



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0023LA-1 for Caddo Parish School Board

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application provides a bullet list of items that are key activities in the four areas, along with the overall goals of college and career ready curriculum and assessments, data systems to drive instruction and monitor progress, increased number of high effective teachers and leaders, and increasing the number of schools that are escaping the academically unacceptable label. The timeline states that all activities are ongoing, except for the hiring of key personnel which would happen in January 2014 if funded, which implies that all of these key activities are already in progress. There is no narrative that describes what the classroom experience would be like for students and teachers.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Caddo Parish has hired The Institute for Strategic Leadership and Learning, a research and consulting firm, to examine their biggest needs and help develop innovative ideas for improvement. Based on their findings, the district identified 62 schools that will participate in the grant. These schools represent the highest poverty areas and/or the lowest academic achievement groups, although the specific schools are not identified. The research firm also identified 3 areas that the lowest schools that make rapid gains have in place: a results-oriented principal who has deliberate expectations and practices, instruction-specific teaming and teacher-specific coach for instructional improvement, and a data system that is continuously responsive to create individualized learning plans.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Many of the objectives of this grant proposal are district-wide, and would not be significantly scaled up following the grant cycle. The proposal includes many objectives with a brief discussion in this section of the goal of each objective. Expectations for learning will increase as the district adopts the Common Core State Standards and the PARCC assessments, assuring that students are college and career ready. Teacher evaluations will be based 50% on teacher performance and 50% on student performance, giving teachers more incentive to see that students succeed. The proposal also includes a Personalized Learning Initiative which plans to provide every student with at least one digital learning device and every teacher with site-based technical and instructional support. The proposal discusses the lack of technology training that the teachers have experienced and how they are reluctant to use technology in their classrooms because of the constant crashing and technological needs which they are not prepared to fix. The district's solution for this problem is hiring 1 technologist for every 4 or 5 schools, which still implies that the probability of having technical support available on campus when teachers need it is very low. The proposal also discusses its past success with 3 schools which received the lowest ratings, and the district took the measures necessary to rebuild the schools with new personnel. While most of the schools that were in this category have increased their performance and moved up another level, 8 more schools have since moved down. There are too many facets to this proposal that do not make it a high quality plan, since the success of all programs is limited if they are all initiated at once, and the potential to promote lasting impact is limited.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application lists the goals in decreasing achievement gaps by school, subject, gender, race, and proficiency rates, but does not describe how these goals were chosen. With so many different goals it appears that many popular projects were chosen without consideration of how successful they could be if implemented all at once. Several of the tables include</p>		

abbreviations which are not explained, and this category has some of the lowest goals. For example, in Geometry, the SWD category currently has a proficiency rate of 9%, and the goal by School Year 2017-18 (Post Grant) is 34%. While this is more than 3 times the current rate, the goal is still less than half of the students. While the application does not indicate this, it could be assumed that this category includes special education students which might make it might be more appropriate, but without an explanation this is not even a consideration. Throughout the plan the goals could be increased, and while not all goals not be met, it would make the plan more ambitious than it currently is.

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
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Since 2009, Caddo Parish District has undergone a massive overhaul of its lowest performing schools. Many of the lowest schools became transformation or turnaround schools and showed growth within a single year. The achievement level at schools with a high percentage of low-income students has grown, and in two schools the average gains were at least 25% in English Language Arts, 16% in Math, 40% in Science, and 39% in Social Studies, based upon state assessments compared between 2008-2009 and 2012-2013. These statistics are impressive, but the fact that only two schools were included implies that no other schools fared as well and that these statistics do not indicate growth in the district. One group of schools has had teachers trained in the Kagan Cooperative Learning structure, and schools which have implemented this have also shown growth. The proposal builds upon this success by providing more training for teachers, creating a database and structures to track student performance and differentiated learning, and to improve career and college readiness.</p> <p>There is no discussion in the application as to how student performance data is made available to students, teachers, or parents at this time. Part of the proposal is to make this available with updated technology and personnel, but it is not in place now.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Caddo Parish is very transparent with their salaries and other expenditures. The district's web site publishes all salaries of teachers, administrators, and staff by name, both with and without benefits, and makes available all documents that Board members receive. The local newspaper also publishes this same information on their web site.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the Louisiana State legislature has been very controlling over budgets, teaching requirements, curriculum, and much more in the past, they have recently released this autonomy to the district level. Louisiana received a Race to the Top state grant, which required that it meet the standards set by the earlier grant rounds. Caddo Parish has been given the autonomy it needs to fulfill the requirements of this grant and its regulations.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	10
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>When the district began to consider applying for this grant, it held community meetings with the superintendent throughout the district to develop the "Vision 2020" plan, but it is unclear how this plan is related to the Vision 2020 plan. Parents, students, and community members spoke up for helping students learn the skills they would need in today's workplace. Teachers and administrators were surveyed as to what they felt were the tools and resources needed to successfully prepare their students. They overwhelmingly voiced an opinion about technology, saying that students were born knowing it and teachers could barely keep up. Taking all of this advice into consideration, the application was written and then sent to Shreveport's mayor, two local teacher unions, and other community organizations. They received support in writing and these letters are included in the application. There is no indication that student input was asked for or considered in the writing of this proposal. If the feedback from teachers was overwhelmingly in favor of technology, it would appear that technology is a much more demanded need than many of the other aspects of the project and should receive an appropriate amount of time and money.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Caddo Parish describes their plan for individualized learning as a three-prong approach: 1) adjusting the pace (individualization of instruction), 2) adjusting the learning approach (differentiation of instruction), and 3) keeping the academic interest of the students. They include many different plans without specifying how each plan fits into each prong. For example, a table is included which gives examples of multiple means of presentation, engagement, and expression, however each of the items in the table include software which is at least 10 years old or more, and it is unclear how most of these means have not already been utilized. There is a separate section for students with disabilities, which makes the plan stronger, however there is no explanation of which services or modifications would be enhanced by this project and how they fit in with what is currently available. The district explains how they currently interpret and utilize an approach to Response to Intervention, but it is unclear how their current Rtl program would be enhanced, other than the introduction of technology for student and teacher use to access all of the technology options for the basal reading program already in place. There is not a specific mention of how students will be trained to use the technology and other resources to track and manage their learning, other than the implication that teachers will teach them. This is not a high quality plan because students are not being trained to track their own learning and take charge of their own futures.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>One of the biggest strengths of this proposal is the professional development provided for teachers to enable them to update their curriculum, use technology to enhance their curriculum, and use formative and summative assessments to guide their instruction. Since Louisiana has adopted the Common Core State Standards and will be using the PARCC assessments, these changes were to have been in place next year, so they are in need of an immediate intervention to maintain the expected timetable. To reach this goal, the district will hire content and instructional coaches to translate the standards, provide teacher-ready lessons, and train the teachers how to guide their instruction with assessment. The application states that one of their largest needs is in technology - both with equipment in the schools and training for the teachers on how to use it, and this grant would provide assistance in both of those areas. Of course, teachers cannot use data systems if the technology is not in place to house the data and make it available to all users at all times, so the grant also includes an investment in modernizing their data systems. All of these components are especially needed in the lowest performing schools, so they will be the first to receive the help. Since at least half of the faculty must be new hires in a turnaround school, a stronger teacher induction program is planned to take this burden away from the new principals. There is no mention of how teachers with poor evaluations will be helped, especially since if the teachers with high evaluations would be transferred to the most needed schools, the teachers with the poor evaluations would be pushed to the schools not included in this proposal.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application includes a description and organizational chart that illustrate the current district administration and the roles of key personnel. There are four directors assigned to schools that are there to support the principals, evaluate the schools, and provide assistance where needed. It would appear that these assignments are mostly geographical, but that information needed to be inferred. One of the directors is assigned to all of the "special" schools and most of the high schools, without an explanation. It would appear that this is an especially challenging position that would require additional assistance, and if these schools are included in the proposal the position would become even more demanding. The administration of this project would fall into the role of the Director of Professional Development, a position that is already filled. There is no explanation as to how this person would be able to add the enormous magnitude of this project leadership to an already full-time position, which would be essential to a high quality plan. Caddo Parish led the way in recent years by receiving a waiver from the state to pilot a program in which students would earn high school credit based</p>		

upon demonstrated knowledge, and not on time spent in the classroom. The initial pilot of this program was so successful that the scope of the project will be increased.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application includes three short paragraphs in section D2. These paragraphs discuss the system that is in place where teachers, parents, and other key personnel can access student records on attendance, grades, disciplinary issues, etc. There is no mention on how the parents in low income areas, which are abundant in this parish, would access these records, receive technical support or training, or have any convenient way to access the data often enough to make it meaningful. There is no evidence here of a high quality plan because not all stakeholders will receive access to the data base, instruction on how to use it, or technical support when needed.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The application includes a table on each project stating that in each of the 5 projects the sponsor is the Director of Professional Development and Grants, the project manager is "Project Manager", the team consists of this Project Manager and the Grants Bookkeeper, and one to two measures each with a single procedure for each. Project 1, the Instructional Coach at Lowest Achieving Schools, includes identical procedures for each of the 2 measures, that state "Action plan developed with intermediate goals with quarterly review to Director of Professional Development to monitor progress toward goals." Not only are none of the items given any details, but it would appear that careful consideration has not yet been given to this important area also. This is not a high quality plan because there is no evidence of careful consideration of all of the tasks required, who would be responsible for each task, how they would receive training if needed, and how all of the needs are interconnected.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
---	----------	----------

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The plan includes a posting of ongoing project updates and feedback onto the schools' website. The monitoring of the project at the school level will be by administrative and professional development personnel who will provide reports to the district leaders and other key stakeholders. Other communication will come in the form of school newsletters, public media, and celebration events. While this is a high quality plan, it could be strengthened with more transparency and reports made more visible without actions required by the participants.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The application includes detailed tables which specify the performance measures at each level, by race, grade level, learning ability, number of students, and percentage of students who are on track to college and career readiness. The goals are extremely ambitious and would demonstrate an exceptional turnaround of skills and knowledge. The large number of goals would imply that less attention can be paid to each goal, thereby weakening the impact and long-range benefits each goal could have.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The majority of the funds of this project are slated to be used for personnel and associated costs, so this section of the application was left short. Strategies to measure effectiveness were missing in the case of some goals, and limited in others. Many goals were given in section E3 which could be evaluated each year to determine if the project is on task and if the anticipated results are being achieved.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Most of the tasks outlined in this proposal are to be completed by existing personnel and it is assumed that the projects could be maintained beyond the scope of the grant period. It is unclear which personnel would be charged with which responsibilities and no assurances given that these employees could increase their work load in this way. There are no other monies being used in this proposal, but once the grant period has ended the projects will have all been completed and there should not be a need for more expenses. A more detailed budget was included in an earlier section of the application.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Each of the project goals will be completed within the grant period and all of the goals involve redirection of current educational delivery systems, including technology which will have been purchased and teachers who will have been trained. This is not a high quality plan because there is no mention of the rate of turnaround for faculty, nor how the new teachers will receive the training already provided in order to maintain the life of the project.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The application states that partnerships exist with childcare providers, community members, and schools, but does not list a single one of these providers or state how this partnership was formed and how it benefits students. A transition plan is included with eight very general goals, but it does not specify how these goals were established, who is charged with the responsibility, and how these goals will be measured. Another goal is to have a "mixed delivery model" where children receive literacy instruction in a variety of settings. Several outstanding partnerships have been named and the application states that these agencies will receive professional development, support, and materials, but it does not state this anywhere else in the application nor in the budget. This is not a high quality plan because there is not a clear description of the current partnerships, how these will change with the funding of this project, and how they will receive the training and materials to become an integral part of the plan.		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Absolute Priority 1 is not addressed in the application, however it has been met through the project goals: students will be able to complete courses by demonstrating mastery rather than by seat hours; schools will receive educational technology and teachers will receive professional development to learn to use the technology to engage students and provide additional instruction; databases will be set up and maintained to provide a centralized source of assessment data to enable teachers to formulate instruction based on student achievement.		

Total	210	125
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0023LA-2 for Caddo Parish School Board

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	1
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant includes a chart with bullet points outlining activities in each of the core educational assurance areas. The listed items are not addressed in detail, and no information is provided to show that the applicant has completed significant work in all four areas. The introduction to this section makes the argument that the applicant will provide a comprehensive plan for reform. Although a vision statement is included, no clear or comprehensive reform is described in the narrative or in the chart included in the section. The applicant includes lists that appear to be topics or activities, however, there is no description provided that ensures the applicant has a clear and credible approach for implementing specific strategies or actions related to each of the bulleted items. No description of the classroom experience is included in the narrative or corresponding chart. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	3
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant did not provide an adequate description of the process used to select schools. A description of the district; percentages of economically disadvantaged students, and charts with student demographics were included and were adequate to address this selection criteria. The comment regarding deliberately choosing specific schools was not followed by information regarding the schools selected. In addition, the comment about choosing schools with less than 40% economically disadvantaged students because those schools do not receive Title I funds, could be interpreted as a suggestion that RTTD funds will supplant State funds rather than supplement a current reform effort within the district. Due to the lack of responsiveness to the criteria regarding a description of the process used, this section warrants a low score. 		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant describes a plan to address the needs within the district. The plan seems to be well-thought through, although there are times it sounds more like a plan for addressing ESEA/NCLB requirements for low-performing schools rather than a comprehensive reform strategy. As a result, this section does not meet the RTTD definition of a high quality plan, and warrants a low to mid range score. Information about current performance does not support the idea that the applicant has implemented meaningful reform and has a plan that can be scaled up to create change throughout the district. Instead, information provided makes the case that the district is struggling and looking for support to intervene in failing schools. The cohort model and plans to address the four core assurance areas, with the oversight described, seems like it would allow the effort to be scaled up (however, there is not a lot of detail provided as a plan for scaling it up) 		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant included charts with adequate goals - but there is nothing included that ties the vision to improved student learning and to achieving the goals outlined.
- The goals included are ambitious, yet some of the areas defined in the notice are not addressed in the applicant's proposal.
- In addition, it is not very clear whether, or how, the applicant plans to address the achievement gap.
- As a result of the brief goals included, but the lack of responsiveness to all areas, this section warrants a low to mid range score.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides examples of growth within the district; however, a clear track record (overall) is not demonstrated by reviewing the data provided. • The applicant does not address transparency and access to student performance data (although the data provided seem to show that data would be available) • The applicant makes reference to several strategies/programs/initiatives that would ultimately address this selection criteria; however, a comprehensive view of all district data, and a track record of success, is not clearly provided in the narrative and corresponding charts. 		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>No evidence of the required items is provided. The applicant provides a narrative stating that these items are available. The reader must accept the applicants statement that everything is available, without evidence that the items are available and accessible to all stakeholders involved in RTTD. Due to the lack of specific examples and/or data, this section warrants a mid-range score.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides basic information (such as the State being a RTT state) and basic reform information that indicates there is adequate support and autonomy for the proposed activities.</p> <p>The selection criteria is focused on demonstrating evidence that there is sufficient autonomy. The applicant describes a traditional state infrastructure and associated requirements. This does not make it clear that there would be sufficient autonomy to implement all aspects of the proposal . . . especially given the large number of participating schools that would be in some type of ESEA/NCLB sanction situation (required to implement turnaround or improvement strategies that may be dictated by outside entities).</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	2
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provided a very general description of stakeholder support. • No description of how stakeholder participation was solicited or how stakeholders participated • Letters of support were included in the appendices. • Due to the lack of a documented process that involved all stakeholders in the development of this proposal, the section warrants a low score. 		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section of the proposal is stronger than the others. The applicant provides a narrative that creates a picture of students within the district, and some general ways that the district plans to address their individual needs. • The applicant does tie plans to college and career ready standards and personalized learning through the use of technology. • The weakness in this section is, again, due to the general nature of the narrative. The applicant does not outline specific ways that RTTD will build a reform initiative that engages students and personalizes learning for each student. The narrative seems to describe activities that are important in all good instruction, and that many districts hope to implement in order to help students achieve success. • High need students are addressed, also in a somewhat general way (RtI for SWD; ELL strategies, etc.) • Due to the lack of a high quality plan (headings within this section are often good, however, the headings are not tied together by a coherent plan aligned to RTTD and to the applicant's vision), this section warrants a low to mid range score. 		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is stronger than the others and provides more detail regarding the data and technology available to teachers within the district. • The professional development activities; use of technology, and feedback to educators is described in a little more detail than in previous sections. • The weakness, again, is that much of this section describes current best practice (rather than reform efforts) • Due to the more extensive plan for professional development, this section warrants a mid range score. 		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	5
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides sufficient information regarding district office governance. Charts included indicate sufficient support for individual schools as well as personnel involved in the RTTD proposed activities. • School leadership teams seem to have autonomy in higher-performing schools. It is not clear whether all leadership teams have sufficient autonomy. • The applicant indicates that several schools have piloted programs focused on credit for mastery - it does not appear to be implemented throughout the system. • The applicant describes principles of universal design, however, very little information is provided that indicates students may demonstrate mastery in multiple ways or at multiple times. • The applicant sufficiently addresses accommodations, resources and adaptaions available to ELLs and SWDs. 		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section does not seem to address the selection criteria - very general description is provided. • The student information system seems like a typical data system available in most school districts. There is no information provided that ties the data, or technology system, to specific RTTD activities. • Again, due to the lack of detail as well as the lack of a specific, high-quality plan that is aligned to the RTTD requirements, this section warrants a low score. 		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very general charts are provided. These indicate that a continuous improvement process will be implemented. Additional information and detail regarding feedback would make this section stronger. • The charts and tables provided do not constitute a high quality plan and do not adequately address "how" the applicant will monitor and share the information. As a result, this section warrants a low score. 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The narrative included provides a brief description of basic school district communication. This is not sufficient to provide engagement with both internal and external stakeholders. • However, the applicant does state that RTTD will have a link on the website, and quarterly reports will be provided to specific stakeholder groups. • As a result of the strategies included, this section warrants a mid range score. 		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance measures seem reasonable, however no justification or rationale for each measure was provided. In addition, no information regarding timely feedback was provided. • This section provides more detail and ties the goals to specific standards. Goals seem to address all items in the RTTD selection criteria. As a result, this section warrants a relatively high score. 		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is very brief and does not provide a high quality plan for evaluating the RTTD activities. As a result, it warrants a low score. • The primary weakness, in this section, is the lack of a rigorous, high-quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the project, and to ensure continuous improvement. As a result, this section warrants a low score. 		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of budget line items (for the entire project and for specific projects) is included. • Budgeted funds seem reasonable for each specific line item • It is unclear whether items included in the budget are all new RTTD items or whether RTTD will provide funding for items currently paid for through State or local funds • Narrative included does not adequately address each project or the overall budget. • This section has most of the information required . . . however, it is not tied together into a plan that is aligned to the vision of the project and it is not easy to follow (and identify each of the items in the selection criteria). As a result, this section warrants a mid range score. 		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Information not included (some general comments about program sustainability are included, however, budget/funding sustainability is not addressed)

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- Good early childhood partnership was outlined in the competitive preference section
- This section was a strength of the proposal due to the detailed description of both the partnership proposed and the activities planned.
- The increased level of detail warrants a relatively high score.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant met the minimum general requirements of absolute priority 1.

Total	210	72
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0023LA-3 for Caddo Parish School Board

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	4

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The application includes a table with activities listed associated with each of the four core educational assurance areas. The table also lists deliverables and responsible persons for each of the areas. A statement about the timeline of the project indicates that all activities are ongoing.

The application states that the school system has adopted Common Core Standards and measures progress and performance against these standards.

The application states the LEA has a robust data system that provides timely data about student growth to educators and

their supervisors.

Precautions are taken to limit access to data to comply with FERPA.

The application does not describe how the data system will provide data about how to improve instruction.

The applicant began implementing a teacher evaluation system in the 2013-2014 school year. This information could be used to identify areas in which teachers need additional development opportunities.

A principal and superintendent evaluation plan will be implemented in 2014-2015 school year.

The application does not address recruiting effective teachers and/or principals.

Details are not included about the “aggressive incentive plan and compensation package” that will be aimed at attracting the best teachers.

The applicant does not indicate if current teachers and/or principals will be offered rewards for effective performance.

The application does not address rewarding effective principals.

The application does not address retaining effective teachers and/or principals.

Practices that are identified as effective will be shared across schools. Practices and programs that are identified as ineffective will be discontinued.

The applicant has adopted Common Core Standards. Professional Learning Communities will be established.

Inadequate specifics were provided about how the proposed project activities will deepen student learning. The applicant did not describe how the proposed activities will be beneficial in their LEA.

No information was provided about how student academic interests would be identified.

The application does not describe what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

Overall, this application did not articulate a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. It was not clear what strategies were currently in place and which strategies were going to be implemented as a part of Race to the Top program in order to build on the applicant's work in the four core educational areas. The application lists activities, but does not provide details about how the activities will be implemented with fidelity in support of the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support. The applicant does not provide a clear picture of what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application explains that after consultation with stakeholders, the district developed the application to address the specific needs of the students in all Caddo Parrish schools with particular focus on the schools labeled “academically unacceptable”.

The application says the decision to include particular schools was deliberate, but no process is described. No criteria are identified. The narrative seems to indicate that all schools will be a part of the proposed program. If the program will include all schools, then no decision was made to include particular schools.

The list of district schools provided does not match the narrative. The narrative states that all 62 Caddo Parrish schools “will have the opportunity” to participate. The table lists 60. It is not clear what the applicant means by “have the opportunity to participate”. This reads as though participation is optional, which further confuses the issue of identifying participating schools. The narrative describes the percentage of low-income students in 51 of the schools. The corresponding table only includes 44 schools. Then information is provided about 11 schools not receiving Title I funding. It is not clear if these schools are part of the 51 from the narrative, the 44 from the table or are additional participating schools, such as the 10 listed in the “academically unacceptable” list included in the application. Many different populations and schools were identified in the application, but there was not a clear explanation of which schools were participating and how the described populations are a part of the participating schools.

The application does not delineate which schools will be participating in which grant activities.

The applicant provides numbers regarding student participation.

Three different options are provided for the number of participating students. The narrative states that approximately 41,667 students will be participating. The table that lists participating schools indicates that 40,759 students will be participating. The table that lists performance measures shows that 41,000 students will be participating. This makes it difficult to identify the total number of participating students.

The application includes a table that lists the number of participating students from low-income families for 60 schools.

All district schools were not included in the table in this section. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the total number of participating students from low-income families.

Because the participating schools were not clearly identified in the proposal, it is not possible to determine the total number of participating students from low-income families.

The application includes a table that lists the number of participating students who are high-need students for 60 schools.

All district schools were not included in the table in this section. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the total number of participating high-need students.

Because the participating schools were not clearly identified in the proposal, it is not possible to determine the total number of participating high-need students.

The application includes a table that lists the number of participating educators for 60 schools.

All district schools were not included in the table in this section. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the total number of participating educators.

Because the participating schools were not clearly identified in the proposal, it is not possible to determine the total number of participating educators.

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

10

3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Key goals listed in the proposal are: increase student achievement, provide greater opportunities for personalized learning, and ensure student readiness for college and careers.

The applicant intends to establish a District Turnaround Office. Personnel for the office are listed.

The application states that the program will design its curriculum and assessment system to be aligned with Common Core Standards. Common assessments will be constructed for common classes. Every classroom will establish high quality learning targets and assessments.

The application states that efforts will be scaled up.

The application states that source of funding will be continually pursued.

Administrators, teacher leaders, and instructional coaches will provide advice, support, and training.

The application does not include a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will help the applicant reach its outcome goals or will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools.

The specific responsibilities of the District Turnaround Office are not described in the application. It is not clear if there will be a differentiation of services for “academically unacceptable” schools. Specific activities and deliverables are not identified for this component of the program.

The application does not provide information about how the district will align the curriculum and assessment system with Common Core Standards. Specific activities and deliverables are not identified for this component of the program.

No deliverables are identified in the proposal.

The application does not include a detailed timeline identifying when specific activities or deliverables will occur throughout the project. In addition, there is no designation of a responsible party for each activity and/or deliverable.

The application does not describe a plan to implement strategies to expand capacity.

No details are provided about what sources of funding will be pursued or who the responsible party will be. It is not clear what is meant by “innovative budgeting techniques” will be explored to maximize the use of district funds to maintain the project.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not describe how the selected assessments correlate to the listed goals.

The applicant does not describe the methodology for determining growth. It describes the measure that will be used. It is not clear what will be done with that measure to determine growth.

Goals are listed for different subgroups of students on different assessments. Goals have been established for increasing the percent of students who test proficient. Goals have also been set for increasing the average scale scores.

It is difficult to tell if the goals are ambitious or achievable because all subjects are combined for all grades 3-8. It will be difficult to improve learning performance without knowing which grades need assistance.

Achievement gaps are listed by subgroup for each grade 3 through 8 in ELA and in Math. The goals are achievable, but the goals in some categories are not ambitious.

No achievement gaps are listed for high school students. Without identified goals, it is not possible to determine if the goals are ambitious or achievable.

The application includes a baseline and goals for the high school graduation rate. The applicant states that the high school graduation rate is not reported by subgroup by the state. It is not clear which schools or students are included in the provided graduation rate. Based on the vision presented in the application it is not possible to determine if the goals listed for high school graduate rate are ambitious or achievable.

The applicant lists baseline and goals for increasing college enrollment rates. The applicant states that the college enrollment rate is not reported by subgroup by the state. Based on the vision presented in the application it is not possible to determine if the goals listed for college enrollment are ambitious or achievable.

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	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The data provided does not present sufficient evidence of a clear record of success.

Scores are included for two schools that have made significant improvements in percent proficient on the state assessment. Including results for only two schools does not reflect a clear track record of success.

The table included showing the 2012-2013 results for the 4th grade LEAP does not reflect a clear record of success. The scores do not show high needs students performing at comparable levels as students in other schools as is described in the narrative.

Data provided about students taking and passing AP Exams shows improvement over the past two years, but does not completely address the criterion which asks for a clear record of success in the past four years.

A chart showing an increase student achievement on End-of-Course Tests is included in the application.

The application does not address raising college enrollment rates.

The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) was introduced in two high schools last year. Those two schools were able to come out of “academically unacceptable” status.

A list of schools that were removed from the academically unacceptable list at the end of SY 2012-2013 is included in the application.

The online data system will be used to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents.

The applicant includes selective information about some increases in student achievement. However, the information provided does not demonstrate evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years. In addition, several of the components listed in the criteria are not addressed in the application.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district uses BoardDocs which is a web-based system which provides stakeholders access to salaries and expenditures. Salary schedules for all personnel are included on the website. Individual salaries are published by local media outlets each year. Monthly financial reports are prepared by the district and are available by request.</p> <p>The applicant meets the minimum standard established in the criteria for this category. Information from the four identified categories is available online. However, the application does not demonstrate an increase in transparency or a high level of transparency.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that the reforms that have been enacted or proposed in this application are directly aligned with the reforms proposed by the state of Louisiana. Louisiana requires personnel evaluations. The district has previously been granted seat-time waivers and permission to use online courses.</p> <p>The applicant does not clearly demonstrate evidence of the extent to which it has successful conditions and sufficient autonomy. Specifics are not provided about how the information provided in the proposal is aligned with the reforms proposed by the state. The applicant does not describe how the mandatory personnel evaluations will be used to achieve results as a part of the Race to the Top program. The applicant has been granted seat time waivers, but does not describe how that will be used as a part of the Race to the Top program. The applicant indicates that they have the autonomy to use online courses, but does not indicate how online courses will be implemented as a part of Race to the Top.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	4
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>No evidence was provided to describe how students in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal. The applicant included students in meetings for the Vision 2020 plan, but not for the development of this proposal.</p> <p>No evidence was provided to describe how the proposal was revised based on student engagement and feedback.</p> <p>No evidence was provided to describe how families in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal. The applicant included families in meetings for the Vision 2020 plan, but not for the development of this proposal.</p> <p>No evidence was provided to describe how the proposal was revised based on familial engagement and feedback.</p> <p>A survey was administered to teachers and administrators as to what they felt were the most important tools/resources they needed to be successful in preparing their students to be college and career ready. The responses indicated a desire for more professional development on strategies for student engagement as well as the need for increased in technology in the classroom. The proposal incorporates the need for increased technology.</p> <p>It is not indicated if the proposed professional development will address student engagement in response to the survey results.</p> <p>Letters of support from both the Associated Professional Educators of Louisiana (APEL) and Red River United American Federation of Teachers (AFT) are included in the application.</p> <p>Letters of support from the mayor and several community organizations (Martin Luther King Community Development Corporation, The Community Foundation, Shreve Memorial Library) are included as part of the application.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	5

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide a complete high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. There is no detailed timeline. No deliverables are identified. There is no indication of who the responsible parties will be for ensuring the successful implementation of activities.

Most of the activities described in the application (Universal Design for Learning, services for students with disabilities, Response to Intervention) are already in place in the district. The applicant does not describe how these components will be expanded as a part of the proposed program.

As a part of the College and Career Awareness Planning component of the project, the applicant plans to align the online grade book with Common Core. This will help maintain alignment of the district curriculum with college- and career-ready standards.

The applicant takes a three prong approach to individualized learning: adjusting the pace, adjusting the learning approach, and leveraging the academic interest of students.

A table related to the Universal Design of Learning is included in the application. The table lists means of presentation, means of engagement, and means of assessment.

The table related to Universal Design of Learning does not include rationale for the inclusion of these strategies. It is not clear how the teachers and/or students will be using these things to personalize the learning environment. More information is needed about how these things will be implemented into the classroom experience.

No specific details are included about how the personalized academic plans will be developed.

There is no description of how students can accelerate their learning. The applicant indicates that a seat-time waiver has been approved. No details are provided about how this waiver will be implemented into the schools. Details are not provided about how students will progress at an accelerated pace.

A course is offered to students in grades six through nine that prepares students to make academic and career choices that facilitate college and career planning.

The application indicates that that each student will develop an Individual Graduation Plan. No details are provided about the process for the development of the Individual Graduation Plans.

This criterion is not adequately addressed. The application does not explain how the proposed program will enable participating students to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest.

Community stakeholders will work with high school students to emphasize the importance of completing high school and attending and completing college.

The application does not describe what strategies will be used by the stakeholders working with the students. It is not clear which high schools students will be working with community stakeholders. No selection criteria are listed for either the participating students or for the selection of community stakeholders.

ESL students will develop presentations representing their home countries. Parents of these students will be invited to present as well. This will give students at some schools to learn about different cultures.

No rationale was provided about why ESL student presentations will be used to provide access and exposure to diverse cultures. The use of ESL-only students excludes students from other cultures who might also have interesting/valuable information to share with their classmates about their cultures. The applicant does not address what accommodations will be made to help facilitate presentations from students functioning in their second language. A rationale is not included to justify further singling ESL students out by requiring presentations to the classroom and/or school.

The majority of the students will be passive learners about diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives. This will not result in deeper individual student learning.

The application does not describe strategies that will be effectively implemented to allow students to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving

Parental involvement is not addressed.

By the end of 8th grade, students develop an Individualized Graduation Plan.

The application does not list criteria that will be used to identify "appropriate instructional apps."

The program will incorporate technology to personalize learning.

Because the application does not identify specific content that will be used as a part of the proposed program, it is not possible to determine if the content is high-quality or if it is aligned with college- and career-ready standards or graduation requirements.

Student data is maintained in the online grade book system.

The applicant does not describe how teachers will provide personalized learning recommendations as a part of the proposed program.

This proposal does not describe high-quality strategies or accommodations specifically selected for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career- ready graduation requirements.

The applicant does not describe what training and support will be provided to ensure that students understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them as a part of the proposed program.

While presenting a number of best practices, the application does not present a clear picture of how these practices fit together as an integrated systemic program to be implemented as a part of a Race to the Top funded program.

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

20

5

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal states that Instructional Technology Specialists will provide professional development on the integration of technology into the curriculum.

The application does not include a high-quality plan to ensure that all participating educators receive training for effectively implementing personalized learning environments and strategies that will meet each student's academic needs. The application does not describe: key goals, clear description of activities to be undertaken, rationale for the selected activities, timeline, deliverables, or identified responsible parties for implementing activities.

The application does not have a high-quality plan to adapt content and instruction in order to provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches. It does not include: key goals, clear description of activities to be undertaken, rationale for the selected activities, timeline, deliverables, or identified responsible parties for implementing activities.

The application does not have a high-quality plan to frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or graduation requirements, use data to inform the acceleration of student progress, or to use data to inform the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators. It does not include: key goals, clear description of activities to be undertaken, rationale for the selected activities, timeline, deliverables, or identified responsible parties for implementing activities.

The applicant will use annual test data to measure student progress for some participating students.

A teacher evaluation system is in place that will provide frequent feedback. As part of the evaluation process, teachers will receive feedback which includes recommendations for improvement. There are no strategies included in the proposal that will be implemented to improve the teaching of individuals who score poorly on evaluations.

The application does not include: key goals, clear description of activities to be undertaken, rationale for the selected activities, timeline, deliverables, or identified responsible parties for implementing activities that will result in using feedback to improve teachers' practice and effectiveness.

The application does not explain how educator will identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests.

The application does not identify specific learning resources that will be used as a part of the proposed program.

The application states that apps will be used as learning resources.

The application does not address how educators will have access to or knowledge of tools to create and share new resources.

No processes or tools are described to match student needs with specific resources.

No strategies to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs are included in the proposal.

The district's teacher evaluation plan will assess educator effectiveness.

The application does not include strategies that will be implemented to assess and improve school culture and climate.

The application does not describe training for school leaders and school leadership teams that will enable them to structure an effective learning environment.

The district maintains student performance data, but the application does not describe systems or practices that will be implemented in order to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.

The application does not have a high-quality plan for increasing the number of student who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. The proposal does not include: key goals, clear description of activities to be undertaken, rationale for the selected activities, timeline, deliverables, or identified responsible parties for implementing activities.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	5
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The application includes organization charts of the current LEA structure. It lists who will work for whom. However, there are no clear responsibilities assigned to the positions to demonstrate support and services for the activities to be implemented as a part of the proposed program. The information provided does not a high-quality plan to support project implementation, The components described are not additional activities that will be implemented as a part of Race to the Top.</p> <p>The application does not mention if school leadership teams are provided any flexibility and/or autonomy over school schedules and calendars.</p> <p>Principals are given autonomy in personnel decisions.</p> <p>The application does not describe any flexibility or autonomy the school leadership teams may or may not have with regard to staffing models.</p> <p>Principals are allowed to determine roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators.</p> <p>Title I principals are given autonomy in constructing their school budgets. The applicant does not indicate what flexibilities are provided to principals of schools that are not Title I eligible.</p> <p>The district has been granted a waiver for seat time. Strategies for giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery are not described. It is not clear how the proposed project will implement the seat-time waiver to allow for students to progress at an accelerated rate.</p> <p>The application does not describe strategies for giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.</p> <p>The applicant will use the Universal Design for Learning to make resources more accessible to all students.</p> <p>Strategies that could allow for flexible instruction are mentioned in the application.</p> <p>The application does not describe how strategies will be implemented to adapt instructional practices to all students.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that all students will have access. The district has the resources to provide students access while they are in school.

Three different student to computer ratios are included in the proposal which makes it impossible to determine if all students will indeed have access to necessary content while out of school. The application lists that the state of Louisiana

recommends 5:1. The district's technology plan states that 1:1 is the district goal. The ratio of 3:1 is also included in this proposal. No rationale is provided for the 3:1 ratio.

JPAMs is available outside of school.

The applicant states that parents will be included in training.

Teachers will have access to student information and instructional resources through various avenues provided by the district.

The application states that online support will be provided to stakeholders. No information is provided about what topics will be included in the online training, who will develop the online training, or who will maintain the online training.

Instructional technology Specialists will provide support to educators in the district.

The application does not include strategies for ensuring stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support.

The district has an online system that provides access to real time data for parents and students. It includes "reports that are downloadable into an open data format and can be used with other electronic learning systems."

The application does not list or describe which electronic systems can be used with the district's "robust information technology system."

The district uses Sungard Enterprise Resource Planning System software to integrate financial, human resource, and payroll systems.

The applicant does not present a high-quality plan for supporting project implementation. Details are not provided about the policies and infrastructure that will provide the support and resources needed to support personalized learning.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The application does not include a high-quality plan to ensure a high-quality approach to continuously improve the district's plan. The application does not include a timeline or deliverables for the selected activities. The application does not clearly indicate who the responsible party is. Individuals are listed as Project Sponsor, Project Manager, and Project Team. However, tasks and/or responsibilities are not assigned to these individuals.</p> <p>The applicant will monitor the quality of its investments using the Project Management Oversight Committee Model.</p> <p>Measures are listed for activities that occur in the district.</p> <p>Some of the measures listed do not adequately measure progress toward goals. For example, measuring the number of Instructional Coaches in schools will not measure progress toward improving professional practices. The measures listed do not measure quality of the investments. Example: the number of staff trained in the Kagan Structure does not measure quality of the implementation so it cannot be determined if it has improved professional practices.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>A Race to the Top page will be maintained on the district website. No information is included about who will maintain the website or how often it will be updated.</p> <p>Project Manager will complete quarterly reports to the Chief Academic Officer, Superintendent, and Board of Education.</p> <p>Quarterly newsletters and parent meeting will inform parents and the community of progress toward goals. No information is included about who will conduct the meetings or develop the newsletters. No details are provided about how the newsletter will be distributed.</p> <p>The application describes how the district provides basic information using systems that are already in place. A high-quality plan is not included to address activities that will be implemented to develop and maintain ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. In addition, the application does not describe a clear and high-quality</p>		

approach to continuously improve its plan through adjustments and revisions during implementation.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Rationales are not included for the listed performance measures.

The application does not describe how the selected performance measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information.

The application does not address modifications that may occur if the measure is insufficient to determine implementation progress.

For each of the performance measure, the applicant lists overall and subgroup performance with baseline and annual targets for each year through one year post-grant. The application does not provide enough detail to determine if the goals provided are ambitious and achievable.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant intends to use PMOC, but does not describe what evaluation activities will be utilized under the umbrella of PMOC.

The measures listed in the proposal do not identify implementation or effectiveness. They count things or people present in the district.

The application does not include a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of funded activities. The application does not describe: methods of evaluation, rationale for the selected methods, timeline, deliverables, or identified responsible parties for implementing activities.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The application state that the district plans to use Title I, Title II, and General Funds to support the development of the proposal. The applicant does not explain how the current Title I, Title 2, and General Funds budgets and/or activities will be adjusted to accommodate for the the support for Race to the Top.

The application includes budget information. However, not enough detailed information is included to determine if the proposed budget seems reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal.

The applicant's budget does not provide a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities. There is not a description of all funds that will be used to support the implementation of the proposal. The application distinguished between one-time investments versus ongoing operational costs. The application does not identify operational costs that will be incurred after the grant period.

The application does not describe a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

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

10

2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not have a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The application does not describe: key goals, clear description of activities to be undertaken, rationale for the selected activities, timeline, deliverables, or identified responsible parties for implementing activities.

The applicant states that cadres will be formed to help extend the sustainability of the project.

The applicant states that additional sources of funding will be pursued. However, no details are provided about what strategies will be implemented or by whom in order to ensure that funding is secured to sustain Race to the Top activities.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Caddo Parrish has working relationships with multiple community organizations.

The application identifies four desired results: students ending 4th grade on level, students arriving in high school on time and on level, students arriving in first grade ready to learn, and increased community involvement.

The application does not describe how the partnership will use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty (including highly mobile students), family instability, or other child welfare issues.

The application does not describe how the partnership will develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students to at least other high-need students and communities in the LEA or consortium over time.

The application does not describe how the partnership will improve results over time.

The application does not describe how the partnership would, within participating schools, integrate education and other for participating students.

The application does not describe how the partnership will work together to assess the needs and assets of participating students that are aligned with the partnership's goals for improving the education and family and community supports identified by the partnership.

The application does not describe how the partnership will work together to identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports identified by the applicant.

The application does not describe how the partnership will work together to create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results.

The application does not describe how the partnership will work together to 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 .

The application does not describe how the partnership will work together to routinely assess the applicant's progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems.

Performance measures are listed for each identified desired result. The performance measures for the proposed population are not ambitious. The final year goal for one of the groups is lower than the baseline. Another target is only a 2% increase over the baseline at the end of the grant funding period. The goals listed in the 2017-2018 column include dates for previous years so it is not clear what the targets are for the first year post-grant.

Several of the partnerships listed in the Absolute Priority relate to an early childhood population. One of the desired results is that students arrive in first grade ready to learn. No performance measure is included for this population/desired result.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

While the application states that personalized learning environments will be implemented, the application does not coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to achieve the goals of the Race to the Top grant program.

Total	210	71
-------	-----	----