



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0221PA-1 for Harrisburg School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided demographic information about Harrisburg School District and highlighted a few areas of success (ex. ranked 9th out of Pennsylvania's 500+ school districts and Charter Schools in growth for both reading and math according to the Average Growth Index).

The applicant described the Personalized Academics complemented by Technology in Harrisburg (PATH) vision to establish personalized learning for every student that is developed, monitor and adjust by a team including the student, parent and appropriate school staff. Every student will graduate with the content knowledge and 21st Century skills needed to succeed in college, the workplace and the global society.

The applicant identified and adequately described its four areas of emphasis: (1) Students in HBG will participate in a rigorous, digital learning platform tailored to individual needs, to improve student growth, deepen student learning, and decrease achievement gaps; (2) Improve student outcomes using robust data systems to measure student growth, and inform educators how to adjust instruction targeted to students' individual needs and personalized learning; (3). Increase teacher and principal capacity (teachers, school leaders, counselors, etc.) to design and implement differentiated and individualized instruction; and (4) Create sustainable school and district level systems to support personalized learning aligned with college and career readiness skills. Figure B illustrated a diagram of the four areas with personalize learning environments as the centerpiece.

The digital learning platform will expand digital learning options for students in grades K to 12th grades, via the Canvas Learning platform. The Canvas Learning platform establishes highly effective learning environments in which teachers access a wide variety of educational tools, content and professional development aligned with core standards.

The applicant noted that the district will improve student outcomes by using robust data systems that will guide instructional and programmatic decision making. PATH will provide teachers will a variety of new instructional tools to revise and create relevant, rigorous, and motivating lessons to help students achieve college and career ready standards and graduation requirements. PATH will enable the applicant to align Performance Pathways (Sungard) with the proposed digital learning platform, CANVAS.

In the area of teacher and principal effectiveness, the applicant noted that teachers would participate in on-going, job embedded, differentiated professional development supported by districts and school wide policies and structures to facilitate digital student learning and creativity, design and develop digital age learning experiences and assessments, model digital age work and learning, promote digital responsibility, and improve their individual professional practices. Teachers would participate in professional development to learn how to engage students in exploring real work issues and solve authentic problems using digital tools and resources; promote student reflection using collaborative tools to reveal and clarify students' conceptual understanding and thinking, planning, and creative processes; and design, develop, and adapt relevant, digital age learning experiences and assessments to promote student learning and creativity. Staff will receive small group technical training and classroom-based support to create a personalized learning environment for each student that incorporates effective instructional practices. The applicant did a sufficient job describing how teachers' effectiveness would be enhanced and even mentioned PD for staff but provided limited data on how principals would improve effectiveness.

The applicant notes that every student in grades K to 12 in the Harrisburg School District will have a personalized learning plan that is linked to college and career standards. The plan would be developed by the teacher(s), parents, and the student's input based on their interests, talents, skills, strength, and assessments. Students would participate in a host of career awareness activities in elementary school, engage in exploratory opportunities in middle school and identify and select a career pathway in high school. Students would begin by identifying their interest, talents, skills, strengths, and needs through career assessments, inventories, and career exposure.

The applicant provided a table identifying the project's goals and objectives. Under each goal (Create, and provide K-12 students with a rigorous educational program that is individualized, data driven and technology supported by a digital learning platform; Improve student outcomes using robust data systems to measure student growth, and to inform and adjust instruction targeted to students' individual

needs and personalized learning plan; Increase staff capacity (teachers, school leaders, counselors, etc.) to design and implement differentiated and individualized instruction; and Create K-12 college and Career Pathways to support personalized learning) the applicant provided implementation objectives and the intermediate outcomes. This data provided supporting evidence to the applicant's claims.

Collectively, the applicant gave some supporting details to justify the claims. As it relates to the LEA building on their work, some of the areas mentioned need additional details to demonstrate a clear alignment to the vision. For example, the applicant noted that teachers have CCSS implementation professional development on the weekends but does not provide supporting details that explain the quantity of PD session, who provides the PD training, or how many teachers attended these PD sessions. In addition, the applicant commented on improving teacher and principal effectiveness (3) but only mentioned how teachers' effectiveness would be enhanced. The applicant also mentioned "robust" data systems but did not show evidence as to how these systems work together. More information is needed for these areas to clearly articulate a comprehensive and coherent reform vision; therefore, a score of 7 is given.

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

10

8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a chart that illustrated the PATH goals and an implementation guide for years 1-4. Under the digital learning goal, the applicant noted that in year 1 the personalized learning framework would be introduced using Google Chrome books, in year 2, the personalized learning framework would be implemented, while in year 3, the framework will be refined and monitored. Evidence for year 4 was missing for this goal element.

The applicant described how schools were selected. Harrisburg School District's RTT-D team reviewed multi data documents, and faculty survey results from the 2012 Recovery quality analysis to determine where change is needed most. Data were collected, discussed and reviewed at the District wide Principal's meeting, the Secondary Reform task meetings, and the Partner Response to Intervention and Instruction meetings. Supporting details indicate that all schools in Harrisburg were selected based on the achievement gap between the schools and the state and the district's high transition rate.

The applicant listed the school that will participate in the grant and provided (Table A2) the number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators. Harrisburg City School District will target all of the 6,311 students and 165 educators in our 10 schools. The targeted schools meet the RTT-D selection criteria: 97% of the students in the participating schools are high need students (defined as minority or low income).

Collectively, the applicant provided some evidence to support its implementation approach. The process the applicant used to select schools to participate was addressed but additional details are needed to justify the need for all schools. The schools are different but more evidence to differentiate them would further strengthen the applicant's claims. Including more of the district's scores versus the state averages would have provided stronger evidence, therefore, a score of 8 is given.

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

10

1

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not specifically address the question. Evidence that speaks clearly and directly to how the proposal would be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform was minimal. The applicant did not provide clear or strong evidence of a high quality plan and a score of 1 is provided.

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

10

6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposed that the PATH plan coupled with embedded teacher professional development and coaching strategies will provide a pathway for all students to receive individualize instruction and support to target acceleration strategies to close the achievement gaps. The targeted values displayed in Table (A)(4)(a) are based on the baseline 2013 Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) scores for students in grades 3 thru 8th grade and Pennsylvania's KEYSTONE summative assessment for students enrolled in Algebra 1 and 10th grade Literature course. The goals for ED, ELL, and SWD for various schools in the district need supporting details to justify the claims provided. For example, at Downey math- ED baseline data show 0% with an increase of 5% in year 1 and 15% and 20% increase in year 2 and 3-4 respectively. Also, Marshall Middle Reading data for ELL and SWD show almost a 20% increase in year 1. Clarification is needed to understand why data are provided by individual school.

As it relates to decreasing the achievement gap, the applicant pointed out that the targets for Table (A)(b) are the same as defined in Table (A)(4)(a). Pennsylvania's modified AMO target is to reduce % of non-proficient students by 50% over the five years using 2013 as the baseline. The target in this area is to reduce the gap between the percent of proficient students in ELA and Math in the IEP, ELL, subgroups and all of the other subgroups as compared to the State averages. The district will utilize Pennsylvania's Valued Added Assessment System to monitor the growth of every student and ensure each learner is meeting or exceeding the state standards of at least one year of growth.

In table (A)(4)(c), the data reflect the combination graduation rates for John Harris High School and Sci-Tech High School. The goals for this area are ambitious and achievable based on the evidence provided.

The goals for college enrollment rates do not reflect that of the various student subgroups. The applicant identified the subgroups as 2 /4 year College or University; non-degree granting postsec; specialized associated degree. The evidence for this area is lacking.

The applicant provided optional data for postsecondary degree attainment. It is noted that while college enrollment is a reachable goal, the proportion of HBG students who complete college remains a constant barrier. The applicant is proposing to collaborate with the college and career readiness counselors to work with the students in closing the aspiration-attainment gap (Center for American Progress). (CCRCs) College & Career Readiness Counselors will be responsible for guiding students through individualized career assessments and interest inventories as well as providing career awareness/career counseling.

The applicant addressed each of the elements but additional details are needed to support the claims noted in the performance on summative assessments and college enrollment components. Details why the data are reported by schools would add some clarity to the applicant's claims. The goals for student subgroups would be helpful and would add strength to the applicant's response. Therefore, a score of 6 was given.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided evidence that demonstrates a record of success within the past four years. The district's goal was to pilot the implementation of the STEM focused high school and STEM focused middle school. TABLE (A)(4)(a) demonstrates the students in the STEM middle school inside of the bigger middle school outperformed their peers by more than 65%. Students in the STEM middle school demonstrated above average results on the PSSA and KEYSTONE exams and continuous academic growth in the small school within a school.

In addition, the partnership with GEAR UP assisted the district in improving the high school graduation rate improved from 45% to 51% in one year. The collaboration with the Federal GEAR up program assisted the students in developing college and career readiness skills, complete the SATs, and enroll in college.

The applicant noted that in 2010, the district was successful in securing School Improvement Grants for five of their lowest performing schools. The applicant created the School Transformation Office to take direct ownership of the transformation process and provide one on-one support to the lowest performing five schools. The strategic SIG action plans have resulted in significant growth for three (Rowland; Scott; and John Harris) of the five identified schools. The applicant provided a table to show areas of growth and regression. Some figures for John Harris are missing; therefore, further details are needed to support the applicant's claims.

The applicant does show a TABLE that reflects Harrisburg City School District's Reading Results (Growth Model) for Math. It ranked 9th highest in the state and 2nd highest for the high minority, high poverty school districts in Pennsylvania.

As it relates to student performance data transparency, the applicant highlighted the development and implementation of the extended day learning and the administration of the online benchmark assessments. Students complete the assessment on line and teachers have immediate access to test results and use the interactive reports to set instructional targets, conduct student led goal setting conferences, and refine their instructional practices.

Overall, the applicant addressed each component but supporting evidence is needed to justify the applicant's claims. Some evidence of success was provided but evidence supporting successes in college enrollment rates would have strengthened this element. Data showing how the STEM focused students compared to the state averages and/or other middle schools in the state would have strengthened the claims. In addition, a chart showing the number of students in the Gear Up program enrolling and attaining a degree would have been useful evidence for this element.

In addition, supporting evidence is needed in the area of student performance data transparency. The applicant provided evidence as to how educators and students access data but it is unclear how data is made available to the parents besides the eschool system

(which reports attendance and grades). Additional evidence that shows how the parents use the data to improve participation, instruction, and services is necessary. Based on the evidence as a whole, a score of 10 is given.

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

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

As it relates to increasing transparency in the LEA, the applicant noted that each year the district publishes the per-pupil expenditures, remediation funding, professional development expenditures and other basic educational expenditures as part of its annual accountability report. This information is posted on the Pennsylvania Department of Education Website.

The district publishes actual salaries of staff member that falls within the following bargaining groups including Harrisburg Area School District building administrators and all other positions within the District in all minutes of its School Board meetings which are usually printed in the County-Wide daily and weekend newspapers.

The applicant also noted that following figures for elements a-d respectively: \$33,543,806.45; \$25,418,460.47; \$23,657,347.89; and \$867,520. The applicant does not indicate what the figures represent.

Overall, the applicant provides minimal evidence for the four categories. Supporting details or a chart illustrating the four categories would have strengthened the applicant's claims. Based on the evidence provided, a score of 3 is provided.

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

10

2

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The information the applicant provided lack clarity and does not connect to the overall question of state context for implementation. The applicant highlight a number of instituted reform initiatives such as the educator evaluation tied to student growth (2011), principal evaluation (2012), superintendent evaluation (2012), student common assessments (2013), professional development that support effective instructional strategies (2011), and formative assessments (2011). No supporting details were provided to strengthen these claims.

The applicant mentions two pathway focused schools and the implementation of Cyber Academy, a school within a school and its transition to a blended drop in model. More details would have possibly shown a clearer connection between the Academy and the state context for implementation.

The applicant also describes and identifies budgeted items for implementation of four areas: digital learning, teacher/principal evaluation, student improvement and acceleration, and personalized learning environments. The supporting details for each do not demonstrate successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments.

In addition, the applicant provides an implementation guide illustrating personnel to be hired, teams to be formed, and wireless upgrades to take place.

There are some disconnections between the evidence provided and the overall question. Based on the evidence provided it is not clearly understood the state context for implementation. Therefore a score of 2 is given.

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

15

4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identifies the following groups as participants in the proposal development process: Harrisburg Education Association; Harrisburg School Administrators Association; Harrisburg's Title 1 support staff; Community Representative; Mayor of Harrisburg City; Pennsylvania Department of Education; and Harrisburg Secondary Task Force. No other information was provided for element A.

The following letters from key stakeholders were provided: The City of Harrisburg-Linda Thompson; State Representative-Patty Kim; Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network-Executive Director, Angela Kirby; Harrisburg Public School Foundation-Karen Snider; Harrisburg University of Science and Technology-Eric Darr; Pennsylvania Department of Education, Special Assistant to Secretary-Dale Hamby; Capital Region Partnership for Career Development-Michael Berk; and Senate of Pennsylvania-Senator Robert Teplitz.

Overall, the applicant provided limited evidence to show stakeholder engagement and support. The evidence provided did not show if the LEA participated in collective bargaining; therefore, element A could not be included in the overall score. Although letters of support were included, letters from other key stakeholders such as student and parent organizations, civil rights or advocacy groups would have strengthened the evidence provided. Based on the evidence, a score of 4 is given.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant notes that the proposed project will focus on a four tier framework: a digital learning platform; a data driven learning and assessment system; a career pathways model; and, a system to ensure teacher/leader effectiveness. *PATH* will restructure teaching and learning in the District from a teacher-directed model to a student-centered and focused model.

The applicant asserts that learning will be self-paced, guided by individual assessment, individual goal setting, and individual student monitoring made possible by the digital learning platform and highly re-trained teachers and leaders. Parents and educators will collaborate to develop a student individualized plan and portfolio that will guide their academic course of study and their exploration and immersion in relevant career and work experiences.

The applicant highlights the work of Stiggins (2005)-Assessment for learning model as *PATH*'s instructional approach. This work focuses on the use of standards aligned curriculum maps that are teacher and student friendly for clarity of the intended outcome of learning student motivation (self - monitoring or assessment has been documented as a highly motivational tool as students watch themselves succeed).

Addition evidence asserts that a robust data system and technologies will allow access among students, teachers and parents to content and knowledge anywhere and anytime. The system will also allow the learner access to real-time information on their progress toward goals.

The applicant addresses each of the components. The applicant highlights the integration of the *Pennsylvania Academic Career Education and Work Standards* with the *PA Common Core Standards* and aligning them to the K-12 curriculum. District integration of these Standards will introduce students to the inter-relationship of education with post-schooling and adult life including the exploration of college and careers and how the mastery of educational content skills can be linked to success in accomplishing their career goals. The approach will comprise of K-4 career awareness, 5-8 career exploratory, and 9-12 career planning. The evidence provided was justified by supporting details.

To address the Learning and Development Goals Linked to College- and Career-Ready Standards element, the applicant notes that career development classes, advisories, and collaboration among students, parents, teachers and counselors will assist the student in linking learning and development goals to college and Career Readiness Standards.

Students will have opportunities to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest through the District's Career Pathway programs of study. The program combines career awareness and exploration with academics and allow students opportunities to experience the relevance of education to the world of work, to their goals and aspirations. Supporting details were provided.

The applicant provided sufficient evidence to support its claims. The applicant mentioned that Students will be able to study with students in China and other places around the world through the District's digital learning platform and mobile technologies.

The applicant notes that critical thinking skills will be enhanced by using assessment data (academic, career inventories, leadership and personality scales). In addition, personalization techniques such as advisements, mentoring opportunities and instructional planning will bolster mastery of these critical skills. The applicant provides sufficient supporting details to justify its claims.

The applicant provided a purposeful description for the element that addressed a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and to ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. The evidence provided was meaningful and justified.

In addition, the applicant provided sufficient evidence to support the claims in the following two elements: High-quality content, including digital learning content as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and ongoing and regular feedback. Career portfolios will be used to collect students' progress.

Based on the evidence provided, the applicant addressed each element and provided supporting details to some of its claims. As it relates to a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments, the applicant mentions strategies that will engage students in active learning, technology usage but more details are needed. Evidence that speaks to high quality instructional environments is minimal and additional support is needed to show a clear connection to the larger goals and vision.

In addition, when addressing the mechanisms that will provide training and support, the applicant refers to the e-portfolio and the participation in a series of training and guidance opportunities. It is not clear which mechanisms would support students' use of the tools and resources. More details are needed in this area to further explain this element. Based on the evidence provided, the score of 13 is given.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	3
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant notes that training will also be directed toward professional learning communities (PLC's), administrative supervision (building leaders), and counseling practices.

In efforts to assist teachers with understanding and developing SLO's (Student Learning Objectives), the applicants mentions a series of high quality professional development opportunities that will enable every staff member to identify learning targets for each class they teach. Supporting details are not provided to strengthen the applicant's claims.

In addition, the applicant mentions two data systems: the e-portfolio and the unit mastery data. These data coupled with classroom observations will be the core of professional discussions that occur in the PLCs. The evidence provided does not provide sufficient data to support the applicant's claims.

The applicant did not address the four core components of the question. Partial evidence was provided for only element (a). Based on the evidence, this does not demonstrate a high quality plan as defined in the notice. Data is missing and claims are not adequately supported. As a result, a score of 3 is given.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	3

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not adequately address each of the elements (a-e) listed. As it relates to element (a), the applicant notes that it will form a new department known as the Office of Transformation and Improvement which will focus its efforts on the full implementation of the plan and oversee work that will be done at the district and individual school level. This office will be housed in student support services under the Assistant Superintendent in charge of Educational Services and supervised by an Administrator on Special Assignment (AOSA) (to be hired). The AOSA will manage each of the projects and work closely with district central office staff to a create support structures for each school site/personalized learning environment.

The applicant describes the following teams/committees/coordinators that will be developed and supervised by the AOSA: district level, personalized learning committee advisory, personalized learning committee secondary advisory, district implementation team, and the pathways coordinator. The descriptions identify who the team will consist of, the role of the team, and when the team will meet and report out to.

As it relates to school leadership teams, it is not clear if this was clearly established. The applicant mentions the Personalized Learning Committee Advisory (PLCA) which will be comprised of the Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, PATH Transformation AOSA, a site administrator from each site, a teacher representative from each site, one implementation specialist, and one teacher, two parents representing each site, two counselors, CTE department Chair, and four members from the business

community. Based on the evidence provided it is not clear if this committee will have flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets. More information is needed to determine if the PLCA is equivalent to school leadership teams.

The applicant does not clearly address elements c-e. Evidence for these elements is missing. Based on the limited evidence, the applicant does not demonstrate a high quality plan as defined in this notice. As a result, a score of 3 is given.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	0
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not address this question.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: <p>The applicant notes the plan would involve qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods. Data will be collected and reviewed regularly by the implementation committees that will support project development at the site and at the district level.</p> <p>The applicant mentions the PLC observation protocol that can be used to gather data and provide an insight into the overall effectiveness of the PLC. The supervising administrator and instructional coach will monitor the conversations and identify student progress.</p> <p>As it relates to administer training, the applicant mentions that the district is in the process of assessing administrative staff to determine which staff members have developed turnaround characteristics as part of their daily practice. The baseline will be collected from each school site administrator in January 2014. This information will be used to begin planning the professional support for each site leader. The applicant notes that both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected and reported but not supporting details were offered.</p> <p>In addition, the student data system will be used by individual teachers, common course PLC teams, departments, school support teams, secondary PLC's and the Transformational PLC to utilize student and teacher data to improve student performance. The applicant points out that every student will be closely monitored in every classroom using data to verify that they are meeting mastery. Discussions about individual students, groups of students, and professional practices will be conducted regularly.</p> <p>Addressing school to career development, the applicant states that the use of this data system will be monitored closely at all schools/learning environments and all project leadership teams. Evaluation will start with development of the tool. Once the tool is up and running an evaluation system will be set up to measure its success in supporting students, parents, and staff. Evaluation will consist of student and parent surveys, monitoring data collections that verify student completion of school to career requirements.</p> <p>The applicant describes the public communication and information distribution by stating that the district will be developing quarterly reports that will identify student performance and professional practice data that define project implementation and student performance. The parent staff advisory will work to share information and develop outreach programs that will increase access between the school site and the community. Information will be shared in multiple media in multiple ways including local television, radio, internet, and newspapers.</p> <p>The applicant provides inadequate evidence of a high quality plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process. There were some disconnections between the applicant's descriptions (curriculum and assessment structures; professional learning communities; administer training; implementation of PLCs, data driven systemic improvements; counselor PLC; school to career development; and public communication and information distribution) and an improvement process. The evidence provided was not supported by meaningful and applicable details. How the applicant will monitor and measure its investments was weak. Based on this evidence, a score of 7 was given.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In this section, the applicant mentions that Strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders have been skillfully crafted throughout this application in order to drive transparent system wide improvements. The supporting details did not support the applicant's claims.</p> <p>The applicant commented about the learner-centered classrooms and the longitudinal e portfolio. The longitudinal e-portfolio provides a data system that students and families can follow as they seek to move students from sixth grade through high school meeting college and career ready expectations. Utilizing this system data will be updated on a bi-weekly basis so that students can see if they have requirements posted in that tool. Parents will also be attending quarterly trainings to access information about student requirements and student performance.</p> <p>The evidence provided does not fully address the question and therefore, does not demonstrate evidence of a high quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement. The applicant needs to provide supporting details to strengthen this question. Based on the evidence provided, a score of 1 is given.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a set of tables that addresses state level, district level, and classroom level assessments and notes that the assessments were selected because they could be used to effectively measure student progress towards college and career level mastery.</p> <p>The Pennsylvania System of State Assessment (PSSA) and the Middle School Criterion Reference Tests (CRT) were selected because they are the center of the state accountability system. Data can be used in ELA and Mathematics to determine if a student has earned base level proficiency and can also be used to measure success between subgroups. The assessments can also be used to measure growth among common peer groups (data can be used as a student performance component for teacher and administrator evaluation).</p> <p>The applicant provides two tables (one for Harrisburg Area Middle School and one for John Harris High) describing the purpose for selecting the assessments. For example for the middle school (6-8), the purpose of the ELA and Math PSSA was that the State exam was used to verify school AYP and student basic skills- measure both growth and status while at the high school (9-12), the purpose for selecting the Math and ELA CUPA was because the assessments were used to demonstrate standard mastery throughout the year. When fully developed they will provide information about state performance levels. (Data can be used as a student performance data component for teacher and administrator evaluation)- College and Career Ready Indicator. The applicant provides reasonable explanations for selecting the measures.</p> <p>The table (All applicants-a) show that the percentage of students with highly effective teachers and principals is 100% for baseline. The data revealing the number of students who are on track to college and career readiness show only all participating students; the subgroups are not provided. This information is also true for the number of students who took the SAT, ACT, or ASV AB.</p> <p>It appears that some data are missing or needs justification as to why it is not present. It is not clear how the measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information tailored to tis proposed plan. More details are needed in this area to strengthen the claims. In addition, the applicant did not make it clear as to how it will review and improve the measure over time. Based on this lack of evidence, a score of 1 is given.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide evidence that demonstrates a high quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed activities. Therefore, a score of 0 is provided.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant referred a table that illustrated the budget categories (personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual, training stipends, other and indirect costs) and the budgeted figures for year 1-4. The total cost of the proposed plan was \$15,487,432.00; \$5,496,400 went towards personnel and \$1,845,872 toward supplies.</p> <p>The applicant noted that project costs were based on actual quotes and the average salaries and benefits for similar positions in the Harrisburg area. This evidence was provided to address component b.</p> <p>To address the component c, the applicant noted in the narrative that the budget provided illustrates a description of all funds and identifies the funds that will be used for one time investments vs. those that will be used for ongoing operation cost.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant provided a table (4-1 Project1) that illustrated the budget categories (such as personnel, equipment, etc.) with a cost description and assumption for years 1-4. For instance, there were 4 equipment needs (Chrome notebooks- 1 for student and 1 for teacher; SMART boards, and wireless connection) and a description of its cost, use, quantity, etc. This table added some support to the overall budget chart.</p> <p>Overall, the budget narrative was weak and the claims were not supported with sufficient or reasonable evidence. It was clear from the evidence where all funds that will support the project will come from. There was not enough evidence to clearly determine if the plan is reasonable and sufficient to support the project goals. Although some evidence was provided to support component c, supporting details were missing which made it difficult to determine if the budget depicted elements that would ensure long term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided, a score of 3 was given.</p>		

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant noted that HBG would put a number of core supports by the end of the grant period and hire a certified auditor, who will monitor the implementation action plan. The applicant also noted that weekly meetings would take place to solicit feedback, and document progress, regression or next steps and ongoing gap analysis.</p> <p>No additional information was provided to further explain the sustainability of the project goals in particular how the applicant would evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget, and include an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds.</p> <p>The applicant did not discuss the specific support that would be provided from the state and local government leaders or any other stakeholder who provided a letter of support. The evidence provided does not demonstrate a high quality plan; therefore, a score of 1 is given.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a table (population-level desired results) that identifies the population group (all elementary, all middle, and all high school students) with the desired results (reduce the achievement gap by 50% and demonstrate continuous progressive growth).</p> <p>In addition, the applicant identifies the summative assessments being used; the methodology for determining status, and the methodology for determining growth. For example, the assessments mentioned included the PSSA, KEYSTONE, and PVAAS; the methodology for determining status consisted of the PSSA, KEYSTONE, and common unit assessment results; and the methodology for determining growth were the PVAAS and the common unit assessment results.</p> <p>The applicant also provided a table displaying the goal area (reading, math) at various schools with the baseline and performance goals for the following subgroups: African American, Hispanic, White, SWD, ELL and ED.</p>		

No other evidence for this section was provided. The applicant did not cover the six components and the evidence provided did not show a coherent and sustainable partnership to support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1; describe how the partnership would track selected indicators that measure each result or strategies to scale the model beyond the participating students; nor did the applicant describe how the partnership would integrate education and other services for the students. Based on the limited evidence, a score of 1 was given.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identified and adequately described its four areas of emphasis: (1) Students in HBG will participate in a rigorous, digital learning platform tailored to individual needs, to improve student growth, deepen student learning, and decrease achievement gaps; (2) Improve student outcomes using robust data systems to measure student growth, and inform educators how to adjust instruction targeted to students' individual needs and personalized learning; (3). Increase teacher and principal capacity (teachers, school leaders, counselors, etc.) to design and implement differentiated and individualized instruction; and (4) Create sustainable school and district level systems to support personalized learning aligned with college and career readiness skills.

The applicant provided a table identifying the project's goals and objectives. Under each goal (Create, and provide K-12 students with a rigorous educational program that is individualized, data driven and technology supported by a digital learning platform; Improve student outcomes using robust data systems to measure student growth, and to inform and adjust instruction targeted to students' individual needs and personalized learning plan; Increase staff capacity (teachers, school leaders, counselors, etc.) to design and implement differentiated and individualized instruction; and Create K-12 college and Career Pathways to support personalized learning), the applicant provided implementation objectives and the intermediate outcomes. This data provided supporting evidence to the applicant's claims.

The applicant provides some evidence of how its vision would likely result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals. It also identified some supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

As it relates to learning, the applicant notes that the proposed project will focus on a four tier framework: a digital learning platform; a data driven learning and assessment system; a career pathways model; and, a system to ensure teacher/leader effectiveness. *PATH* will restructure teaching and learning in the District from a teacher-directed model to a student-centered and focused model.

Based on the overall evidence provided, the applicant Met Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	74
--------------	------------	-----------

Race to the Top - District



Technical Review Form

Application #0221PA-2 for Harrisburg School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a1.

The applicant mentions that the district has realigned curriculum maps and has adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), it is not clear how these maps and standards are actualized across K-12 classrooms. The description of district policies and how the teachers are moving their instruction and assessment toward these new standards are not clear. It is also not clear what types of related college and career-aligned assessments are used in the district.

a2.

Data systems of "Performance Pathways" and "eschool" are mentioned by the applicant but it is not clear how these two systems work together in a comprehensive way in measuring student growth and success, inform teachers and school leaders with data about how they can improve instruction. It would be helpful to clarify how the online assessment system gathers the relevant student data that is needed in providing timely feedback for educators. The applicant provides limited evidence as to how these data systems are used within the various teachers and leaders in the system to improve learning for students.

a3.

The applicant has provided limited evidence as to how it is recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most. The teacher development around CCSS is described in generalities (page 32). Both weekend professional development and on-going, job embedded professional development is mentioned but not fully detailed as to how these strategies are focused on teachers at the most needed schools.

a4.

The applicant has not provided enough evidence as to how this proposed work builds on the work of turning around their lowest achieving schools. While the applicant does list the various partnerships and grants that it has been awarded to support its lowest performing schools, there is limited evidence as to how the district is building from this work funded by these sources and/or partnerships.

b.

The digital learning platform (PATH) (page 33-34) proposed by the applicant is limited in details. It is unclear what this digital platform is, how it will be implemented across its targeted schools, and how this system works in accelerating students' academic outcomes. While the overall vision around the capacities of what the proposed PATH would accomplish, the approach lacks credible details as to how it will personalize student learning, build on students' interests, and transform the applicant's current approach to teaching and learning.

The four goals and associated outcomes listed have promise. However, the goals and the intermediate outcomes as written are not framed in ways that are measureable and grow over time. As a result, it is difficult for the applicant to measure its growth and achievement of outcomes within the project period. Additionally, it is unclear how the outcomes differ across the various needs of the school sites. Because the applicant has not detailed the various needs across each of the schools and school populations, these goals and outcomes are broad and blanket K-12 under the assumption that the implementation issues and needs are similar across schools and student populations.

c.

It is unclear how the outside vendor, "Canvas Learning," platform will be utilized by students and teachers in a personalized learning environment. It is unclear whether this vendor's resources and tools are of high quality and are CCSS-aligned. Additionally, the applicant has not provided any evidence of prior evidence of success of this platform in independent

studies or within the applicant's lowest performing schools. As a result, it is difficult to ascertain whether the investment in this platform will generate student-learning outcomes proposed by the applicant. Additionally, it is unclear how this platform will be fully differentiated across each of developmental grade-spans (e.g. early elementary, late elementary, middle, and high school) and various special populations (e.g. English language learners, students with disabilities, and gifted and talented students).

The vision of the personalized learning plan has promise. However, it is unclear how students, teachers, and school leaders interact over the project period in developing this plan with students. The host of career awareness activities and exploratory activities are not clearly specified so it's difficult to understand how these strategies work in complement with the blended learning proposed.

Overall, the applicant scored a 3/10 because it poorly articulated a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on each of the four educational assurance areas, poorly describes what the classroom experiences would be for students and teachers, and weakly describes a credible approach that will accelerate student-learning outcomes. Additionally, the proposed work doesn't make it clear how it plans to build on existing resources, capacities and structures of strategies that have evidence of success within the district.

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

10

4

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a and b.

It is not evident what types of data the applicant team used in determine which schools would participate in this work and how the various teams worked together in analyzing these data sets in determining the criteria by which schools would participate in this work. The data presented for the STEM schools and non-STEM schools did not further clarify the needs by specific schools. Rather, it created a portrait of a school system that had two sets of schools with divergent summative academic outcomes. It is unclear which of these 10 schools listed are a part of the School Improvement Grant schools that have had significant academic gains using some of the strategies proposed. Of these 10 schools listed, it is also unclear which of these schools is STEM focused and which schools had higher academic outcomes. These details regarding the academic outcomes of these 10 schools are important because the applicant's strategy across each of the schools will vary based on the needs at each of the school site.

c. Total # of participating students.

The applicant has provided total number of participant students at each of the participating school sites.

Overall, the applicant scored a 4/10 in this selection criterion because the applicant provided limited evidence as to how its approach would be implemented across the diversity of its schools. The applicant highlights the range of outcomes across a number of the STEM and non-STEM schools, but the approach proposed does not fully address how the strategies would be fully differentiated between these two types of school populations.

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

10

2

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a weak plan in how its proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change and help it reach its outcomes goals. The implementation overview lacks in details related to how the activities work together in a coherent way in supporting its big goals. In addition, it lacks details as to persons responsible for each strand of work proposed. The implementation strategies proposed are described in generalities and are not aligned to the work at any specific school or student population.

As a result, the applicant scored a 2/10 for this selection criterion because the applicant failed to fully articulate the key components of a high-quality plan. These key components include: rational for major activities, specific timeline of work, and parties responsible for implementing each of the key activities.

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

10

4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The core goals listed for the applicant district is described in generalities.

It is not clear how the applicant set the growth rates across the various subgroup populations at each school site. The applicant claims that projected annual increases are somewhat higher for some targeted subgroups and somewhat less for other subgroups but do not detail which subgroups have higher growth rates and the rationale behind these differences in

goals.

The measures regarding the summative assessments are not fully detailed. It is not clear how the applicant will provide common unit assessments across all subjects as the tools and instruments for these other subjects are not detailed and the summative growth rates over the project period are also not detailed. Additionally, it is not clear whether the common unit assessment materials are Common Core aligned. The applicant has not provided evidence whether these common unit assessments can be used as a measure for students' college and career readiness.

It is not clear how the use of these assessment tools will work together with instruction in decreasing the achievement gap that is mentioned by the applicant. The tools and data generated will not necessarily reduce the achievement gap themselves. It is unclear the type of targeted accelerated support that both teachers and students will receive in closing the achievement gap. The applicant has provided limited evidence as to what actions or strategies it plans to take in closing the achievement gap for each subpopulation both at the school level and at the district level.

It is unclear how the PATH model proposed by the applicant would generate an increase in graduation rates. There is limited evidence proposed by the applicant that explicitly addresses how it plans to work at the secondary level in increasing the graduation rates for its students. Similarly, in regards to the rates of college enrollment, it is unclear how the PATH model proposed would generate an increase in college enrollment rates. There is limited evidence proposed by the applicant that explicitly addresses how it plans to work at the secondary level in increasing the college enrollment rates for its students.

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	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides limited data as to how it has had a record of success in the past four years in improving learning outcomes and close achievement gaps within its district. The case that has been highlighted is that of the implementation of the STEM schools in the district. It is not clear whether the increase in student outcomes may have been a selection bias within the district where students and families self-selected themselves for the STEM school with the lower achieving students to have remained in the non-STEM school. As a result, it is difficult to take one set of comparison school data and determine whether the growth in test schools was that of the strategies implemented at the STEM schools or that of selection bias within the school population.

b.

The applicant provides evidence of increased academic outcomes in 3 of its 5 lowest achieving schools for only two years (2011 to 2013). It is unclear what the outcomes were of the 2 other schools that were part of the SIG grant. For John Harris School, the data for only one year is listed so there is not enough evidence as to whether these growth trends have continued since 2012. Additionally, some of the data points for grade 4 are not present so it's unclear why that data has not been included in the three data charts used as examples records of success.

c.

The applicant has not demonstrated strong evidence as to how student performance data is made available to students and families in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Simply saying that information is available for review by students and parents doesn't translate to them using that data to increase their learning opportunities and generate higher academic outcomes. This is similar to the case for teachers and educators who have access to this data. It is unclear what mechanisms will be in place for educators so that the data that is available to them can be used to make improvements in their instruction for their students.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has described ways that it provides each of the four categories listed in selection criterion B2 as publically available data. It is not clear whether all of the minutes of its school board meetings are printing in the local paper as the applicant states that these minutes are "usually" printed in the local papers. The inconsistency of the publically available data sources weakens the applicant's argument that it has an established track record of demonstrating a high level of transparency. Additionally, the applicant has not provided concrete evidence, attachments, or examples in the appendix

related to any of the four categories of school-level expenditures. As a result, the applicant scored a 2/5 for minimally meeting this selection criterion.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
--	-----------	----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not clearly provide adequate evidence in describing the conditions or the autonomies it has present in implementing a personalized learning environment for its targeted schools. While the applicant has mentioned that it has a number of reform initiatives such as educator evaluation tied to student growth, principal evaluation, superintendent evaluation, and common student assessments, there is not a connection between these conditions to that of the proposed reform efforts proposed by the applicant. For example, the strategy of the cyber academy is not fully articulated and it is not clear how the conditions of the school support this strategy. Additionally, the applicant lists a number of blended learning content providers that it intends to use for its activities. The applicant has not provided adequate evidence as to how any of the blended learning tools have had prior success in its schools and evidence that would support how these tools would improve student achievement. It is also unclear how these resources would be fully integrated across its K-12 schools and adapted into the classroom environment.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	1
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided very limited details and evidence as to how it has developed meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development and support for the proposal. While the applicant provided a list of groups that were represented in the review process of the proposal, it is not clear what the level of support for each of the listed groups have been for the proposal development process. The letters of support provided by the applicant do not match the list of stakeholders that are detailed within the narrative. Additionally, it is not clear how each of the teams will serve as ambassadors for this initiative and provide feedback in developing an action plan for implementation.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a(i) The applicant has listed a number of K-12 approaches that are promising in supporting students' understanding of what they are learning. However, the applicant does not describe in detail how this work will be actualized in schools, who will be leading the work, and the content of the work itself. The list of strategies is not described in any detail and it is unclear who will work with students in creating individual plans and portfolios over the K-12 continuum. Additionally, the applicant mentions that college and career counseling will be available for all students, but details regarding how this strategy will be implemented is not present so it is difficult to assess how this strategy fits into the larger theory of action of the applicant's proposal.

a(ii) The applicant has not demonstrated adequate evidence as to how it intends to support students in identifying and pursuing their own learning and development goals linked to college and career standards. While the applicant lists a number of strategies such as career development classes, advisories, and collaborations with students, parents, teachers, and counselors in developing these learning goals, it is not clear how these work will be actualized across all 10 schools, in each of the classrooms, and for each student over the course of the project period.

a(iii) The applicant does not fully detail the strategy of career pathways for its students as a way of involving students in deeper learning experiences. That is, it is unclear how students enter these pathways, what the partnerships of these pathways are, how these pathways are defined across various career trajectories, the type of leadership and staffing that may be involved in this work, and how students engage in deeper learning experiences within each of these pathways.

a(iv) The applicant provides limited details and evidence as to how the proposal will provide students access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual learning. The applicant does not detail how the project-based learning would support this work as it is unclear what resources will be used in developing these project-based learning experiences and what teachers would need to do in supporting this type of learning. While the applicant mentions that using the technology will assist in this type of student learning goal, there is not enough detail provided as to how the technology will be used across all 10 schools, in each of the classrooms, across and within content

areas, and personalized by individual students.

a(v) The applicant provides limited details and evidence as to how it will provide students in mastering critical academic content and develop skills and traits as detailed in selection criterion C(1)(a)(v). While the applicant state that it will provide opportunities for students to develop these specified skills and traits, it is not clear when, where, how, and with whom these students will be working with over the course of the project period. The idea of scaffolding the work for students holds promise but this strategy is not fully articulated as it is unclear how teachers will do this work with students.

b(i) The applicant has provided limited details as to how it plans to provide a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals. The description of the plan is vague and does not include adequate details as to who would be leading this work across each school and within each grade span. The timeline of work is also not present. It is not clear who the career advocates will be and what work they will do with each student. None of this work are situated as part of a high quality plan that brings the various strategies together in a coherent and comprehensive way in meeting its goals and vision of the larger program of work.

b(ii) The applicant does not provide adequate evidence and details as to the types of instructional approaches and environments it intends to build through this proposal. While the applicant lists that it plans to foster stronger relationships with smaller organizational structures and programs for students and teachers to spend time together, it is unclear what the mechanisms will be in supporting that vision. The Scope of Work plans for each school is mentioned, but it is unclear how will be working on that plan and how this plan works in the larger context of both the district work and the student level work in promoting student achievement.

b(iii) The applicant lists a small number of potential technology products that it intends to utilize with students and teachers are part of the work in providing each student with access to high quality digital learning content. The list that is provided is more a list of tools than content providers. For examples, Office 365 is a tool for students to use in managing and generating content. The applicant does not provide a plan as to how participating students will have access to these technological tools in and outside of the classrooms. Additionally, there is not a correspondence between the tools listed to that of high-quality content accessible to students.

b(iv) The applicant provides weak evidence as to how it plans to provide ongoing and regular feedback in accelerating student learning. It is unclear how teachers would be accountable for this input and feedback. Additionally, it is not clear how parents and students would be actively engaged. Minimal details are provided about students' electronic portfolio and how students would interact with this over the course of the project and their educational career.

The role of the implementation specialist is unclear. It is unclear how these specialists will bring teacher teams together at the school site over the course of the school year and how school leaders and district leaders would be supportive of this work.

b(v) The applicant does not provide adequate evidence as to the accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students. The Personalized Learning Plan (PLP) does not necessary target specific high-need students. Other components mentioned in this plan are not well defined. For example, it is not clear what type of new infrastructure will be present at the middle and high school that will be present to accommodate the applicant's strategy of career exploration and planning. The applicant does not provide details as to what the new infrastructure will be nor how this new infrastructure will be used to support its highest need students.

c. The applicant has generally described the mechanisms that students will use to in understanding how to use the tools available to them. The idea of e-portfolio as mentioned by the applicant is promising. However, it is unclear how students, teachers, and families will interact with this system. The applicant does not provide examples of what the e-portfolio would look like and how the e-portfolio will be used by key stakeholders over the course of the students' academic career.

Overall, the applicant received a low score of 4/20. While the applicant provided some components of what it intended to do over the course of the project period, the plan lacked the clarity and details that is critical in a comprehensive plan. Many of the components of a plan have not been detailed and of the activities that were listed, they were disconnected from one another and didn't connect to the larger goals and vision of work proposed by the applicant.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	1
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has failed to detail a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing students' learning environment. The applicant briefly describes the use of professional learning communities (PLC) as a mechanism for teachers to learn about the strategies proposed as well as a venue for teachers to discuss the findings. The various structures of PLCs provided are general and do not provide adequate details as to how this work would be actualized in schools.

Overall, the applicant received a low score of 1/20 because it provided very limited details as to how participating educators would be working together in a coherent and comprehensive way in advancing the personalized learning agenda across its 10 schools. Because there was limited evidence provided by the applicant, it was difficult to award additional point values across each of the C(2) Teaching and Leading sub-criterion.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	2
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided limited evidence as to how the LEA central office will be organized to support the work proposed. The organization is loosely detailed regarding the new transformation department and the composition of personnel in that department. Only titles of the position are given and it is unclear whether there are currently personnel who will fulfill these positions or that the applicant would recruit for these positions when the grant is funded. Similarly, the team composition at the school site is described in generalities. It is unclear the type of power and autonomy these school-based leadership teams will have over the course of the project period as the applicant has not provided evidence related to school leadership teams' flexibility and autonomy of such factors as school schedule and calendars, personnel and staffing, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets.</p> <p>The applicant has not provided evidence in addressing sub-criterion D1, parts c, d, and e.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	0
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has not provided any evidence in the narrative to support the selection criterion D(2) parts a-d.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided limited evidence as to how it would go about implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that moves the work toward its project goals. While the applicant lists a series of seven approaches that may be promising for teams as they collaborate and make adjustments and revisions to their work, the explicit process of continuous improvement has been detailed in limited ways across each of the seven approaches listed. For example, in the work of the implementation PLCs, it is unclear how these various teams will be using the student and teacher data system to improve on student performance. The actual work of these groups is described in generalities. That is, it is unclear how these actions are fully connected to the work of personalized learning for each student and how these continuous improvement processes will differ across school sites with various needs.</p> <p>The applicant has provided a general plan of public communication and information distribution for the public. While providing reports in multiple languages are important, it is unclear whether the applicant fully understands the language needs of the parent community and will be able to align its resources for this type of communication outreach efforts. There is also a lack of clarity in the roles and responsibilities of the parent staff advisory council. Their work is described in generalities and not part of any cohesive plan of action over the course of the project period.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant scored a 3/15 because it did not detail a high-quality plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process. A high quality plan needs to be composed of the following key components: key goals, activities to be undertaken and rationale for activities, timeline of work, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing the activities. While the applicant provided some components of an implementation plan, the details around the components were not well detailed and when taken as a collective, the plan lacked credibility of success in meeting the project goals.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scored a 1/5 because it did not detail a high-quality plan for implementing an ongoing communication and engagement process with internal and external stakeholders. A high quality plan needs to be composed of the following key components: key goals, activities to be undertaking and rationale for activities, timeline of work, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing the activities. While the applicant provided some general strategies around ways that it plans to engage with stakeholders, it has not fully detailed out who those stakeholders were, how each of the mechanisms detailed would target those stakeholders, and who these teams would be working in tandem in achieving the applicant's larger communications and engagement goals. Taken as a whole, the details around how the applicant plans to engage with key stakeholders were poorly articulated and the plan lacked credibility of success in meeting the project outcomes.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided limited details as to the performance measures across each of the grade spans and the rationale behind each of the measures and how these measures work together in informing the applicant's implementation success. Measures for grades K-5 are not fully explicated or have not been included fully in the narrative. The applicant has not provided data for the number of highly effective teacher and principals' growth rates across the performance measure tables. For the Pre-K3 tables, the subgroups only include African American males (AAM) and SWD and do not include other sub-categories such as ELLs and students identified as high need. The applicant has not provided rationale as to why these two sub-categories have been identified, while other sub-groups have not been included.

Overall, the applicant scored a 1/5 for this selection criterion because it provided limited details as to the type of performance measures it plans to use in assessing its big goals. Most of the performance tables were not completely filled out, so it was difficult to understand the growth goals the applicant had planned to set for its participating students.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not provided any evidence of a high quality plan in rigorously evaluating the effectiveness of the proposed activities.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has provided limited information within the budget narrative as to clarifying the various funds that will support the project and justification as to whether the funds requested for the project is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal. The budget tables provide additional information regarding each of the cost assumptions and limited rationale for the project, but there is a lack of cohesiveness around how each of these investments (e.g. personnel, equipment, supplies, and contracts) work together to support each of the applicant's big goals or project areas. The applicant has also not identified whether the funds would be used as a one-time investment versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has not satisfactorily provided adequate evidence as to how it plans to sustain its project goals beyond the project period. The applicant has not provided a plan of how it will continue the work with non-RTTT funding. The core supports as mentioned by the applicant are vague and does not provide enough details to make up a coherent plan of action for sustainability.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has not provided adequate evidence as to how it intends to meet the selection criterion of the competitive preference priority. No explicit partnerships have been detailed or mentioned within the narrative in supporting coherent and sustainable partnerships. The applicant repeats the performance measures that have been detailed in an earlier section but does not provide additional information as to how these duplicate measures would be used to augment student and family supports to schools.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has not met the absolute priority.</p> <p>In regards to the four core educational assurances, the applicant has not demonstrated comprehensively ways that it will use college-ready standards and assessments that will be used to accelerate learning gains across the various sub populations. For example, the applicant has not provided a coherent theory of action in which the PATH model would be implementing across its 10 schools for all participating students. The components within the PATH model are not well articulated as the components do not explicitly address how students' participation in these activities would allow students to meet college-ready standards and assessments.</p> <p>The applicant has not detailed out a clear teacher career and performance compensation system for its teachers and school leaders. The applicant has provided limited evidence as to the autonomies it has in how it plans to recruit, reward, and retain highly effective teachers in the system. While the applicant has detailed some mechanisms as to how teachers would work together in PLC structures, there is still a lack of clarity as to how teacher would work together in developing the skills and knowledge needed to be a highly effective teacher or school leader.</p> <p>Lastly, the applicant has demonstrated limited evidence that it has produced results in its lowest achieving schools. While the STEM focused schools received strong academic gains, there was limited evidence provided that showed that these gains grew from actions of specific strategies implemented by the applicant. That is, it is not clear whether these gains at the STEM schools were that of reshuffling school populations where students and families self-selected to be part of these STEM schools.</p>		

Total	210	35
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0221PA-3 for Harrisburg School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A(1) (a)

The District sets forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in the four core educational assurance areas. This is evidenced by the District's current restructuring of teacher and principal evaluation. This incorporates student growth and other measures. The District is implementing "realigned curriculum maps" and adopting CCSS at the District and classroom level. There is on-going "job embedded CC professional development. The District also uses a "robust data system" which aligns with "the district's current online assessment systems to identify individual teacher and teacher student match data." The District also has introduced "evidence based strategies" to improve student performance.

A(1) (b)

The District articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. This is evidenced by their proposed program "PATH" -- Personalized Academics complemented by Technology in Harrisburg. It's four pillars are 1) Students "will participate in a rigorous, digital learning platform tailored to individual needs, to improve student growth, deepen student learning, and decrease achievement gaps" 2) Improve student outcomes using robust data systems to measure student growth, and inform educators how to adjust instruction targeted to students' individual needs and personalized learning 3) Increase teacher and principal capacity and 4) create sustainable school and district level systems to support personalized learning aligned with college and career readiness skills. The District sets up a compelling argument not just for each individual pillar as a way to support the personalized growth of the students, but how each pillar will support the district as a whole toward moving each student forward.

A(1) (c)

The District describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. This experience includes a very robust Digital Learning Platform. The Canvas Learning platform "establishes high effective learning environments in which teachers access a wide variety of educational tools, content and professional development aligned with core standards. The District will also use Skoolboo and Khan Academy resources to help personalize the learning environment. The PATH project will also help teachers use data to make real-time decisions to monitor individual student growth. Teachers will also participate in on-going professional development to support the personalized learning environments, be it digital student learning or "face-to-face" environments.

The District addresses all aspects of the overall question as well as the individual subsections with detail and a coherent reform vision.

10

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A(2) (a)

The District provides a description of the process that the applicant used to select schools to participate. The District gives a robust reason why it chose to select all schools in the District. After looking at data throughout the District, it felt that all schools needed support and that its PATH system would be a very good way to provide that support. Even though the District's STEM focused schools did well and that there might be a compelling reason to only focus on non-STEM focused schools, the District as a whole scores almost half as well as the State average on reading and math proficiency exams. Thus, making PATH district-wide was very compelling

A(2) (b)

The list of schools is provided.

A(2) (c)

The total number of students in all subsections is provided.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A(3)

The District does not address this subsection in its proposal. With holistic grading it is possible to glean pieces of their application plan. However, there is no discussion of a scale-up or how the proposal will lead toward meaningful reform. The District's plan to provide meaningful reform to the entire District and help the District reach its outcome goals is high quality. The PATH program is designed to address all District schools and thus the scaling up is embedded in the overall project.

However, the District does not articulate this and does not have a subsection A(3) in its proposal. With holistic grading this section can receive partial credit.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The District's PATH program is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA(s), overall and by student subgroup. The PATH program is robust and addresses all aspects of a high-quality plan as described previously in this review. Additionally, the PATH program is designed with the personalized learning of each student at its heart and truly incorporates that into all aspects of the program.

The District has three core goals in their Comprehensive strategic plan 1) Close the achievement gap, 2) Improve Graduation rates, and 3) Elevate student growth overall. These core goals, along with the PATH program, interwoven with the goals articulated in this section all lead to a vision likely to lead toward student success.

A(4) (a)-(e) The District has created ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are respectful to each targets subcategories with the intention of creating "district wide improvements and reduce the achievement gap" Additionally, the District's algorithm for figuring out the goals "exceeds the CRO five point annual increases." The District also highlights which assessments it will use for specific goals.

The District provides more than enough information to address each subsection of this question. However, in the college enrollment piece there are questions about titles and descriptions.

The only concern is that some subcategories are too ambitious. Most goals are 100-150% over the baseline. Yet, a few goals exceed the baseline data by over 1000%. SWD reading proficiency going from 7.8% to 81.56% in five years, ED reading proficiency going from 0% to 80.20% just seems unrealistic. However the District should be commended for creating goals for not just the District but each school within the District.

9

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The District shows a clear record of success as evidenced by its STEM pilot program which lead to students scoring over 65% better than their peers. Additionally, the District demonstrated "above average results on the PSSA and KEYSTONE exams and continuous academic growth in" the areas that received the STEM pilot program. This pilot program heavily informed the District's PATH program with is the basis of the RTTT-D proposal.

The District, while working with GEAR UP, raised the high school graduation 6% in one year. This collaboration also lead to students "developing college and career readiness skills, complete the SATs, and enroll in college," with "90% of the students enrolled in post-secondary college, university or career institute."

The District with the use of a SIG grant was able to raise student achievement in three out of the five of its low performing schools. Lastly, the District has made great strides as compared to the State and rank 9th over all using a growth model approach in math and 2nd "highest for the high minority, high poverty school districts in" the State.

The District also shows how by using on-line assessments, teachers "have immediate access to test results and use the interactive reports to set instructional targets, conduct student led goal setting conferences, and refine their instructional

practices."

However, the availability of these high caliber assessments and reports is limited to the teachers. Parents and students have access to "student attendance and grades."

The District shows a compelling ability to lead change for student success for the years of success are confined. Additionally, the parent and student accessibility to ways that inform and improve participation is lacking.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The District has attempted to make transparent its processes, practices and investments.

The District answers all subsections, however, there is little explanation. The numbers are given and we are told that all information is accessible.

This is a medium response since the answers are there but it is hard to tell how transparent the process, practices, or investments are to the public.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

According to the District, there are no State "impediments to the reforms proposed through the RTTT-D PATH project." The State already allows for "acceleration at the middle school level by demonstrated mastery of competencies rather than seat time." The District has also created student common assessments and professional development that support effective instructional strategies and formative assessments. Additionally, the District's use of Cyber Academy as a "school within a school" to help support students increase their rates of learning in classrooms is allowed by State Law as well. The State has also supported educator, principal, and superintendent evaluations tied to student growth. The Personalized Learning Environments that the District describes all seem well within the state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements of the District. Thus, under State law the District has successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments described in the District's proposal.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	3
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The District has not shown meaningful stakeholder engagement and support. Though the District stipulated that it completed a "comprehensive review process" this process was not discussed at all. Additionally, the only groups that were represented were the District Education Association, the School Administrators Association, the Title 1 support staff, the Mayor, the State Dept of Ed and the Districts Secondary Task Force and "Community Representative"

No description of how students, families, or teachers were engaged.

Letters of support were provided from key stakeholders, but none from families or students.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The District has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The District's plan included an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all their students that enables participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs. The District's plan, PATH, is a high quality plan that will lead toward improved learning.

For learning C(1)(a)(i) students understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. The District will integrate the state Academic Career Education and Work Standards with the State Common Core Standards with the entire K-12 curriculum. This will introduce students to the inter-relationship of education with post-schooling and adult life. The District highlights that K-4 will focus on Career Awareness, 5-8 on Career Exploration, and 9-12 on Career Planning. Additionally, College and career counseling will be available to students throughout their K-12 experience.

C(1)(a)(ii) Students will "identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college and career ready standards and/or college and career ready graduation requirements. Students will have advisories, career development classes as well as having their Individual Learning Plans incorporate college and career goals. Student will also have electives "related directly to career interest."

C(1)(a)(iii) Students will be able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. As described earlier, students will have a range of opportunities "to be involved in deep learning" through the District's Career Pathway program. Additionally, the digital learning platforms described earlier will expand opportunities for students to participate in "rigorous and deep learning experience anytime, anywhere."

C(1)(a)(iv) Students in the District will have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning by "participating in exploratory opportunities related to their career interests." They will be exposed and interact with business partners and community members who represent the diversity of the school community. The District will also use interviews, in-school speakers, and mentors to represent the diversity of the school community. The technology of the District will allow students to explore outside of their community and around the world. However, how that will happen is not discussed or explained, other than by using "digital learning platforms and mobile technologies."

C(1)(a)(v) Students will be able to master critical academic content and develop the skills and traits mentioned in the prompt using the personalized learning strategies discussed by the District. A robust data assessment of academic, career inventories, leadership and personality scales, will be used to create an Individualized Learning Plan. Each student will also have advisement, mentoring opportunities, and instructional planning to master the skills.

C(1)(b)(i) As mentioned before the District will create a scaffolded system to get students to be college and career ready. The three part career awareness, exploration, and planning coupled with face-to-face and digital learning based on individual on-going formative assessment will allow for a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development. Each student will have their skills and interests taken into account when moving through the District's schools. The student will even be afforded a "Career Advocate" to "stress the importance of successfully completing courses and participate in planning each student's individual plan."

C(1)(b)(ii) The District will provide a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments by providing "ongoing professional development that will prepare teachers to use instructional strategies that engage students." Exploratory programs, mentoring, and shadowing, providing students with "real-world opportunities" as they explore a career pathway. Students will have "modified mastery learning, cognitive/learning style-based approaches, authentic pedagogy and assessments aligned" to the CC and "apprenticeship programs with guided practice, exploration and teacher coaching."

C(1)(b)(iii) The District will provide students with high-quality content through digital learning as well as face-to-face instruction. The District will even use university students to help the District students to improve technology skills. Though mentioned throughout the proposal. This section does not address the specific high-quality content that the students will be receiving. This section is very weak on what exactly the content is that the students will get.

C(1)(b)(iv) (A)(B) The District has a robust way of giving ongoing and regular feedback through an "integrated platform for educators, students, and parents." Each stakeholder has access to real-time tools that inform instruction. Individual student data is updated through the District's Instructional Management System. Educators will be able to link students to appropriate learning paths to address their needs. Because of the data, each student will have a personalized learning recommendation based on their individual skill and knowledge level as well as interest.

C(1)(b)(v) The District has many high need students and feels that their program will support them, especially since the underlying pedagogy of the program is based around theories that are supposed to support low performing schools. The

Districts lays out a plan to improve student learning through creating the personalized learning environment and assisting students who enter high school with poor skills. The District has set out a new infrastructure to deal with all students but especially geared toward high need students, such as student advisement and mentoring. This section is clearly trying to address the needs of high needs students but it does not show a differentiation for those students as strongly as is needed. It is also very much focused on high school and middle school students and does not make much if any mention for younger students.

C(1)(c) Students as well as families will receive "training that will help them access the e-portfolio." Students will be "required to participate in a series of high quality training and guidance opportunities." Middle and High School students will start with an introduction of the e-portfolio and will receive on-going training a minimum of once per quarter. With additional resources, the District will strengthen these sessions and incorporate more training throughout the year.

The District does a strong job addressing an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, especially through career readiness activities. However, the District seems to forget about its elementary students and does not robustly explore what the high quality learning experiences the students will receive outside of job and career embedded work.

15

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

20

3

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The District attempts to create a high quality approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students, in particular high-need students. However, the District's explanation of the approach is cursory, only exploring the ideas of teachers developing "Student learning objectives" and creating Professional Learning Communities.

Though the District is correct in highlighting the "greatest predictor of students success in reading and/or mathematics is the quality and preparedness of the classroom teacher," how the District will increase the teachers skill in do the aforementioned is vague. District states that it will create a "comprehensive training program." Training will be directed toward PLCs, administrators, and counseling practices. This section just seems incomplete.

The ideas of PLCs and SLOs are strong, but the analysis and explanation are severely lacking.

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:

The District has practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalize learning by

a) organizing the central office to provide support and services to all participating schools. This is evidenced by the Districts proposed creation of "the Office of Transformation and Improvement." This department will "focus its efforts on the full implementation of the RTTT project plan."

b) providing school leadership team flexibility and autonomy. This is not evidenced in the proposal. School leadership teams seem to have access to the District but their flexibility and/or autonomy, especially on the subjects mentioned in the question are not discussed.

c) giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery not time. This has been evidenced in previous sections of the proposal, with a mention that in middle school the students can show mastery. However, it is not mentioned in this section, nor is it clearly stated in other parts of the proposal.

d) giving student the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple way. This has been stated in previous sections within the PATH program. Students, using digital learning are exposed to different ways of performing. But a specific discussion about demonstrating mastery at multiple times and in multiple ways is not mentioned.

e) providing learning resources and instructional practice that are good for all students especially SWD and ELL. This is not overtly evidenced. In fact there is little to no conversation in the entire proposal concerning SWD or ELL. Though the

District does go into detail about resources and instructional practices within in the digital learning and PATHs discussion, there is none in this section or with respect to SWD or ELL students.

This section is not of high quality since it did not address the question fully.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The District does not address this section of the question specifically. Throughout the proposal the District does mention that students will have access to technology and that parents will have the opportunity to take classes to learn the e-portfolio. There was also a description of a technology support structure that would help support students, parents, and educators in understanding the digital components of the program. However, this is from a myriad of sources throughout the proposal and not indicated for this question.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The District attempts to have a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. The District provides ways for timely and regular feedback on progress toward the goals and opportunities for ongoing correction and improvements. The District does this by following what it had already done for its SIG projects. As the District states, it will be "utilizing qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods," to see if the it is progressing towards its goal. The District will have common course teachers "come together to establish learning targets and develop common post assessments." Having the teachers come together will help determine the on-going needs of the District. The District will also create PLCs. These PLCs will help monitor student progress and identify interventions needed once data is collected and analyzed. Additionally, the District will be training administrators to better understand the data. The administrators will be mentored and then asked to demonstrate their skill in "data discussions, PLC observations, and classroom observations." Other topics the District suggests that will support the ongoing improvement of implementation are the implementation of PLCs with a focus of data driven systemic improvement. There will be the creation of a Counselor PLC and the school to career support of the e-portfolio.

Though the District provides multiple programs in which it feels that continuous improvement will happen, there is very little articulation of how there will be timely and regular feedback and how exactly information will be monitored or measured.

This is not a high-quality explanation, because the reader is not told how data will me monitored or measures or shared only that it will be.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The District will engage in ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders by supporting the myriad of PLCs. These PLCs will engage with each other as well as the school community as a whole. There will also be constant updating of data in the Districts systems so that students can see their progress.

The District does not address the ways in which communication and engagement will occur only that PLCs will communicate. It does not address the idea of actually adjusting the proposal/plan but only how teachers or students might adjust their instruction/work product to succeed. There seems to be a disconnect between the question the District is answering and the one the grant is asking.

1

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The District's states that it has chosen the targets to be at "Proficient" level. The explanation is that using "this level, students will be able to exit high school without requiring remediation in reading or math." The specific assessments are chosen because they are at "the center of the state accountability system."

However, the District does not state how these measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. Additionally, the District does not address how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. Furthermore some of the performance measures are blank or don't seem to be tied to any rationale.

This is a low quality answer because it does not address the subsections.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The District does not address this section.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The District does not create a cohesive budget narrative but explains each item, and thus this is a middle quality section. The District provides a budget with monies focused on the proposal, but does not describe a thoughtful rationale.

Though the District does not provide a thoughtful rationale within this section, the PATH plan has been articulated in other sections and thus the budget does seem to align with the program. Additionally, it is hard to divine which budget lines are for one-time investment verse ongoing operational costs, but much of that can be inferred by the type of budget item.

The District provides a budget that identifies all the funds that will support the project. Though it should be noted at only \$80,000 will be contributed from other sources as compared to over \$15 million from the grant. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the proposal. Most of the grant monies go to equipment and salaries which fits into the PATH program, because it is so technology dependent. The salaries are for new roles like 13 "teacher technology facilitators."

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The District does not address this section anywhere in the proposal.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The District does not address this section. There is no conversation about how the District proposes to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students, giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The District meets the absolute priority because it shows that through its PATH program a student will have a learning environment that will significantly improve learning and teaching through personalization. Through the program, students will participate in a rigorous, digital learning platform tailored to individual needs, to improve student growth, deepen student learning, and decrease achievement gaps. The District will also "engage students, and provide technology to create and implement K-12 blended learning environments that combine face-to-face, online, and digital instruction that is rigorous, technology rich and individualized." The District will also develop, monitor, assess, and refine individualized student learning plans. The District will implement competency-based models to support and accelerate students' progress through their learning plans. The District will also increase teacher and principal effectiveness by implementing comprehensive PD plans and differentiated PLCs. The District will provide ongoing, sustained classroom based support to teachers in the area of personalized learning and digital learning platform approaches as well as provide intensive support, clear expectations, and research based strategies for educators and principals. The District will implement college and career readiness pathways to meet individual student needs and interests, embed evidence of personalized learning plans into the teacher and principal evaluation framework, and embed continuous improvement systems at all levels from PD to instruction into school wide outcomes.

The District lays out a very clear and comprehensive plan and thus meets the priority. However, within the proposal the details of the plan are not all fleshed out and thus this proposal suffers.

Total	210	90
-------	-----	----