



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0105WA-1 for East Valley School District #361

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The East Valley School District offers a wide vision for the imagination that encompasses a place where all student succeed, parents are engaged, teachers continue to learn and use data to support their pedagogy, and the environment is enriched. While a beginning, the vision does not reach the level required by the criterion. The narrative lacks a discussion of the relationship of these vision points to the four core educational areas that would be included in a more comprehensive response.</p> <p>Similarly, the proposal fails to provide the district's strategies towards the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support - all key elements of the Race to the Top - District program.</p> <p>The proposal does not provide a description of the student experience within a personalized learning environment.</p> <p>The application includes three goals for the project that focus on a year's worth of achievement for each student, a welcoming and safe school environment, and strong parent and community involvement. These goals are not aligned to the assurances and do not reflect personalized learning, preparation for college and career, decreasing achievement gaps, or any other outcome recommended within the request for proposals.</p> <p>The rating for this response is low.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The proposal describes the transition within the school district from K-5 schools to K-8 schools, a process that concluded with the current school year. All of these newly-formed K-8 schools and the single high school, constituting the entire district, will participate in the project. This is reasonable, given the small size of the district and the number of schools.</p> <p>The applicant does not expressly address the process for selecting the full district nor the eligibility of the schools for this project; this information is included on the tables within the section. The total number of participating students (calculated from the School Demographic Chart at 3,635) is significantly lower than the figure provided on the initial Budget Requirement page at the beginning of the application which states 4,423.</p> <p>The demographic chart illustrates the full involvement of all students at all schools. Several columns are completed incorrectly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Column E: Total # of low-income students in the district (vs low-income students enrolled in that single school)</li> <li>• Column H: % of participating students from low-income families from the school in that row (vs 100% for every school), and</li> <li>• Column I (% of total district low-income population represented by this school's low-income enrollment (vs 100% for every school))</li> </ul> <p>The proposal list the schools and provides some of the data required. As the district is small and all schools were included, the applicant did not discuss the process of selection; this was a reasonable choice.</p> <p>The response rates in the mid range.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

While the district has experienced a significant reform moving into a K-8/9-12 model, this transition is now complete and is not sufficient to serve as the high-quality plan for reform required for this competition. The narrative does not include a plan for reaching the identified goals or meeting the performance or summative assessment goals for any grade band in any area.

The application does not include a high-quality plan (including timeline, deliverables, activities, parties responsible). There is no discussion as to how any project will be scaled up into meaningful reform beyond the participating schools.

The response rating is low.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant includes data on summative assessments, achievement gaps, graduation rates, college enrollment, and postsecondary degree enrollment rates; this information is useful.

The summative assessment data includes baseline and targets in reading and math for students in grades three through eight only; no data is provided for students in K-2 or 9-12. If no acceptable measurement is available for the K-2 students, that should be noted. High school data for both reading and math would provide the complete set of baseline and target information for assessments. Targets for each year are appropriately ambitious and indicate a steady trend towards a reasonable outcome by the end of the grant.

Target figures for reducing the achievement gap, however, are not ambitious. The applicant applied a standard percentage decrease to each year which may be appropriate for a greater gap but results in an extremely slow reduction when the gap is already very small. An example includes the achievement gap between the comparison group (white students) and the subgroup (low-income students) for 3rd grade reading. The baseline achievement gap is only 2%. Even by the first post-grant year, this percentage is only reduced to 1%. Percentages less than 5% could be eliminated with the four-year grant period. These figures do not appear to consider the number of students in the smaller subgroups. Changes of a few percent can equal one child.

The college enrollment targets are ambitious, with 90% of students expected to go to college upon high school graduation by the end of the grant (55% do at this time). The target calculations are not consistent (exceed 100% throughout), making the data unusable.

The proposal includes some of the required information; it rates in the lower-middle range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The proposal offers examples of success within the district over several years, including the high school graduation rate and a K-5 school (pre-transition to K-8) that made an impressive change to its science program in just one year. East Valley Middle School, as a persistently low achieving K-5 school prior to the shift to K-8, moved students to proficiency levels in both math and reading within a similarly short period of time. An earlier response illustrates a significant increase in 2014 (and annual increase over several years) of number of seats filled in AP and college courses at the high school level.

The district uses the Oasis system that allows access to student achievement data to students, educators, and parents to be used for both information and to track student work and develop interventions and necessary. This will allow data-driven decision making on the parts of all of these decision makers and increase each student's capacity to track their own work and make modifications when needed. This is a useful tool and provides evidence that the district will use data to make decisions, that teachers will have access to student data to drive instructional decisions, and that parents will have resources that can guide their assistance to their children - all with the potential to positively impact student achievement.

Using the tools provided through the Oasis system and the successful of the reform efforts undertaken, and evidenced by the success, for example, of East Valley Middle School, the applicant demonstrates the ability to improve student learning outcomes by both raising student achievement and increasing the graduation rate. These are good examples to

demonstrate that capacity.

The proposal would be strengthened by the addition of evidence, data, discussion of reforms in specific schools, and a record of equity in learning and teaching.

The rating is low in the mid range.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------	----------

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The application provides a website to document the transparency of district processes, practices, and investments. None of the criteria are addressed, including school-level personnel salaries for instructional staff or teachers, or non-personnel expenditures. The proposal does include reference to the district's salary scale and a comment on the Board of Director's budget approval process.

The information does not include a description of the extent to which the district makes makes available the personnel salaries and non-personnel expenditures as requested.

The score for this criterion is low.

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The district limits its response to this criterion with the written recitation of the State's legislation that supports public schools. The statement provides a definition of progressive education as well as expectations for all graduates within all public school districts. These expectations, while loosely aligned to the goals of the project, create a new set of program objectives.

This general statement is an insufficient response to the criterion; it does not demonstrate evidence of conditions or autonomy to implement the personalized learning environment at the heart of Race to the Top or even the goals set forth by the applicant.

Rating for this response is low.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The narrative provides a list of groups involved in the early work of the school change; this does not include any documentation or evidence of involvement in the proposal for funding. Notes and agenda from meetings date from the 2007-2010 work; the process described in the narrative is from 2010. Although the teachers are represented by a local union or association, there is no reference to this organization within the discussion other than participation in the pre-2010 work.

The proposal includes two letters of support, one each from the Mayor and the Assistant Superintendent of the NEW Educational Service District. Letters of support from other key stakeholders, including principals and teachers, would indicate a higher degree of awareness, interest, involvement, and support.

The application provides no evidence of the involvement of students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the Race to the Top-District proposal.

The response to the criterion is low, as it primarily refers to work other than the current proposal and does not provide adequate evidence of support.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

East Valley's application offers a three-step plan to create an engaging and personalized learning environment throughout its five K-8 schools and single high school. With the first step complete (preschool), and most of the second step as well (transition to middle schools), the remainder of the work focuses on significant changes to the facilities for each of the five K-8 schools to accommodate their new structures. Throughout the four years of funding, 89% of direct costs are allocated towards this work. The third and final step of the plan carries this idea of new opportunities for students forward.

With its emphasis on the three steps, the proposal does not specifically address the areas within the criterion, including the assurance of an approach to learning where students understand the importance of their learning, the identification of specific learning and develop goals linked to college- and career-ready standards, and student access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives. Full responses on these topics would assist in a more convincing argument for support.

The narrative does identify Project Lead the Way as an example of a robust addition to the middle school curriculum, and appropriately so. This, however, is an ongoing program and not new with the Race to the Top proposal.

While the proposal occasionally touches on areas within this criterion, there is no clear effort to respond to many portions. The steps, while of interest to the district, are not responsive to the criteria. They do not address, for example, access to a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments for students, or ongoing and regular feedback from updated student data that can assist with determining a students career or college readiness.

The application does not offer any insight as to how high-need students have access to the accommodations and strategies they need to meet college- and career-ready standards.

The response to this criterion is rated low. The only focus of the narrative is the three identified steps, none of which directly address any of the criteria.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The description provided in the narrative covers the current status within East Valley. The Professional Learning Communities at every level and across schools, the work towards improving science, and regular meetings of teams that include the Superintendent and other administrators are all ongoing rather than part of a new high-quality plan and a new vision for reform. East Valley is not seeking support for a new reform model or a new vision; it is in place.

Without the benefit of a new plan and vision from which to work, the applicant is challenged to provide strong examples for how the practice and effectiveness of participating educators and principals will be improved from feedback from their evaluation systems or how the learning approaches will be improved through access to tools and student data.

A new plan would include increasing the number of students receiving instruction from teachers who have been consistently successful in advancing students at least one years worth of growth each academic year (the definition of an effective teacher). The proposal does not address this portion of the criterion or any others addressing teacher availability or success.

Most of the elements within this criterion are not addressed. The applicant focused on the existing status of the district's schools, omitting a more thorough discussion of a new high-quality plan.

The response rates in the low area.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

As a part of the "East Valley School District Reconfiguration" project of 2010, the district's central office made several changes that impact the students of the participating schools. Of particular significance was the addition of a principal on special assignment to assist onsite administrative administrative teams at the schools to resolve conflicts, conduct trainings, and monitor curriculum implementation.

The proposal provides no evidence that the leadership at the participant schools has flexibility or autonomy over school schedules, calendars, personnel decisions, or school-level budgets. The narrative specifically notes, in fact, that each

building must commit to teaching the curriculum with fidelity.

Reference is made to student's ability to progress based on demonstrated mastery, however, this is limited to credit recovery, class failures, and the probability of not graduating on time. The application does not offer evidence of credit for accelerated learning, or mastery of standards in ways other than the traditional classroom, although there is access to online courses. No information is provided specific to policies or practices that would facilitate adaptable and fully-accessible personalized learning.

The descriptions within this response cover the current status - the new configurations within the district. These descriptions are not a part of a new plan or vision, but of the vision culminating in the restructure that was completed in 2010.

The applicant responded to some of the criteria; the score rates in the low-mid range.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The public library system, through a partnership with the district, provides each student with an electronic access card; this card allows the students access to academic support activities. No additional information is provided including a minimum age for the card, if student data can be accessed, and if other stakeholders (including parents) are able to view this information as well.

Student data is available in sharable formats elsewhere and available for online viewing. With a high percentage of low-income families, access through the public library system is extremely limiting for reasonable communications with parents and to expect an increase in parent engagement.

Evidence is provided of tutoring programs that have shown some degree of success. The narrative identifies three programs at the elementary level, but provides no evidence of evaluation to see if results have been positive.

Technology that would increase access to personalized learning opportunities for students is not included as a part of the plan or vision within the proposal, making training and supports for teachers, students, and their parents a less critical issue. The narrative does not address if the information technology systems allow parents and students to export their data. This information is lacking.

Discussion of the interoperability of the data systems do not include information on budget data.

The response rates as mid-range.

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The application does not include a high-quality plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress towards project goals throughout the grant. The stated goals, which are also the district's goals, do not include any new measurable objectives that are not already in place and operational that can be monitored and measured.

While the response provides interesting insight and perspective on the district's current situation, it does not offer a full and comprehensive discussion of the criterion.

The response is rated low.

<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides a chart of the various communication channels within the district; if its purpose is to illustrate a confusing structure, it is very successful. It does underscore the assertion that the channels of communication must be

clear and consistent.

The proposal does not include all elements for a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. Such a plan would include key goals and the rationale for all activities to be undertaken. The district's plan does include a listing that includes both activities and deliverables; a beginning of a communication/engagement plan.

The district's plan recognizes the role of external stakeholders, including community members as part of building Advisory Task Forces and the influence of civic clubs (Superintendent presentations).

Parent engagement and communication is fostered as each teacher and principal is required to contact parents in their class/school annually.

Table 1 offers a Communication and Involvement Opportunities Chart that includes a setting, communication/feedback column, timeline and the office with the responsibility for ensuring that the task is completed.

While not a totally complete plan, the applicant includes several useful components that can begin a quality plan; the response rates in the mid range.

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

**5**

**3**

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The application includes the requisite number of performance measures for all grade levels with baseline figures and annual target measures.

Required performance measures are not included for (E)(3) a and b that focus on effective and highly-effective teachers and principals. This data is not yet available. The absence of this data leaves a significant weakness in this response.

The performance measures include several (both for grades 4-8 and for 9-12) that are looking for baseline and target data relative to tracking students and their preparation for college and careers. For grades 4-8, students were considered on track to graduate with an attendance rate of at least 95% and enrollment of at least 30 days; for high school students, only the enrollment was used. For both measures, the baseline figures were all less than 50% with a post-grant goal of 75%. Given the fact that almost 90% of students currently graduate from high school and that these two factors are better indicators for high school graduation than for college or career readiness, a different indicator such as ACT subtests might be preferred.

The measures selected will provide timely and formative information to program leaders that can be used by school administrators and other key decision makers to revise, recalculate, and accelerate as needed. The proposal, however, does not include a description of how this annual data (and these anticipated goals) will be reviewed.

The rating is mid range.

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

**5**

**0**

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The proposal does not offer a plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of the activities.

With no response, either within the space for this criterion or elsewhere in the application, the score is very low.

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The budget identifies two sources of funding: grant funds and Washington State matching construction funds. The total cost of the project, \$16 million, includes the \$10 million grant request and \$6 million matching construction funds. The matching funds are considerable and indicate the support of the State.

Of the requested funding, 89% is targeted for construction costs. A Project Manager, partly overseeing the construction, is grant funded throughout the project. No funds are requested for teachers, including for professional development, training,

to personalize learning, meet with parents or stakeholders, tutor students, or develop curriculum.

The applicant does not provide a direct link between the use of the funds for the construction work and either the goals of :

- accelerating student achievement
- deepening student learning, and
- increasing equity through personalized student support,

or the goal of reconfiguring schools to the K-8 model (which has already occurred).

The proposal does not identified funds that will be for one-time investment, although the construction costs would be expected to be within that category.

The development and renovation of facilities is not included as one of the goals identified by the applicant. No rationale or explanation is provided to demonstrate how this use of funds directly addresses the goals of:

- a variety of opportunities for students that will promote at least one year of academic progress or will be engaged in a successful academic intervention,
- a welcoming and safe school learning community, or
- a school that demonstrates a high level of community and parent involvement.

This is not a well-supported budget for the goals identified by the applicant or through the competition.

The rating for the response is low.

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

**10**

**2**

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The East Valley School District submitted a budget for a one-time major construction project for several of its K-8 school sites; matching construction funds were included from the State of Washington. This level of State support is a strength for the work.

The application does not include a sustainability plan nor a plan to review the effectiveness of past investments to inform future decisions or a budget beyond the four years of grant support.

The response is lacking some key elements as noted above.

The score is rated low.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The proposal provides short descriptions of numerous ongoing partnerships between the district and organizations, non-profits, businesses, etc. within the community that support the participant schools. The examples are useful and provide evidence of a significant interest in these relationships on behalf of students.

The district identified a partnership with a local drug and alcohol intervention and treatment center as a primary focus (no indication of private/public affiliation). Recognizing the need to address these issues and expand the knowledge base beyond a small scope, the applicant listed seven population groups and appropriate desired results; the results include both educational and non-educational outcomes. The desired results are not measurable (i.e.. Students with family support commit to a drug-free school experience).

Performance measures are included for one of the indicators. The performance measures focuses on the percentage of students participating in the Washington Drug Free Youth program with participation rates increasing annually. The goals are both reasonable and ambitious.

The criterion includes numerous details that are not addressed within the response. They include a description of how the partnership would build the capacity of the staff at the schools, identify and inventory student needs, and engage parents

and families.

The response does not link back to the application itself, does not address the goals, and does not even address the new proposed work at the schools. It appears as a totally independent factor from all that has come before it. The Competitive Preference Priority must refer to a coherent and sustainable partnership that supports a plan that focuses on Personalized Learning Environment. The description of the partnership with the drug and alcohol intervention and treatment center does not address any personalized learning within the schools.

The response to the Competitive Preference Priority is rated in the low/middle.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The application submitted by East Valley School District does not include a new plan or new set of activities, either of which would focus on personalized learning environments. The district has a 2010 plan in place and requests funding to continue the work through construction of classrooms and learning space as well as limited equipment and supplies. The proposal does not address the core educational assurances, effectiveness of teachers, or significantly increasing personalization of the learning environment for students.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>61</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0105WA-2 for East Valley School District #361

#### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's mission is to inspire all students to achieve academic excellence and become responsible citizens. The guiding principles are: engage students in meaningful educational experiences that can be applied to the larger world, engage parents and the community, offer many opportunities for students and families, and create a culture that is respectful and caring. The narrative throughout the application speaks about "re-visioning". There is a lack of explanation of what that actually means.

The narrative does not address the four core educational assurance areas. There is nothing in the narrative or in the appendix that refers to standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in the college workplace or global economy. A data system is in place that measures growth and success. It is used to track student progress and to develop interventions. Newly hired teachers are interviewed by the Superintendent to ensure that they are committed to and understand the district vision. There is a comprehensive look of how the schools in the district have been turned around and reconfigured.

This section is weak because the reform vision does not address the four core educational assurance areas completely. It does not articulate a clear approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning and

increasing equity through personalized student support. It does not describe what classroom experiences will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant is in the process of reconfiguring and revisioning all of its schools. There were meetings as early as 2010 to discuss the reconfiguration. The description of the process that the applicant used is sparse. It includes notes from a 2010 meeting but there is little documentation as to whom attended the meeting and the processes that came between 2010 and the present.

The narrative lists the schools in the new configuration. There is a a table listing the participating schools, the configurations, number of educators, number of participating students, the number of participating high-need students and the number of participating low-income students and the percentage of the total district population.

Although this applicant meets the second two requirements of this section, the lack of process description and lack of clarity of what the grant is actually about is causing points to be deducted. The data Included in (A)(3) is presented incorrectly. Column E does not present the total students in the district or LEA. Column H does not included the percent of Participating students from low-income families. Column I does not present the percentage of Total LEA low-income population. It is being awarded two points.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The application does not include a high-quality plan that describes how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools and how it will help the applicant reach its outcome goals. Narrative is included as to why K-8 configurations will improve student learning outcomes.

This section is weak because it lacks a high-quality plan. It is receiving two points because of the narrative involved around reconfiguration. The narrative is not involved around the core assurances. In a later section the narrative talks about the need to revamp the space at school sites to encourage personalization.

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

**10**

**4**

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

District-wide goals are included in the narrative for third through eighth grade summative assessments of reading and math. The summative assessment used is the Washington State Measure of Student Progress Reading and Math assessments. The goals for each subject and grade are broken up by subgroup. The methodology is the number of students scoring proficient or higher on the statewide assessment. It includes baseline data and goals for the four years of the grant and one year post grant.

The same measurements are used to reduce the achievement gap by one-half by the 2017-18 year. This goal still leaves quite a large achievement gap for some populations, especially students in special education.

The district has configured into having a single high school. The table reports that the current graduation rate is the highest in the region at a total percentage just under 90% for all students. The goal is to increase high school graduation rates to 99% for each subgroup by 2016-17.

The goal is to increase college enrollment to 90% by the year 2016-17. Only 65% attends college in the baseline year of 2012-13. The narrative states that many students take college courses while still in high school.

The lack of clarity of the vision hinders the possibility that the proposal is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity. The performance goals are achievable but are not ambitious. This section is receiving four points for including the annual goals requested. The narrative included with the goals is too sparse to be meaningful.

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

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>There is some improvement of the graduation rate over the last four years. The graduation rate in 2008/09 was 87.2% and in 2011/12 it was 91.5%. The narrative explains that the graduation rate shows improvement because students are able to "petition" to use mastery on state required tests as a way to recoup class credits. The narrative mentions a chart that shows the progress of the Washington State End of Course Exams. However, the chart is not included in the proposal. Two other charts are included for math only that show the difference of math achievement before and after the reconfiguration of one school.</p> <p>The narrative does not support a clear record of success over the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. The description and charts included do not demonstrate the applicant's ability to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps. It does not address achieving ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools other than reconfiguring the school will result in improvement. Elsewhere in the proposal the narrative addresses that student performance data is available to educators and parents and is used for interventions. it does not talk about data being available to students.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>There does not seem to be a high level of transparency in the processes, practices and investments of the district. District budget information is available through the district website and is not included in the proposal.</p> <p>The state of Washington has a standardized salary schedule for teachers. The website where salaries and collective bargaining agreements are located is included in the narrative.</p> <p>The superintendent of the district presents a monthly fiscal report to the board. The report is available to the public but is not included in the proposal.</p> <p>The narrative does not address the four categories required. It only states that the information is available on websites. The location of the material does not include a description of the extent to which the applicant makes the information available. It is receiving one point.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The narrative consists of a quote from state legislation that describes the goals of school districts. The narrative throughout the proposal discusses reconfiguration and "re-visioning". It does not discuss how personalized learning environments would be established, nor does it describe what these environments would look like.</p> <p>This is receiving 0 points because it is unresponsive to the topic. A later section addresses personalized learning environments and the need to improve the facilities of the district. The narrative does not describe whether there are successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement personalized learning environments that are not described.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>District stakeholders began meeting in 2010 to study how to make the schools more effective. Meetings continued throughout the year and a decision was made that schools need to reconfigure into the present structure of K-8 schools and one high school. There are notes from one meeting in the appendix.</p> <p>The appendix contains letters of support from the City of Spokane Valley maor and from an Assistant Superintendent of the Spokane Student Learning &amp; Support Services office.</p> <p>The narrative states that "the importance of personalized instruction, parent engagement, community partnerships and individualized student learning soon became obvious". However personalized instruction, parent engagement, community partnerships and individualized student learning are not addressed throughout the proposal. The proposal does not demonstrate evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement or support for the proposal. It demonstrates evidence of</p>		

stakeholder engagement and support for reconfiguration of the district which has been completed this year. This section is awarded two points for including a description of stakeholder engagement. It does not include evidence of direct engagement and support from the collective bargaining organization.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>This section of the proposal addresses creating an engaging and personalized learning environment.</p> <p>The first step in accomplishing this has been done. The narrative talks about creating quality school experiences in pre-school and reaches out to low income families to provide high quality experiences that connect both parents and children to school. Other than the inclusion of a "free all-day kindergarten" for all children, the narrative does not address how to create quality school experiences in preschool.</p> <p>The second step is to begin by fifth grade programs of exploration and hands-on learning. This is already being put into place and includes mentoring and walk to read and math programs that individualize learning based on student needs. Seventh and eighth grade students attend the East Valley Enrichment Center once a week and attend various classes that include health and fitness, band and orchestra ensembles, woodshop, technology, leadership, choir, art, science or art history in music and cinema. The narrative does not address how and if the students select classes, and how long each class is held both on a daily and a course level. Students are able to opt out of attending the enrichment classes.</p> <p>To provide individualized hands-on learning experiences changes need to be made in the structure of the classroom buildings.</p> <p>Step three is to continue regardless of whether funding can be obtained. The goal is to open a project based high school for grades nine and ten in the 2014-15 school year.</p> <p>The applicant does not have a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching. The narrative speaks about the need to improve facilities but does not address approaches to learning that engage and empower learners, other than a once a week visit to the Enrichment Center. The classes offered at the Enrichment Center need to be offered at all schools for all students. The narrative does not address any of the points asked for in this section. The section is receiving four points.</p>		
<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Professional Learning Communities are in place at the school sites with the support of the Board of Directors. "Teachers meet within schools, between schools, within departments, across departments, cross grade levels and within grade levels". The purpose of the professional learning communities is to ensure that instruction is creates opportunities for student success. Collaboration of fifth grade science teachers resulted in significant improvement since the professional learning communities began. Teacher Leaders receive small stipends for leading the collaboration discussions.

Three district goals have been developed. They are:

1. Every student will have a variety of opportunities that will promote at least one year of academic progress or will be engaged in a successful academic intervention.
2. All students will feel welcome and safe as members of their school learning community.
3. All schools will demonstrate high levels of community and parent involvement.

Teacher leaders are encouraged to make recommendations identifying resources and training that are necessary to continue the progress towards the three goals.

Principals, the Curriculum Director, the Director of Career and Technical Education and other stakeholders meet weekly to evaluate district academic progress and to evaluate how resources should be allocated to increase student achievement. These leaders also work on the implementation of the new teacher evaluation system to ensure that highly effective teachers are in every classroom.

Each school has a child study team that uses the Response to Intervention process to determine interventions needed. Information on the data systems are available to educators.

The proposal does not have a high-quality plan to improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. While Professional Learning Communities are in place the narrative did not stress how they support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards. It lacks narrative to address the information needed for this section and is receiving four points.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant does not have a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive polices and infrastructure that provide every student, educator and level of the education system with the support and resources then need, when and where they are needed. The plan included is a narrative about reconfiguration of the district from 2010. It does not address how to facilitate personalized learning and the requirements of this section. The narrative does address reorganization of the district office but it is not for the purpose of facilitating personalized learning.</p> <p>Some personalization does exist. High school students are able to complete some classes on line. Teachers must teach the curriculum with fidelity. If teachers want to change something in the curriculum to address struggling students, they must petition the principal. The Walk to Read and Walk to Math programs address individual needs. Math and reading courses are available during school breaks. Students who have successfully completed AP courses are allowed to tutor students in that subject. This has had success in increasing the grades of the students tutored.</p> <p>This section is receiving five points. Besides not have a high-quality plan, it does not address providing school leadership teams with flexibility and autonomy. It does not describe providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students. The narrative does address that students may receive credit for classes they scored proficient on the state assessments.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not have a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

The proposal shares that there is personalized learning but does not describe it. It does not discuss that all participating students, parents, educators and other stakeholders regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources to support the implementation of the proposal. It does not discuss how stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support for the project.

It does address that the reconfiguration of the district to all K-8 schools plus one high school will help with personalization. Schools must teach provided curriculum with fidelity. If any changes are requested to address gaps in instruction, teachers must petition the principal who may or may not authorize the changes. Students can augment their curriculum by participating in online classes.

There are systems in place that allow teachers, students and parents to share data.

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>A high-quality plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process is not included. There are no processes in place to provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals. The plan does not address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top-District. This section is receiving three points because a narrative was included, even though it does not adequately address the prompt.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>A high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement is not included. A list of different venues for communication is provided. A table is included listing communication settings, the purpose of the communication, a timeline and who is responsible. It does not reveal goals and activities and deliverables. This is receiving two points because the applicant attempts to provide a plan for communication and engagement.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures are provided for each grade-level band. The applicant described for each measure proposed the rationale for selecting the measure. The proposal does not provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information tailored to the plan or theory of action. It does not state how it will review and improve the measure over time.</p> <p>The goals for the measures are not ambitious. In the post-grant section for the performance measure for the number of students who are on track to college- and career-ready is only 75% for all subgroups. That is one of the core educational assurances of the grant. Having 75% of your students on track for being college- and career-ready is not enough.</p> <p>This section is receiving two points because charts of performance measures were included.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Section E4 is not addressed and is receiving 0 points. The plan discusses the modernization of facilities that are needed to reconfigure the schools. It does not address how plans can be continuously improved. It does not include a high-quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the modernization.</p>		

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The narrative states that the "Race to the Top Grant would allow the district to complete the facilities expansion plan and is a one-time resource need". The Project-Level Itemized Costs include a Grant Manager, equipment and supplies. The equipment and supplies would be used to equip the learning centers with computers, presentation equipment and furniture. There are no training stipends included.</p> <p>The appendix includes district funding information. The community has voted down two bond proposals to support the expansion. There is a rationale included for the investment but it does not align to the core assurance areas. This section is receiving two points.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not have a high-quality plan for sustaining the project's goals after the term of the grant. Most funds it is asking for are going towards modernization of facilities. The district had tried twice before for the voters to vote for a bond that would support the modernization and both times the bond measure failed. Therefore it does not seem to have public support. There is no description of how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of the project. The budget does not support the goals presented in the narrative.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant lists the partnerships it has with agencies and the services provided.

- Family & Schools Succeeding Together counselor is paid for through local district funds. It provides services to students in need of mental health services and is paid by the district.
- YMCA runs a before and after school program for students K-6. The program does not exist at all schools and the proposal would like to expand the program to all schools.
- A school-community garden provides fresh produce for the school cafeterias. Fresh wheat and flour are provided by Shepherd Grain and Archer Midland Daniels for fresh baked goods. One of the schools has a program where elderly community members are fed.
- The Rotary provides scholarships to Technical Colleges and tickets once a year for a theater production.
- Boeing and Microsoft provide funding for a robotics class.
- The school district and others close by belong to the Spokane Valley Technical Center which provides high school students high quality career and technical opportunities. Avista Corporation helps students with entrepreneurial developments.
- The school district provides drug and alcohol testing, counseling and education services through local private drug and alcohol treatment service providers.

All population groups have educational or family community results. They seven results all are focus on substance abuse. All use one measure, the percent of student population participating in the Washington Drug Free Youth Program. Baseline and goal data is provided. The plan does not state how the data will be used to target its resources in order to improve results. The proposal states that the district would like to expand the Washington Drug Free Youth Program into eighth grade.

There is no description how partnerships would integrate education and other services. There is no narrative about how the capacity of staff would be increased.

The annual performance measures are included.

This section is receiving six points because an attempt was made to answer the prompt completely.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

This proposal does not coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on core educational assurance areas to create learning assurance areas. Although the state of Washington is part of the Common Core consortia, the proposal does not address rigorous standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in the college workplace and the global economy. The proposal does not address a data system that measures growth and informs instruction. The proposal does not address how it will recruit, train and retain effective teachers and administrators. It does not address how it will turn around its lowest achieving schools.

Total	210	47
-------	-----	----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

**Application #0105WA-3 for East Valley School District #361**

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a) The applicant provides some evidence that its efforts relate to the core educational assurance areas, but details are lacking. The applicant's primary reform effort described in the narrative is based on its new grade level configuration (i.e., from a PreK-5 configuration to a PreK-8 configuration). The district has realized some measure of success in that schools have received state recognition (i.e., School of Excellence, School of Distinction) and all lower grade schools have migrated to the K-8 grouping. Brief references to other initiatives including, a magnet STEAM school, instructional programming that addresses academic and behavioral needs (i.e., Complex Trauma, Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS), environmental education, Project Lead the Way), a data system accessible by parents and students, increased access to career and technical education (CTE) courses, and improved academic achievement. However, details on these initiatives are limited. For instance, the applicant notes that its Skyward data system is used to track student progress and develop interventions, but provides no discussion of how this occurs. There is also limited discussion on how the district ensures that its standards are college and career ready standards; how it recruits, develops, rewards or retains effective teachers and principals in high-need schools; and specific details on its initiatives to turn around its lowest-achieving schools. While the narrative indicates a district focus on assessing and addressing operational, facility, instructional and student performance challenges, the lack of detail on prior work or evidence of success in the core educational assurance areas weakens the application.</p> <p>b) The applicant provides limited discussion on its intent to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning. The applicant includes three goals in the narrative: one year of academic progress or appropriate academic interventions for all students, a welcoming and safe learning community for students, and high levels of community and parent involvement. Yet, the narrative lacks detail that describes how the district will accomplish these specific goals. There is also limited discussion on how the district intends to deepen student learning and increase equity through personalized learning. The narrative notes that the district intends to create a personalized learning environment for students, but discussions of how this will occur are cursory and lack connection of how the project's focus (i.e., adding classroom space) will advance personalized learning.</p> <p>c) The narrative does not contain an adequate description of how classroom instruction will change or reflect a personalized learning environment. The district has a Response to Intervention (RTI) initiative, but the narrative does not provide a clear, comprehensive discussion of how RTI will be used in this project or is currently being used in the district. The narrative vacillates between brief descriptions of past, current and future district initiatives and components of the project associated with this competition.</p> <p>The difficulty associated with identifying the focus of the narrative and components linked to the purpose of the proposed project, weakens the application. This selection criteria scores in the low range.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a) The applicant does not clearly describe the process used to select project schools. The district recently restructured its lower grade schools from a traditional K-5/6-8 grade configuration to a K-8 configuration and considers the expansion of school facilities as the next step in its efforts to improve its schools. However, beyond a description of failed bond</p>		

referendums, there is no description of the process the district used to select schools to receive additional classroom space. Although all schools are noted in the narrative as participating schools, there is no clear discussion of how schools were selected as participating schools (n=6).

b)The chart in section (A)(2) lists all schools as participating in the project. However, the budget, overall budget summary narrative and the project-level budget narrative indicate that only the K-8 sites will receive the requested construction funds. It is, therefore, unclear which schools will actually benefit from the proposed project (i.e., receive the additional classroom space requested in the application). Also, the list of participating schools has incorrect raw data (column E) and incorrect calculated data (column I). The use of incorrect data distorts the statistical description of the schools in the project.

c) The applicant provides conflicting data regarding the number of students served by the district. The Program-Specific Assurances for Individual LEA Applicants section notes that 4423 students will participate in the project. The list of participating schools in the narrative indicates that the district serves 3635 students in its schools. Inconsistent data in the narrative is problematic. Nonetheless, according to the chart in section (A)(2), 2044 students are from low-income families and 644 are classified as high-need students. The schools employ 227 teachers.

While the applicant provides required data for this selection criteria, the response contains data inconsistent with data in other sections of the application and a data chart that is incorrectly filled out.

The applicant scores in the middle range.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan that describes how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools or how it will assist the district in reaching outcome goals. The lack of specific details that relate to this construction-focused project (i.e., activities to be undertaken in this project, a timeline specific to this project, deliverables for this project, persons responsible for executing activities under this project) weaken the application.

The applicant included several action plans as appendices. However, neither of the plans clearly relates to the purpose expressed for funding under this project. For instance, the plan in appendix K references the grade level reconfiguration of district schools (already completed) and the failed bond referendum to support construction needs in the district. An action plan from the magnet school is also included; but the creation of a magnet school is not the focus of this project. Several appendices contain information that is either undated or dated (i.e., 2007-2010). The link between additional classroom space and the project's stated goals is also not clearly stated.

The lack of a high-quality plan (as defined in the NIA) that specifically addresses this project's primary intent to add classroom space weakens the narrative. The applicant's response to this selection criteria scores in the low range.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not provide a comprehensive description of subgroup performance on projected goals. The applicant provides annual student performance goals for grades 3-8 reading and math, and high school graduation rate. The anticipated increases are ambitious and achievable for a project serving approximately 4423 students. However, the table delineating performance goals does not include a Hispanic subgroup for several performance goals. The chart detailing increases in high school graduation rate also does not include the following subgroups: white, Pacific Islander. The chart delineating anticipated increases in college enrollment does not list any subgroups. Instead, Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) structures are provided (i.e., public 4-year, public 2-year, etc.).

It is also unclear why benchmarks on reading and math are noted for Black, Asian and American Indian subgroups, but no achievement gap targets are noted for these same subgroups. If data indicating performance levels are available, data informing achievement gaps would also likely be available. The narrative does not clearly address why data is absent in one area and included in another.

Inconsistent use of subgroups, lack of explanation regarding missing data and missing subgroups for college enrollment rate data weakens this section of the application. The response scores in the middle range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The narrative provides some evidence that the district advances student learning and achievement and increases equity in learning and teaching. The applicant provides one data set with evidence covering four years of performance. Other data sets included in the narrative (i.e., college credit earned in high school and AP enrollment) do not, however, show four years of performance. Chart two does not clearly identify the legends of the bar graph, which makes it very difficult to assess the data displayed.</p> <p>a)The applicant provides statements that it has impacted achievement, but provides limited data to support this assertion. The narrative provides 4-years of longitudinal data that shows a 4.3 percentage point increase from 2008 to 2012 in the district's graduation rate. Science data in chart 5 graphically displays marked increases in the number of 5<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring level 3 or 4 on the state's science assessment (p49). However, chart 4 displays grade level performance on the state math assessment. This data does not clearly indicate that performance increases in math are consistent across years or grade levels. For instance, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade performance in math increased in the 2011-12 school year but fell back in 2012-13 to performance levels similar to the 2010-11 school year. Only 4<sup>th</sup> grade and 7<sup>th</sup> grade math performance from 2010-2013 and 8<sup>th</sup> grade performance from 2006-2009 showed incremental gains.</p> <p>b)There is no sufficient evidence to support applicant claims that the district achieves ambitious and significant reforms in persistently lowest performing schools. First, the applicant does not clearly identify which project schools are persistently lowest performing. The narrative states that East Farms School was the "worst elementary school" in the county, but now has an exemplary rating in math improvement and science. However, the lack of a developed discussion, including data to document the claim, weakens this section of the proposal. No other evidence of ambitious and significant reforms in persistently lowest performing schools that documents the district's ability to effect such change was provided.</p> <p>c)The district provides access to student performance information through its Skyward website. Parent and student access to grades, missing assignments and discipline records likely increases parent awareness and encourages student accountability for learning.</p> <p>The applicant scores in the middle range. There is evidence to support longitudinal growth in math (4<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> grades), science (5<sup>th</sup> grade) and the district's graduation rate. However, the lack of documentation to support growth in other academic areas, weakens the application.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides sparse evidence of district transparency in processes, practices and investments. Beyond information contained on the state-issued salary schedule and the collective bargaining agreement provided on the district's website, it is unclear how transparency of actual school-level personnel salaries or actual non-personnel school-level expenditures is achieved. The inclusion of two web addresses in the narrative, with no detail regarding the availability of actual personnel salaries or school-level expenditures on the sites, and vague references to the superintendent's Board reports do not address the selection criteria.</p> <p>The response scores in the low range.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not clearly establish a focus on personalized learning nor sufficient evidence regarding legal, statutory and regulatory requirements that would support a personalized learning environment.</p> <p>The application seeks funding to support a grant manager's salary, equipment purchase, supplies, and funds for construction of additional classroom space. The narrative briefly mentions personalized learning in several sections of the narrative, but does not clearly identify it as the central purpose for funding under this competition. For example, the narrative asserts that additional classroom space, necessitated by the district's grade reconfiguration to a K-8 format, will support a focus on personalized learning. However, the narrative does not detail how personalized learning will occur, what it will look like in each grade level, or resources used to facilitate individualized learning. The lack of discussion regarding</p>		

the state's legal, statutory and regulatory requirements also weakens this section of the narrative.

The response scores in the low range.

**(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)**

**15**

**3**

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence that students, families, teachers and principals were involved in or support the purpose for this project. Support documents provided in the appendix are dated from 2007 to 2010 and were collected or created for other initiatives. The application contains documentation that the Mayor of Spokane Valley, Washington and the NorthEast Washington Educational Service District 101 support the initiative, but no clear evidence of support beyond this is presented. Meeting minutes and summaries are either not dated or from 2007-2010. There is no clear evidence of meetings convened for the purpose of supporting this grant application. The district is governed by a collective bargaining agreement, but there is no letter of support from the union expressing support.

The response scores in the low range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan as described in the NIA. The lack of specific details that relate to this project (i.e., activities to be undertaken in this project, a timeline specific to this project, deliverables for this project, persons responsible for executing activities under this project) weaken the application. The appendix only includes construction cost estimates from the failed bond referendum planning process. Evidence of a plan that describes how components of this project (i.e., construction, equipment purchase, grant manager selection) will advance is not clearly stated.

a)The applicant does not clearly address the intent of this project to ensure high-need students understand what they are learning, identify learning goals linked to college and career readiness, engage in deep learning experiences, have access to diverse cultures or master critical academic content. The narrative intimates that the district has these foci at the core of its mission, but the lack of text regarding how they are operationalized in the classroom and the district weakens the application. References to CTE courses, PLTW, STEAM curriculum, mastery learning, Walk to Read/Walk to Math programs, out-of-school academic remediation, and peer tutoring, are not accompanied by discussions that expound on how they are integrated into instruction and how they advance this project's creation of a personalized learning.

b) The narrative does not clearly assert that students in project schools will have a personalized sequence of courses that ensures college and career readiness. There is no clear discussion of how the district identifies high-quality content or how students will use the equipment purchased through this project to access digital learning content. While the narrative provides limited details on the district's process for recouping credits and its Response to Intervention program, there is no clear discussion of how these or other accommodations or academic interventions are identified or delivered to high-need students. The applicant does, however, provide brief discussions of the district's STEAM magnet school, PLTW initiative and increased access to CTE courses. It should also be noted that parents are able to access student grades and assignments online. This access will likely facilitate awareness of academic progress.

c)Mechanisms for student training to use instructional tools and resources purchased with this funding were also not clearly discussed..

The lack of specific details regarding personalized learning in the project schools and the lack of a high-quality plan, weakens the application. This selection criteria scores in the low range.

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

**20**

**4**

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan that clearly discusses how the learning environment will be personalized. Simply stating that personalized learning is important without an accompanying discussion of how this will occur in the project weakens the application. There is also no clear identification of how teacher training will support the

establishment or development of a personalized learning environment or a discussion of district-wide instructional strategies to advance rigorous courses of study that are unique to each student's needs.

a) There is evidence that the district engages in professional learning communities (PLCs) for teachers. Weekly 90-minute PLC meetings allow for teacher collaboration to review and develop curriculum. The narrative also references a new teacher evaluation system and the district's intent to use feedback from the evaluation process to improve educator effectiveness. But the connection between PLCs and developing student personalized learning environments is not clearly established in the narrative.

b) The narrative provides evidence that teachers have access to district instructional resources. Teachers use the Skyward grading software and Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies. At least one school has adopted the Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) framework. However, specific details regarding each program are lacking in the narrative.

c) The narrative does not include evidence that details how school leaders and school leadership teams will be engaged in this project. Collaboration regarding attempts to pass bond referendums have already occurred and there is no clear plan detailing how leadership teams will be engaged in activities associated with the current project. The narrative notes that the district has a new teacher and principal evaluation system. The district intends to use feedback from these evaluation systems to determine educator effectiveness. But the narrative is void of details that address how evaluation scores will be used to determine effectiveness, what specific training systems will be put in place to improve student performance beyond PLCs, and how an increase in the number of effective and highly effective teachers will be realized.

Sparse details in the narrative regarding teaching and leading weakens the application. The selection criteria scores in the low range.

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not fully address this selection criteria. The lack of information regarding the district's intent to create or expand efforts involving personalized learning is a significant weakness. It is clear that the applicant is an LEA with six schools in the district and each school's leadership team has appropriate autonomy to operate its educational program. Students are able to recoup credits once mastery is demonstrated, and RTI and Walk to Read/Walk to Math initiatives provide students the opportunity to demonstrate content mastery. The narrative does not, however, clearly address resources that are adaptable and accessible to students with disabilities and ELL students.</p> <p>The combination of a lack of details regarding program components and the district's progress toward or intent to establishing personalized learning for all students severely weakens this application. The applicant's response scores in the low range.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>In that the primary purpose of this project is to add additional classroom space and purchase equipment, the applicant's infrastructure to support personalized learning is not adequately discussed. The applicant does, however, note that students have access to public library resources, afterschool tutoring (for high school students) and math/reading courses during school breaks. Discussions regarding parent and student technical support to access resources is not clearly addressed. The applicant notes that students, parents and educators can access data using the Skyward system, but there is no clear discussion of other systems that interact with Skyward and expand access to other performance data or resources.</p> <p>The lack of detail regarding a personalized learning environment negatively impacts the application. The response scores in the low range.</p>		

#### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score

<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not clearly articulate a high-quality plan to gather feedback and track project progress. The absence of a plan that delineates key goals and activities that reflect expenditures in the budget, a rationale for each activity, an updated timeline for construction and equipment purchase with clearly stated deliverables and persons responsible for executing the activities in the plan weakens the application. The appendix contains an undated construction quote, a 2007 facility planning summary, and a white paper describing the district's restructuring process, but does not address how this particular project will proceed if funds are awarded. The applicant also does not clearly state how it will monitor, measure and publicly share information on investments requested in this application.</p> <p>The inadequate description of how the project will assess continuous improvement weakens the application. The response to this selection criteria scores in the low range.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not provide a clear plan for ongoing communication and engagement with district stakeholders regarding the proposed project. The graphics in section (E)(2) and Table 1 show stakeholder groups, methods of engagement, a timeline and persons responsible. But there are no activities, deliverables or rationales specific to the proposed project. The applicant provides evidence that it has engaged parents and community members in the initial stages of the district's re-visioning process and lists community and school forums convened in the district. However, it is not clear how much support has been garnered for activities slated in this project. The narrative notes that the community will be fully engaged in the planning process once grant funds are awarded. However, outreach gauging support for components of this specific project should have occurred prior to application submission to ensure community buy-in. The failure of two voted-bond referendums indicates that community support may be a concern.</p> <p>The response scores in the medium range.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant presents most of the grade level performance measures required in the narrative. The annual increases noted are ambitious and achievable for a project serving almost 4423 students. However, rationales for each measure are not clearly stated and it is not clear how each measure will be reviewed and improved, if needed. Also, the performance measure charts do not contain required measures (a) and (b) for all populations.</p> <p>Although performance measures were included in the application, required narrative associated with each performance measure was not included. Two performance measures were also missing. The response scores in the middle range.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not clearly address a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the activities associated with this project (i.e., project manager salary, travel, equipment and supplies, and added classroom space). The narrative contains brief references to past program evaluation and the intent to use feedback from teacher evaluations to determine impact. But the lack of evaluation activities and a clear response to this selection criteria weakens the narrative. The response scores in the low range.</p>		

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant identifies all funds currently available to support the project. Grants funds are being requested and state match construction funds are available. The amount requested is reasonable to support the type of activities proposed (i.e., grant manager salary, travel, equipment and supplies). It is, however, unclear if construction costs are reasonable</p>		

because the quote in the appendix is not dated and other appendix documents describing construction are not current. The narrative does not clearly indicate which costs are one-time investments and which are for ongoing operational costs. Also, the budget is not fully supported by the text in the narrative. The narrative does not detail activities associated with construction proposed for this current project and does not provide a comprehensive discussion of how the construction/equipment purchase portion of the application connects to the information contained in the narrative. Therefore, while funds are noted in the budget, the disconnect between the budget and activities described in the narrative and appendix weaken the proposal.

This response scores in the low range.

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

**10**

**1**

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not provide sufficient detail regarding its high-quality plan for project sustainability. The narrative mentions that increases in funding are anticipated by the district and the district will provide resources for activities not paid for by this request (i.e., training, staffing, instructional materials). However, there is little discussion of support from state and local leaders or how the applicant intends to evaluate the feedback from this project to address future district needs. Elements of a high-quality plan are also not clearly indicated in the applicant's description of its sustainability efforts. For example, the narrative does not include a timeline for implementing sustainability efforts, specific deliverables as a result of sustainability activities noted in the narrative, or specific assignment of duties to persons in the district.

This response scores in the low range.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant intends to expand multiple district partnerships but provides details regarding one. The Washington Drug Free Youth Program, designed to provide additional family and student supports to address social, emotional and behavioral needs is slated to expansion under this project. The applicant intends to extend this program beyond the high school into the middle grades. Seven goals are noted and are appropriately labeled as educational or family/community supports. Performance measures (i.e., participation goals) noted are ambitious and achievable. In contrast, the narrative does not provide an adequate description of how the partnership would track the indicators or use resultant data to target resources. Limited details are provided describing how the project would integrate with other services or assess participating student needs, inventory those needs, create a decision-making process, engage parents and families in the decision making process or routinely assess its implementation of the drug free program.

This response scores in the middle range.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not meet this absolute priority. A personalized learning environment is alluded to in the narrative, but details describing how a personalized learning environment will be created under this proposal are not clearly described. Personalized learning is mentioned less than five times in the narrative and only in the broadest terms. There are limited details regarding how the proposed project will build upon assurance areas. The discussion of improving teaching and learning through personalized learning (i.e., strategies, tools, supports for teachers/students) is not comprehensive. The district has a new teacher evaluation system and a focus on improving achievement, but did not adequately describe how personalized learning will be integrated. Mentioning that personalizing learning is a focus without details regarding how that will occur does not fully address the absolute priority.

Total	210	55
-------	-----	----