site-based decisions, leadership, curriculum, scheduling, use of space, and budget. The creation of small theme-based schools to replace the comprehensive high school model is highlighted as an example of autonomy. Flexibility is implied in the discussion but not directly addressed. Although the assumption might be made that in order to achieve autonomy, there must be a strong element of flexibility at all levels of the educational system including the teachers, students, administrators, families, and community stakeholders.</p> <p>(c) and (d) Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery...: This phrase is included in the discussion of autonomy of curriculum and discussed in detail in its own section. The proficiency-based model is referenced in this section with direct attention to two key areas that address individualized methods and targeted interventions. Mastery of English language skills and use of the language in academic contexts are also addressed in this section.</p> <p>(e) Providing learning resources and instructional practices...: This is addressed in the discussion of "personalized learning through proficiency practices." A description of how the needs of ELL students are addressed through two research-based strategies (dual language and development of academic English) are discussed. This is a consistent theme throughout the proposal in the sections reviewed to this point. Students with disabilities and a current program or envisioned plan are not presented in detail. They are mentioned side by side with ELL students in the narrative.</p> <p>The narrative and evidence provided for this section of the grant demonstrated a high quality plan that provides for current goals and activities for expanding the goals to serve more students, a research-based rationale is presented in the discussion of ELL learners, a concrete set of deliverables, and a reasonable plan that identifies the responsible parties for implementing the activities is adequate. Overall the credibility of this plan is good.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA is a good position with existing infrastructure and future avenues for developing and implementing a high-quality plan. The deliverables are concrete, the timeline is reasonable, the activities are well-planned and doable, and the parties for implementing the plan are identified.</p> <p>(a) The plan recognizes existing and planned content, tools, and other learning resources that support personalized learning which includes: Parent-out reach events (Family Math and Science Night, Family Literacy events, and Family University"; Audiotext (CDs and tapes) with a player for study at home; mobile learning devices (for online grade-book system); wireless internet access on all district campuses (Achieve 3000).</p> <p>(b) The plan provides for technical support. Additional technical support staff will be hired to assist parents and students. The district has already purchased on-resources such as Achieve 3000.</p> <p>(c) The on-line grade-book system will provide parents and students with a means of tracking progress toward mastery of CCSS. This will be accessed by the mobile learning devices that will be purchased if funding is available.</p> <p>(d) Student information systems like PowerSchool is linked to PowerTeacher are connected to INFORM which allows for tracking of student performance data on assessments is in place at the present time.</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>The strategy presented in the narrative has a management system that will provide timely and regular feedback. In their plan, they propose a four-point strategy that is described in this section. Individuals responsible for the deliverables include an administrative team comprised of a project director, project coordinatory, internal data analyst, school principals, and an external evaluator. Each individual position is fully described with details about the duties of each in this process. A timeline is presented for the collection of data which will be quarterly, biannually, and yearly. The Advisory council will be responsible for monitoring, measuring, and publicly sharing the information on and progress made with the RTTT grant. Minutes from all meetings will be posted at the WSD website in English, Spanish, and Russian. Overall, the applicant provides a high-quality plan for continuous improvement. Details on how the quality of investments in professional development, technology and staff is not fully addressed with the exception of the role of math specialist coaches discussed in this section.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Stakeholders from various entities were part of the grantwriting process. Internal stakeholders were described in detail in this section. The external stakeholders from the community had an important role in this plan. During these sessions it is reported in the narrative that there were concerns regarding the effectiveness of updating the community on a regular basis. The mayor of the city expressed a concern for effective communication between the LEA and the diverse populations -- White senior citizens, Hispanic families, migrant farmworker families, Old Believer Russian families, Eastern European immigrants, White suburbanites, and Somali refugee families. In the grant, there is recognition of the importance of providing specific means of communication to all. The mayor would like to see the Family University expanded. Key goals are not enumerated but embedded in the text. Actions are sensitive to the needs of the community and city leadership (Mayor). Deliverables will occur in the avenues of communication e.g., media. The rationale is the strongpoint here. It represents a meaningful acknowledgement of the diversity of this community. The strategies for fulfilling the intent of this expectation-- ongoing communication and engagement -- has been met through its concise narrative and supporting evidence. In sum, the LEA is in a good position with strategies for ongoing communication and engagement to meet the goals of the reform plan. The deliverables are concrete, the timeline is reasonable, the activities are well-planned and doable, and the parties for implementing the plan are identified.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In this section, there was no narrative to explain each applicant-proposed measures, however explanations were provided in some of the tables.</p> <p>Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance measure for all applicants reported baseline data for highly effective teacher or principal, but no data in (b) for effective teacher or principals (pp. 93 & 94) • Data for Pre-K -- 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate measure of students' academic growth (e.g., language and literacy development or cognition and general learning, including early mathematics and early scientific development); and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student reading achievement at grade 3 on a native language assessment is provided: targeted progress is reasonable with SY 2016 - 2017 ranging between 32% and 70%. ▪ Student growth in reading (Direct Reading Assessment and Foutis-Pinnell) for K-3: Baseline not available; Target measures are reasonable with growth at 5 percentage point increments. ▪ Student reading achievement on math assessment. I am unclear what this means. ○ Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate non-cognitive indicator of growth: None provided in this data set except for "How I feel" survey in the All Table. And there was no data reported there either. • Data for 4 -- 8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Achievement Compact" is not described, but data is reported with data on % of participating students 		

who are on track to college and career-readiness: Targeted measures are reasonable with a range of 76% to 98% as the range of targets in post-grant year.

- Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan: academic indicator is percentage of students passing native language grade level reading exam. Targeted measures are reasonable with no data to report for Russian students at baseline and two academic years. This is in the development as I understand from previous parts of the proposal. Increments are reasonable for targeted performance measures.
 - Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan: No data is reported for health assessment but it is currently under development by K-8 Health and Wellness PLC.
- Data for 9 -- 12:
 - The number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the FAFSA form: Population is 12th graders and baseline is low but targeted measures reveal commitment to increasing the percentages to a range of 63% to 70% in post-grant period.
 - 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: Populations are grades 10 --12. Baseline ranges between 45% and 64% with targeted performance ranging between 65% and 80% in post grant year.
 - Applicant must propose at least one measure of career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students who are or are on track to being career-ready: Populations are 9 -- 12. For this students are going to complete the grade level component of the Student Educational Plan and Profile each year. No data collected for baseline. Targeted performance measure is at 100% by 2015-2016. This is reasonable.
 - Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan: First row of data is percentage of students who pass the reading essential skills test by 11th grade. Targeted performance measures are reasonable with a range of percentages between 60% and 84% in post-grant year.
 - Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan: The Developmental Assets Profile will serve as the primary indicator here. No explanation of what this is in detail is provided. No data is reported in any of the cells in this table.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

According to the proposal, this element is identified as being addressed in the E-1 section. Professional development is addressed through the math specialist coaches who will work with elementary school teachers in the area of math. Employing technology will be the major task of the technician/trainer who will work with teachers and students. The productive use of time, staff, money and other resources is outlined in the duties of each of the roles described in E-1. Working with stakeholders is not clearly defined in this section. Modification of school schedules and structures is not addressed either.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Identifies all funds that will support the project:

- Community partnerships (WSD and business community) for expansion of Family University; Alumni Association; WSD and universities (Pacific, Western Oregon, and Chemeketa)
- Title I, Title IIA, and Title III

(b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal: WSD appears to have a good record of external funding to support current programs. They appear to be optimistic about funding opportunities from the Oregon Governor's office. The funds from this office will provide funding for the bilingual program and this program has been praised for their work by the state education officer.

(c) Provides thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities:

- A description of all of the funds

Identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period

- o One-time investment for staff development in five major areas: IB for Middle school, elementary math, certification of high school teachers for College Credit Now and Career & Technical Education, K-12 proficiency system with CCSS, and website development and media services.

In sum, the narrative in this section and the accompanying budget which included detailed explanations of how funds will be invested (one time and on-going) were clearly presented. The expenditures are reasonable, the rationale is clear, the deliverables are identified, the goals will be reached with the funding, and the individuals or parties responsible for overseeing and/or implementing the operationalization of funding are all clearly laid out in the budget. There is adequate quantitative evidence to support the development and implementation of the proposal.

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

10

3

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, there was an absence of detail in describing the key goals, concrete timeline, and rationale. In the narrative there was attention to support from state and local government leaders. There is attention to the a possible shift in funding from the Oregon's Governor's office. They also refer to the "high praise" that they have received from state education officers for their efforts in bilingual education. The plan calls for the investment in one-time cost items with long-term benefits. A budget is not included in this section nor is there reference to a specific place in the proposal to locate this information. This section did not meet the requirements of a high-quality plan.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The LEA did not submit a proposal for the competitive preference priority. No points were awarded for this section due to this absence.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a coherent and comprehensive plan for creating effective learning environments. The narratives in most of the sections, especially in sections B and C were particularly effective because the narrative and evidence provided for these two sections of the grant demonstrated an ambitious, but achievable high quality plan that provided clearly identifiable key goals, reasonable activities and empirically-supported rationales, a reasonable timeline, concrete deliverables, and a reasonable plan for parties responsible for implementing the activities. The other sections -- A, D, and E -- also addressed the basic elements of a high quality plan but there was an absence of details and grammatical issues that affected the clarity of the proposal. The diversity of this community is unique and the plans proposed for funding by RTTT will definitely promote student progress among all of the students and their families. College and career-ready plans were sensible and focused on the critical nature of developing a solid foundation at the K-12 areas. Educators are recognized for their important contributions to the proposal through programs like the math instructional coaching program. Finally, the interest of community stakeholders is impressive and this is most likely due to the current existence of programs like the Family University program, the after school programs, and the summer programs.

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

