



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0187CO-1 for Harrison School District Two

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>

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

For A1a, the applicant meets this criterion by clearly setting forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that really does build on previous work within the four core educational assurance areas. For the area of college- and career-ready standards, they have revamped their curriculum to align with the common core, and to instill 21st century skills. They are now moving to the next level to focus on cognitive complexity and the transference of understanding using the understanding by design framework. Their goal is ensure that a student who can read; communicate well, both verbally and in writing; do math, and demonstrate proficiency in 21st century skills such as working in teams, information literacy, and economics, will not only be better able to enter college, but, should the student choose not to go to college, be better able to enter the vocational trades, military, or a higher level entry position in the workplace.

For the area of assessment, the applicant noted recent reforms which included an enhanced district assessment process which encompasses all grade levels and content areas, and occurs four times per year. Data is used to help improve instruction, but is also used to monitor teacher and principal effectiveness. The applicant will build upon this work by implementing a 1:1 device for all teachers and students, with teachers using a learning management system for documentation, tracking, reporting, and delivery of e-learning courses, and to personalize learning in unique and individualized ways using the immense resources on the internet as well as varied software aligned to student need and interest. Students will become engaged in their own learning that includes the necessary personal technological devices use to tack learning goals through data and other feedback.

For the area of effective teachers and principals, the district has already implemented a teacher and leader evaluation system that is based on effectiveness and results, and as tied to salary increases. They will continue to expand on this system by working to even more effectively tie data to quality and alignment of instructional practice. They will also be adding expectations within the evaluation system related to the creation of individualized learning environments for students.

For the area of turnarounds, the applicant profiled the incredible success the district has seen in the past few years, turning around their district of nearly 11,000 students (with 70% in poverty) which had been labeled "accredited with improvement" in 2010-2012, to "Accredited" in 2013. In January 2013, a new superintendent was hired, and is working to now take the district to the next level. In addition to a number of district-wide reforms, they have identified six "schools of promise" to undergo strategic innovative practices, including extended years, extended day including dinner, effective teaching and administrative staff, mathematics fellow programs, and high expectations for all.

For A1b, the applicant meets this criterion, by articulating 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. The applicant clearly summarizes their next steps the reform process, leading them to personal learning environment in which students are setting and monitoring their own learning tied to a rigorous curriculum and complex learning strategies, leading to college and career readiness. This will involve a 1:1 technology environment for all 6-12 students; enhanced dual enrollment, on-line usage, and other opportunities to earn college credits; and further refinements to their teacher and leader evaluation system to ensure a highly effective teacher and leader for every student.

For A1c, the applicant almost fully meets this criterion by describing how students will become more engaged in their learning and monitoring of progress, by having more options to each college credit, by having 1:1 technology; by having extended learning opportunities within the targeted schools; and by being challenged to become college and career ready. For teachers, the applicant describes then using technology more to customize learning and to track progress; by being trained by intensively in various areas; and by being held to even higher standards that include 21st century skills. While these descriptions are good, the applicant needed a some details on what the actual classroom experience will be like for

students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments will actually look like (e.g., what would a typical day for teachers and/or students be like).

The applicant scores in the high range.

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

**10**

**8**

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

For A2a, the applicant meets this criterion by noting that 20 of the 24 schools in the districts will be participating, with the 4 independent charter schools not being involved (in part because they are independent, and they also do not have as high of a poverty concern). For the rest of the 20, all teachers and students will be involved, with the 1:1 technology device being implemented for students in grades 6-12 (starting in high school and moving to the middle schools). Elementary students will have access to devices on a 4:1 ratio and an enhanced technology curriculum to ensure they are ready for the 1:1 starting in 6th grade). There is no need for additional phase-in since the applicant proposes to serve all students in all schools in the consortium; however, they do not justify clearly why the decision to include all students in all schools immediately within the first year is the best means to ensure the success of their implementation efforts.

For A2b and c, the applicant meets this criterion by including the list of the 20 participating schools, and the required data, including the total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators. The data listed for each of the 20 schools clearly shows that they far exceed the minimum level of 40% free/reduced lunch.

The applicant scores in the high range.

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

**10**

**6**

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

For A3, the applicant partially meets this criterion by summarizing the overall structure of the district and how it is focused on supporting all 20 of its traditional public schools. The reforms proposed in this grant will be involving all students and teachers in the district and thus scale up to other schools and/or students in not necessary. Instead the applicant describes how these proposed reforms will build up existing work, and help the overall district scale-up their reform levels even further. In addition, the applicant does clearly articulates how these proposed reforms will help them reach their outcome goals.

A missing piece is that the information is not provided in the format of a high quality plan, where it is clear exactly what the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible are for these LEA-wide reforms and change.

The applicant scores in the middle range.

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

**10**

**6**

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

For A4a, the applicant offered the following performance goals:

- 5, 8, 10 Reading and Math Proficiency scores. The applicant offers baseline and targets for students overall, and as broken down by ELL, poverty and minority. The targets are more conservative, improving by 1-2% per year overall, and for each subgroup.

- 5, 8, and 10 Reading and Math Growth percentile (CO Growth Model). The application offeres baseline and targets for students overall (nothing broken down by subgroups), and the target are conservative, improving by 0.5 - 2% per year.

For A4b, the applicant offered the following performance goals:

- decreasing reading and math gaps at the elementary, middle and high school levels, for poverty and minority subgroups (as compared to white students). Baseline data is offered, as well as conservative targets (decreasing 0.5 - 2% or so per year).

For A4c, the applicant offered the following performance goals:

- Increasing the high school graduate rate, overall and as broken down by subgroups (Latino, African American, Male and Female). Baseline is offered (from 2 years ago since recent year will not be available until December), and conservative goals of increasing about 0.5% per year are offered.

For A4d, the applicant offered the following performance goals:

- Increasing the college enrollment rate, overall and as broken down by subgroups (Asian Black, Hispanic, FRL). Baseline is offered, and conservative goals of increasing about 1.5% per year are offered.

Overall, the applicant offers good ambitious and generally achievable goals, but does not include any narrative to help link how the applicant's vision is likely to help them achieve these performance goals. They do not indicate that these goals are equal to or exceed the state ESEA targets, and their subgroup breakdowns are not consistent for each goal (and not included for all of them). The overall targets were also more conservative, making them more likely achievable, but again, there was no narrative to explain the rationale beyond setting their targets.

Overall the applicant scores in the middle range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

### (B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

For B1a, the applicant meets the criteria that requires a clear record of success in improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps, including student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment. As an example for student achievement, they note that they went from being below 50% for both math and writing four years ago (and 61% for reading), and in 2013, they are now above 50% in math and writing, and 67% for reading. Within the state's growth model, they now exceed the state medium for all three areas, with math most notably moving from the 48th percentile to the 57th percentile. For high school graduation rate, they went from 64% in 2008 to 72% in 2011.

As examples for closing the gap, they provide data charts in the appendix showing the decreased gap between minority and White students on the CSAP reading and math assessment, decreasing the reading gap from 16.3% in 2008 to 12.40% in 2011, and the math gap from 16.70% in 2008 to 13.10% in 2011. They offer similar data for students in poverty, going from a 22.40% reading and math gap in 2008 to 15.40% in 2011.

In reference to college enrollment successes, nothing was mentioned in this section, but data provided as part of their baseline for their LEA-wide goals, reveals that their percentage of Black enrolling in college increased from 45.3% in 2012 to 51.2% in 2013, and FRL students from 39.5% to 51.1%. Their average ACT has also gone up from 16.8 in 2010 to 19.2 in 2013.

For B1b, the applicant partially meets this criterion by sharing their overall improvement data for the district as a whole (since many of their schools were low-performing giving the district a lower rating on the state accountability system), and then describing the targeted efforts that had occurred with three schools that had fallen under the "improvement" sanctions, with each of these showing gains to have come out of this status in 2012. They noted that intensive focus will be occurring this year in five "schools of promise," with an intensive focus on extending learning time and math interventions. However, they did not offer specific data for these three schools relative to their achievement score changes over the past few years.

For B1c, the applicant partially meets this criterion by noting that they have implemented a district database which allows parents and students to view timely grades and attendance, and have begun the implementation of a data system to house the achievement data as well as educator effectiveness data. This would allow staff to have timely access to achievement results and empower them to disaggregate data to support instruction. What is missing is any information on a clear track record of performance data being made available to parents and students in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.

Overall, the applicant scores in the lower high range.

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

### (B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

For B2 (1-d), the applicant meets this criterion by noting that they make available the data required by this criterion, by providing it both to the state department (as part of public files), and also have it posted on their website under a link called "financial transparency." They also included a table that provides the four data pieces for each of the 20 participating schools, noting that this was taken from their publicly available civil rights report, and that this data is publicly available as broken down by school.

The applicant receives a high score.

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>For B3, the applicant clearly meets this criterion. They begin by identifying that their state is only one of six with a constitutional requirement for local control of instruction, and that their school board have the autonomy to create and implement instruction, curriculum, and assessment plans for the students that they serve. Their current district strategic plan, coupled with individual school unified improvement plan goals, include the creation of individual learning plans for all students, with the authority for implementing such ILPs to district educators.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant describes a number of state laws recently enacted which will provide support for this district's implementation of this grant proposal. The state's READ Act requires individual plans for students who are reading below grade level and adds parent communication, and that this is already being done via the districts' strategy plan that address student literacy by developing an individualized student literacy plan (ILP). They also note the state's educator effectiveness law that requires all teachers and principals be evaluated half on their performance and half on their student's achievement results, and that their district had all ready put such a system into place, and they have one of the most rigorous pay-for-performance plan in the nation. The state also requires that all 9-12 students to develop and manage and individual career and academic plan (ICAP). There is also a requirement to align preschool to postsecondary education in the state, and that the district's strategic plan focuses on postsecondary readiness. They also are required to develop an advanced learning plan (ALP) for the gifted and talented students, and work with the response to intervention model. All these were offered as examples as to how the state policies are already in alignment with the need to provide individualized learning environment, and the district's work is also in alignment with this. The proposed grant will help them pull all of these individual plans into one electronic form.</p> <p>The applicant scores in the high range.</p>		

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>
--	-----------	----------

<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>For B4a, the applicant barely meets this criterion, by noting the district has a very active "very involved parents (VIP)" group and through this network they sought input and built support for the proposal. They also noted the existence of an active Superintendent's advisory panel that includes members for 10 official community partner organizations, as well as affiliated organizations like the YMCA, NAACP, League of United Latin American Citizens. This group was also informed of the plans to apply for this grant, and met the concept with enthusiasm. They also note that this proposed plan is already embedded in the district's strategic plans for the past few years, and that significant engagement had occurred during that plan development as well.</p> <p>However, they did not indicate how they engaged teachers and students in the proposal development, nor how they used the feedback that they did receive for others within the development and/or revisions of their plan. Also, they did not include any evidence that at least 70% of their teachers from participating schools support this plan. Instead they note that they are not a collective bargaining district, and thus there is no teacher organization to solicit feedback from.</p> <p>For B4b, the applicant partially this criterion by including 11 letters of support as follows: community partnership for child development, parent/volunteer, CO department of education, community college president, Colorado College president, University of Colorado at Colorado Spring Chancellor, regional business alliance, Retired air force academy professor, Space Foundation, US Senator, Colorado Spring Mayor. While this is an impressive collection of letters, especially from the higher education community, missing are any letters from teachers, parent groups, or student organizations.</p> <p>Given no evidence that a least 70% of their teachers support the plan, and some other missing engagement requirements, the applicant scores in the lower end of the middle range.</p>		
---	--	--

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>

<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>For C1a (i-v), the applicant partially meets these criteria. The applicant clearly identifies the many ways the district is already working with parents and students to (i) Understand that what they are learning is</p>		
---	--	--

key to their success in accomplishing their goals; (ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals; (iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest; (iv) Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning; and (v) Master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving. For example, they already have students and parents engaged in creating their individual career and academic plan (ICAP) which is a personalized postsecondary plan that helps ensure readiness for postsecondary and workforce success (and they have this as an assessment point for counselors within their educator effectiveness system). Their curriculum is rigorous, and their educator effectiveness system monitors things like having a culture of high expectation for learning and achievement, how effectively each teachers has created a personal learning environment where each student is involved in self-monitoring and goal setting, and how educators are teaching students 21st century skills and abilities. The grant will be used to help provide 1:1 devices which teachers will use to help expose students to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives, and help them better find meaning and connections to the content.

For C1b (i-v) & c, the applicant partially meets these criteria. Again they note that a number of these criteria are things already happening within their district, but they are lacking the 1;1 devices for all educators and students to help manage in a more effective manner the data surrounding the teaching and learning process. They report that they do currently have a personalized sequence of instructional content to make sure students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready (criterion i), and that they use a variety of instructional approaches (criterion ii). They note their current curriculum offers high-quality content and access to digital learning experiences (criterion iii), and they currently measure the achievement of academic content via district assessment (administered on a quarterly basis), teacher-created assessment/assignments and the state assessments, and that such data is used by teachers to monitor student progress toward the standards and to also adjust and personalized curriculum as needed (criterion iv A and B). They also shared examples of how they use response to invention and other strategies to offer accommodations and other strategies for high-need students, including a summer school program which not only helps students below grade level or ELL, but pairs a distinguished experienced teacher with their new teachers to educate these students as part of a New Staff Institute/ support structure for new teachers. And they note specific items within their educator effective system that do assess each educator on the degree to which they things are occurring with their students, and this data all rolls up into a pay-for-performance system. They also describe how students and teachers will be trained on the new 1:1 devices and the learning management systems which will help them track and manger their learning (criterion c).

Overall, this applicant really did cover every elements within this section, detailing both what they have already done and how the grant will be used to move them even further, except it was not provided using the format of a high quality plan, and thus detail on the specific activities, timelines, deliverables, and person responsible is not always clear. They note that their School Supervisions and Leadership SSL) department will lead the design and facilitation of professional development and they will hire a Director of Personal Learning to oversee the these activities, but no specific timelines were offered.

The applicant scores in the higher middle range.

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

**20**

**18**

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

For C2a (i-iv), the applicant meets these criteria. They describe how all of their teachers are currently supported via ongoing job embedded professional development, involving mentors, grade level planning with team members, grade level leaders, and professional learning communities, in addition to direct training. They also have instructional coordinators assigned to each school to help with specific needs-based support and feedback at both the building and individual classroom level (criterion i). They note how teachers are required to create personalized learning environments, and that this is monitored by their effectiveness system (criterion ii). They describe the many teacher, district, and state assessments used in the district and the data that is then available for teachers to take action (criterion iii). And driving much of this in a systematic manner, they have a very detailed and intensive educator effectiveness system (criterion iv) involving 8-16 documents spot observations per year from building leaders, and 2-3 spot observations from district-level

instructional coordinators. Many also have a peer coaching structure, and all also receive 1-2 formal observations and one summative from building leaders as part of the overall evaluation system. Data from this system is used for performance-base pay and placement decisions. And a significant teacher professional development and support system is in place to help all teachers become highly effective, and the grant efforts will build upon this system.

For C2b (i-iii), the applicant meets these criteria. They describe the many teacher, district, and state assessments used in the district and the data that is then available for teachers to take action (criterion i) (although they currently have to pull from many data bases which is one focus area for improvement via this grant). They have district-prepared standard assessments (which are used for all grades and all subjects 4 times per year). They have access to instructional coordinators who provide needs-based support and who are responsible for the implementation of the professional learning environments at each building (criterion ii). They currently have lots of data to help match student needs with specific resources and approaches to provide feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs (criterion iii), but note that an overall database that allows quick assess to all data will be a significant enhancement as part of their grant efforts.

For C2c (i-ii), the applicant meets these criteria, by having information that helps school leaders assess and take steps to improve educator effectiveness and school culture and climate (criterion i), and have training systems and practices to improve school profess toward increasing achievement and closing the gaps. Details for these practices are noted within the descriptions above, and the grant will build upon these existing efforts.

Overall the applicant is planning to use their grant funds to implement 1:1 devices for teachers and students, integrated data and learning management systems, and the training needed to accomplish this. To this end, they close this section with a summary table that details the elements of a high quality plan to implement such training to support the teachers, leaders, and students. For example, it notes that one goal is to train our teachers how to have their students complete their writing in real-world and collaborative digital media, with this being done by April 2014, for all teachers, and notes the specific people responsible. However, this plan was only focused on the first year, and only on the specific training topics, not all that needs to be done by who, and by when. The applicant scores in the high range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>For D1 (a-b), the applicant meets these criteria, by clearly describing their district structure of oversight and support for principals and teachers. Indeed their central office is organized to have significant staff available to assist principals and teachers (criterion a). There are three overall School Leadership Officers, with two working with their own cluster of elementary schools and one working with the secondary schools. Each elementary group has 3 instructional coordinators each, and there are five such coordinators for the secondary one. These school leadership officers provide support to the building principals while the instructional coordinators provide support to the classroom teachers. But they make it clear that the principal at each building is the instructional leader, and works with a school-level leadership team to plan, create processes that align to their school needs, and then implement initiatives (criterion b). The principals are in charge of staffing, evaluating, and firing personnel based on their identified building needs. They note that principals are vary autonomous, but are held highly accountable for the student achievement at their school.</p> <p>For D1 (c-e), the applicant partially meets these criteria, by describing how principals can create flexible schedule that maximize the instructional time for students, and that students will have greater personal responsibility in their learning and will be given the tools and feedback to set goal's, and monitor their learning. They note that having the 1:1 devices will allow greater use of various online resources, and they plan to explore earning credit through on-line courses and other resources. They note that this will allow students to accelerate or remediate their own learning on their own time with teacher direction and facilitation. They also noted how adaptive technology for students with disabilities will also be more available, and more for ELL learners as well (criterion c). What was not covered was information as to how they would be giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic, and giving them the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. They also do not, however, detail all elements of a high quality plan as to who will be doing what, and by when, for the activities needed to accomplish the goals for this area.</p> <p>The applicant scores in the lower end of the high range.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

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

For D2 a and b, the applicant partially meets this criterion. The information the applicant offers in this section appears to have been cut and pasted from another document (perhaps their current district technology unified improvement plan which they mention), so the information does not always directly address the criterion. They do detail several ways in which the district might go about implementing the 1:1 device for students in grades 6-12 (and a 1:4 for the other grades). They describe district purchasing as compared to a bring-your-own device after receiving a stipend from the district, so it is not clear what the district is really planning to do. In addition, the applicant describes the type of technical and infrastructure support that will be needed to implement such a system.

For D2 c and d, the applicant partially meets this criterion. Nothing is mentioned at all in this section as to how they will use information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning devices (criterion c); although this was touched upon just briefly in another section that this would be a goal to have easy access to data for both students and parents. They also do not specifically state anything about making sure that the district and schools use interoperable data systems (e.g., systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data), but this was somewhat implied as infrastructure issues were profiled in this section. They also do not detail all elements of a high quality plan as to who will be doing what, and by when, for the activities needed to accomplish the goals for this area.

Overall the applicant scores in the lower end of the middle range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>For E1, the applicant meets this criterion, by describing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. They also address how they will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by the grant, namely the 1:1 learning environment and personalized learning. They identify the responsible parties to oversee aspects of this monitoring (e.g., Grant Manager, Grant Director, Instructional Coaches, Research, Data &amp; Accountability Department), and note how some existing data collection systems will be modified (i.e., student and teacher surveys) to include items that related to the implementation of the personal learning environment.</p> <p>Missing are specific timelines as part of a high quality plan for these activities and goals.</p> <p>The applicant scores in the middle range.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>For E2, the applicant partially meets this criterion by describing various avenues by which the district plans to continue to share information with, and engage, various stakeholder groups. These include updates at regular meetings of the Superintendent's Advisory Panel (which include a broad representation of community partners), and also there are twice a year mailing of the district newsletter to over 30,000 residents. They also noted they could add some questions to their annual survey of randomly selected residents and parents to ascertain the level they are adequately informed regarding the condition and direction of the district. They also note that principal meetings are held every other week, and one a month the assistant principals attend as well. These meetings will serve as a way to both share information with school leadership, who in turn would share with their teachers, as well as gain input from the schools.</p> <p>While this information is good, absent was how such ongoing communication and engagement might lead to adjustments and revisions during the implementation, and the response did not include all elements of a high quality plan (although timelines and persons involved could be ascertained from the narrative for the proposed activities in this section).</p> <p>Overall the applicant scores in the middle range.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>

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

For E3, the applicant offers the following performance indicators:

- For all students, # and % of students with an Effective Teachers and Principal, and those with a Highly Effective Principal. Applicant did not provide baseline or annual targets for students overall, but did for a "high need, low income" subgroup. The baseline for this group (for highly effective) is 14%, growing by 1-3% each year until it hits 22% in 2017-18; the baseline for effective is 43%, growing to 57%. A rationale was provided in the narrative for the use of these performance indicators.
- For grades K-3, % proficient and advanced on district assessments for Reading, Math, Health/PE. Applicant did offer baseline data, for all students and for the ELL and SPED subgroups (for reading and math), and Minority and SPED subgroups for Health/PE, with modest annual targets of 1-2% gains each year. For example, the SPED group would go from 33% to 39% by 2017/18. A rationale was provided in the narrative for the use of these performance indicators.
- For grades 4-8, the narrative notes they would be using a pre/post assessments for grades 4-5 focused on college and career readiness. However, this was not profiled in the required tables. A rationale was provided in the narrative for the use of these performance indicators.
- For grades 4-8, TCAP proficiency status for Reading and Math in 5th and 6th grade, as well as the Median Growth Percentile (from the CO Growth Model). For the math and reading proficiency measures, they offer baseline data for all students and as broken down by ELL, poverty, and minority subgroups. Growth targets are modest, increasing 1-2% per year. For example, ELL 5th grade reading would go from 57% to 63% by 2017/18. For the reading and math median growth percentile measures, this data is only presented for students as a whole, and again have modest annual targets of 0.5 - 1%. For example, 5th grade math would go from 52.5 to 55.5 by 2017/18. A rationale was provided in the narrative for the use of these performance indicators.
- For grades 4-8, a measure on Bullying Prevention and Awareness (using a student survey), with baseline data offered for all students and as broken down by male and female. Modest annual targets are offered, increasing 1-2% per year. For example, females would go from 24% to 31% by 2017/18. A rationale was provided in the narrative for the use of this performance indicator.
- For 9-12, #/% students completed FAFSA. Applicants offered baseline and annual targets for all students and then as broken down by ELD (ELL?) and SPED. Larger annual increases are projected to be 4-6% per year. For example, the number for all students would go from 40% to 63% by 2017/18. A rationale was provided in the narrative for the use of these performance indicators.
- For 9-12, two measures are offered to track # and % on track to college and career readiness, however the tables do not make it clear which measures these are. In the narrative, they mention tracking 9th grade credit attainment, as well as the ACT, and the CO Growth Model. It is not clear from the 2 tables, which measures these are. For both baseline and annual targets are offered for students overall, and as broken down by ELL and SPED.
- For 9-12, % of 12th graders meeting or exceeding the College and Career Ready Benchmarks on Accuplacer. Baseline and annual target data is offered for all students as as broken down by ELD and SPED. Modest gains of 1-2% are targets. For example, the SPED students would go from 5% to 11%. A rationale was provided in the narrative for the use of these performance indicators.
- for 9-12, Student Survey on Bully Prevention and Awareness. Baseline data are offered for all students and as broken down by male and female. Modest annual targets are offered, increasing 1-2% per year. For example, females would go from 28% to 35% by 2017/18. A rationale was provided in the narrative for the use of this performance indicator.

Missing from the tables are any of the CO Growth Model measures for the 9-12 that were noted in the narrative.

Overall the applicant scores in the upper end of the middle range. What they have is good, and the narratives provided a rationale as to how such data will support the overall strategy of the reform efforts regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. But some data were missing in the tables, and not all of the required subgroups were always present. Nor did they indicate how they will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>For E4, the applicant partially meets this criterion, by noting that they will be hiring a research analyst to work within their Research, Data, and Accountability Department to handle all of the data acquired from the teacher and leader effectiveness system, and the vast amounts of student outcome data (currently needed to support their pay-for-performance system). This analyst will focus on those data that will help evaluate the effectiveness of the personalized learning program. In addition, they plan to hire an external evaluator to assist the research analyst in evaluation of the data compiled to monitor the program.</p> <p>Adequate detail was provided to demonstrate their plans to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of the grant, but not all elements of a high quality plan were present, such as when these hires would occur, and other key goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties. The applicant score in the middle range.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>For F1, the applicant partially meets the criteria. They offer a narrative and the budget detail needed to support three major projects: staff development and training; personalized learning environments; technology integration; and grant and program management. The narrative which describes and justifies the expenditures for each of the projects is clearly aligned with the rest of the proposal, and all requested funding appear reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. Within the budget they do not specifically identify which of the one time investments, but they do offer that detailed information within the sustainability section of the proposal.</p> <p>They identify a total amount that will come from other funds to support each of the three major project areas, but do not identify and describe where those additional funds will be coming from (criterion F1ci).</p> <p>The applicant scores in the high range.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>For F2, the applicant meets this criterion by detailing how the core aspects of the grant will continue and through what funding sources. They offer good detail for each major grant area, noting that a significant portion was one time money (e.g., additional instructional coaches) to help with training and support while teachers learn how to implement the personalized learning systems and the 1:1 devices. They note how this grant will serve as a way to catapult their district's strategic plan using the one-time purchasing power of the grant, which can lead to second order change. They will also rely on E-rate funding and reduced textbook and printing costs to support the personal devices.</p> <p>They do not specifically address how they will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments, nor are all elements of a high quality plan provided to ascertain specific timelines and persons responsible. .</p> <p>The applicant scores in the middle range.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant did not include any information for this competitive preference priority. Therefore no points are awarded.</p>		

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>Overall the applicant did indeed meet the Absolute Priority 1, by coherently and comprehensively addressing how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.</p> <p>This applicant proposes to build on some significant reforms all ready underway, by implementing a 1:1 device program for secondary students and 1:4 for elementary, implementing an integrated management and learning system for the teachers; implementing enhanced teacher training and instructional coaching support, and a personalized learning environment for their students. Given the reforms already in place, including an educator evaluation system seriously focused on student outcomes and effective practice to support the acquisition of 21st skills as part of making every student college and career-ready, this proposed grant really appears to be doable and their targeted goals achievable. Unfortunately, there are areas within the grant where inadequate details were offered to conclude that it was a high quality plan, and things like not including evidence of 70% of the teachers supporting this grant, caused them to lose valuable points.</p>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>145</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0187CO-3 for Harrison School District Two

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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>It is clearly evident that the applicant has set forth a comprehensive reform vision that addresses all four of the core educational assurance areas as indicated by the coherent goals the LEA have set as evidenced by the following:</p> <p>The applicant is developing curriculum documents that will promote increasing student achievement and support teacher and administrator effectiveness. All curriculum documents will be aligned with Colorado State Common Core Standards. As indicated by the applicant, the District Assessment Process encompasses all grade levels and content areas and occurs four times a year. The Curriculum and Assessment Department drafts all of the tests and ensures alignment to State Standards and Harrison's curriculum. As we move forward with more rigorous expectations, assessments will be revised to align with those higher expectations through: furthering professional development in order to improve assessments; soliciting feedback from teachers and principals; investigating various ways to assess what students know and can do; Refinement of our data management system that can apply not only to district summative assessments but also to</p>		

formative classroom assessments.

The applicant proposes to use data to inform instruction by systematically examining data not only at the proficiency level but at the item level to find strengths and challenges both for disaggregated groups and individual students. The applicant also proposes to effectively tie data to quality and alignment of instructional practice.

Relative to recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most, the applicant proposes to recruit, develop, and retain an effective teacher for every classroom in every school; recruit, develop, and retain an effective principal for every school; and improve education technology in every school. The applicant also partners with higher education to promote teacher recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers.

The applicant is developing curriculum documents that will promote increasing student achievement and support teacher and administrator effectiveness. All curriculum documents will be aligned with Colorado State Common Core Standards. As indicated by the applicant, the District Assessment Process encompasses all grade levels and content areas and occurs four times a year. The Curriculum and Assessment Department drafts all of the tests and ensures alignment to State Standards and Harrison's curriculum. As we move forward with more rigorous expectations, assessments will be revised to align with those higher expectations through: furthering professional development in order to improve assessments; soliciting feedback from teachers and principals; investigating various ways to assess what students know and can do; Refinement of our data management system that can apply not only to district summative assessments but also to formative classroom assessments.

The applicant indicates that it is particularly committed to providing support to those schools with the lowest achievement results and largest achievement gaps. Twenty of the twenty-four schools within Harrison School District 2 will be participating in this grant program. To maximize funds and to create the best environment for cultivate college- and career-ready students; the District is proposing a 1:1 device initiative for our secondary (grades 6-12) students only.

The proposal 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. For example, the applicant proposes to develop curriculum documents that will promote increasing student achievement and support teacher and administrator effectiveness. Participating schools will focus on five principles relative to extended year learning opportunities in the summer, extended day learning opportunities inclusive of a dinner program, effective teaching and administrative staff, mathematics fellow programs, and high expectations for all. The applicant also proposes to implement a K-12 technology Curriculum where students will utilize digital tools to access, manage, evaluate, and synthesize information in order to solve real-world problems individually and collaboratively. The technology curriculum is robust in nature and undergirds what is necessary for the continued student academic achievement.

The applicant articulates a vivid description relative to what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. The applicant envisions every classroom a highly proficient teacher. In addition, students will become responsibly engaged in their own learning through an instructional environment that includes the necessary personal technological devices used to track learning goals through data and other feedback.

Overall, the applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that offers a credible approach to significantly raising student achievement, improving the quality of instruction of every teacher and increasing administrator effectiveness.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the high range.

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

**10**

**7**

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

The applicant indicated that twenty of the twenty-four schools within Harrison School District 2 will be participating in this grant program. However, a description of the process that the applicant used or will use to select schools to participate is not evidenced.

The applicant clearly evidences a list of the schools that will participate in grant activities.

The proposal includes the total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators.

With the exception of how the applicant would select schools to participate in the project, the applicant evidences a logical approach to implementing its reform proposal that includes five aspects of its plan of implementation that will support high-quality LEA and school level implementation. In addition, the proposal includes a clear process for addressing the needs of

students who are career-ready.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

**10**

**4**

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

The applicant proposes for the next five years, to use implement the Effectiveness and Results Plan, which compensates teachers and principals for effective teaching practices and student results. This plan is expected to have an impact on increasing rigor in instruction leading to student's career and college readiness.

The applicant has evidence performance measures relative to student achievement, closing achievement gaps, and college and career-readiness.

The applicant proposes a robust technology curriculum with clearly defined goals and objectives by grade level.

The applicant has clearly stated goals relative to implementing the proposal; however, no indicators of progress toward meeting the goals are evidenced.

The proposal does not present a high-quality plan for scaling up its reform efforts. There is no evidence of a scale up plan inclusive of key goals, activities, a timeline, deliverables and persons responsible for implementation.

The proposed Effectiveness and Results plan has the potential to provide strong support to a scale up plan if the applicant specifically evidenced how the plan would have a direct impact student learning outcomes for all students who would be served and how its implementation would result in district-wide change.

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

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

**10**

**7**

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

The applicant's vision for improving student learning and performance is comprehensible and should result in improved student learning and performance outcomes.

The proposal projects and anticipates a steady growth for all identified subgroups relative to student achievement, closing the achievement gap and college and career-readiness.

-For example, the baseline performance percentage for 8th grade reading proficiency overall, for minorities is anticipated to increase from 54% to 62% over a five year period (post grant) is ambitious and achievable

The applicant convincingly describes performance goals that will result in decreasing the achievement gap between subgroups from 15.7% to 6.1% over a five year period (post-grant). This 9.6% gap decrease is ambitious and achievable.

The plan addresses increasing graduation rate each year of the grant annually by .4%. Over a five year period (post-grant), the graduation rate is anticipated to increase an average of 2%. This is attainable yet it is not ambitious.

The applicant proposes to increase the college enrollment rate from 44% to 53% over a five year period (post-grant) which is both ambitious and achievable.

The applicant did not include the State targets, therefore, it is not possible to ascertain if the goals listed meet or exceed the State ESEA targets overall or by subgroup.

With the exception of the minimal expectation for increasing graduation rate that does not boast to be ambitious, the bar set as a result of the proposal's vision in setting ambitious performance measures should result in improved student learning and increased equity among all of the students anticipated to be served by the proposal.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides sufficient evidence relative to improved student achievement and increased high school graduation rates as indicated by the following: Four years ago our state assessment scores on the Colorado State Assessment Program (CSAP) showed that we were below 50% Proficient and Advanced for both Math and Writing, and 61% Proficient and Advanced in Reading. The most recent 2013 state assessment scores show our marked improvement with Math and Writing above 50% and Reading up to 67%.</p> <p>In school years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 less than 65% of the students graduated. In 2010-2011, the graduation rate increased by four percent. School year 2011-2012, Harrison graduated just over 74 percent of its students.</p> <p>As indicated by the data provided by the applicant, the college enrollment decreased by approximately 4% between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years.</p> <p>The applicant indicated that the Minority Achievement Gap shows a reduction by 4.2% in reading and 3.0% in math from 2010 to 2013 and that the Poverty Achievement Gap reduction of 8.1% in reading and 7.4% in math. The applicant also indicated that district high school students are closing the gap in all contents, especially math and science. No base line or ending results data is provided to indicate to what degree the gaps significantly decreased relative to its impact on student achievement.</p> <p>The applicant sufficiently demonstrated that the district achieved ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools as indicated by the following: On the 2013 State Assessments the percentage of students scoring “Proficient” or “Advanced” increased or remained the same on 22 out of 27 assessments. On the LEA’s language acquisition assessment, the subgroup population of English Language Learners, which makes up 18% of the students population, showed a growth percentile of 57 across the district. The district moved from the accreditation rating of “Accredited with Improvement” in 2010, 2011, and 2012 to “Accredited” in 2013 on the preliminary plan assignment.</p> <p>The applicant aligns its common assessments to monthly-paced curriculum “maps”, produced by the Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Department. The data from these assessments is readily available to principals and teachers who can then determine the mastery of each student.</p> <p>However, the current systems do not allow students or parents to securely access individual achievement data.</p> <p>The applicant provided compelling data indicating success relative to raising student achievement and graduation rate over a four year period.</p> <p>However, the District has experienced a decline in college enrollment and did not consistently provide data over a four year period relative to achievement gap closure and college enrollment. In addition, neither students nor parents are able to securely access individual achievement data.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant sufficiently demonstrate evidence of a clear record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching over the past four.</p> <p>This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the high range.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The LEA clearly demonstrates a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures, actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only, actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only and actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level. The applicant also indicated that the district has a “Financial Transparency” link on the front page of the district website for anyone interested in learning more about how district funds are spent.</p> <p>Overall the district has demonstrated concrete evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.</p> <p>This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the high range.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

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

The participating LEA has clearly demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal based on the following:

The 178 Colorado Public School Boards of Education have the autonomy to create and implement instruction, curriculum, and assessment plans for the students that each serves.

The State Department of Education provided a letter indicating its support of implementing the proposed reform initiative.

The Harrison Board of Education has delegated the authority of implementing Individual Learning Plans to district educators.

In 2010, Senate Bill 10-191 "Educator Effectiveness" became law (C.R.S. 22-63-103) and required that teachers and principals be evaluated half on their performance and half on their students' achievement results.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the high range.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The following stakeholder and engagement supports are indicated. For the 2013-2014, the District introduced a strategic plan to improve academic achievement, instruction quality and to recruit and retain the best and brightest teachers. One of four major strategies to achieving the plan's goals is parent and community engagement as well as the engagement of the community and important stakeholders.

The district launched the Very Involved Parents (VIP) volunteer program as a community ownership program to encourage community members to serve in classrooms and schools, inspire parents to serve on committees, attend district events/meetings and energize parents to attend school events and

471 VIPs donated 2,375 volunteer hours per month to 19 schools. It is through this network that the district sought input and built support for this Race to the Top proposal.

The proposal does not evidence a description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal and, as appropriate, how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback.

The applicant does not provide evidence indicating that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal.

Letters of support from parents, civic and community partners, volunteers, members of the business community, institutions of higher education and government demonstrate Harrison School District Two's meaningful stakeholder engagement are evidenced.

However, letters of support are not evidenced from student, student organizations or parent organizations

The applicant indicated that the district sought input and built support for this Race to the Top proposal from its VIP initiative. However, the applicant failed to evidence the degree of VIP engaged in the development of the proposal and, whether or not the VIP provided feedback.

Overall, the LEA has not adequately demonstrated evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal. All of the required elements that would determine if the proposal evidences meaningful stakeholder engagement of the proposal are not demonstrated.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>

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

The applicant evidences an adequate plan to help students understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. For example, the Professional Educator's Evaluation Rubric that guide teacher's practices include holding teachers accountable to involving students in assessing their own learning. In addition, one indicator of the rubric measures how effectively teachers create personal learning environments where students are involved in self-monitoring and goal setting. The plan does not however, indicate that parents are involved in the process.

The applicant evidences a sufficient plan inclusive of educator and parental support where students will be able to identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college and career-readiness as indicated by the following: The district is researching an effective technology system that provides learning algorithms for each student and a student goal setting/monitoring system. In addition, the district is already participating in College in Colorado and students in grades 6 through 12 are expected to initiate and consistently make changes to their Individual Career and Academic Plans assisting students and their parents in developing and maintaining a personalized postsecondary plan that ensures readiness for postsecondary and workforce success.

The plan sufficiently evidences a plan whereby the district is committed to students experiencing a deep level of learning and cognitive rigor. For example, the district will approach this effort by increasing the level of rigor and depth of knowledge by the use of a rigorous curriculum used by every teacher and classroom implementation of questioning frameworks consistent with the Colorado State's usage of the Webb's Framework in the state standards and standardized assessments. The Professional Educators Evaluation Rubric also places emphasis on instructional strategies that focus on questioning and increasing cognitive demands. The plan, however, does not evidence the role of the parents in the process.

The applicant sufficiently evidence a plan indicating that with educator support, students have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. For example, the applicant communicates that through giving students personal learning experiences that allow them to move outside of their classrooms, the students will have opportunities and access to learning about diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives. These personal learning experiences will allow the students to find meaning and connections to the content and broaden their post-K-12 options and preparations for success. The plan does not however, indicate that parents are involved in the process.

The applicant makes reference in the proposal indicating that the district is committed to meeting and exceeding Colorado's identified 21st Century Skills and Abilities. These skills are inclusive of critical thinking and reasoning, problem-solving information literacy, collaboration, self-direction and or invention. The applicant does not specify how it will address its commitment to meeting and exceeding these skills and abilities. The applicant also does not indicate how parental involvement would be included in this process.

The applicant's plan includes a comprehensive technology curriculum that is sufficient to supports students being able to experience a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable them to achieve their individual learning goals and ensure they can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

The applicant's plan evidences comprehensive elements of a variety of high-quality instructional approaches such as Blended Learning, Flipped Classrooms and Questioning Frameworks. These instructional approaches will allow the district to customize each student's experience through self-pacing, student interest, and data management for both the advanced learner and those who need remediation. The applicant also indicates that teachers are scaffolding instruction through questioning and complexity of learning and depth of knowledge to increase student achievement. These personalized approach promise to provide the district with better information in order for teachers to more closely target and track instructional needs.

The applicant's plan clearly evidences elements of high-quality content, including digital learning content as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements based on the following: The District's curriculum was designed to provide a roadmap for teachers to provide the instruction of rigorous and relevant content. The curriculum supports the concept of personal learning environments in that the content has relevancy for students and their learning. There is a focus on how the students connect the content in one area to the content in a seemingly different content area. This connection across the various content disciplines allows students to increase their ingenuity, resourcefulness, and creativity with the intention that they are better prepared for their college and or career pursuits.

The applicant evidences a coherent process for on-going and regular feedback relative to frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements. For example, teachers

regularly access and systemically use electronic data management tools to retrieve, organize, and create multiple measures of individual and group student achievement data to accurately refine and modify instruction for whole group, small, group, and individual students. The data is updated quarterly after a round of District Summative Evaluations. The District

Assessment Process encompasses all grade levels and content areas and they occur 4 times a year.

The applicant's plan sufficiently evidences a process whereby personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and available content, instructional approaches, and supports. The district uses the achievement of academic content, which is currently measured by the analysis of data related to district assessments, teacher-created assessments/assignments, and the Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP).

The applicant's plan sufficiently evidences a process whereby accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready or college- and career-ready graduation requirements. For example, the Professional Educator's Evaluation Rubric teachers includes a component where teachers are expected to provide differentiated instruction and assessment by content, process and/or product to address the unique learning differences of students through personal learning environments.

Relative to exposing students to personalized learning tools, the applicant only addresses initial focus on deployment, training and familiarization. No additional evidence is addressed relative to a plan whereby mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. Initial exposure to the personal learning tools without a plan for follow-up or technical support relative to using the devices does not support a concrete mechanism for ensuring students understand how to utilize the tools to track and manage their learning. Therefore-the plan is of insufficient quality.

The plan fails to include mechanisms to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them.

This section of the plan communicates general processes. In addition, parental involvement is referenced at a minimum relative to provides necessary supports to students in assisting them in improving academically and preparing them for college and career-readiness.

Overall, the plan is comprehensive in nature and is adequately sufficient 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 plan contains the majority of the elements necessary to be identified as high-quality as defined by the criteria in this section of the proposal.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

**20**

**20**

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

The applicants plan well evidences a process whereby all participating educators engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity. For example, the applicant ensures that all personnel understand and can support in an informed way, the key actions of the district relative to personalized learning. The district utilizes a systems thinking process to implement new initiatives that supports administrators and teacher leaders with all levels of training and sense making, inclusive of ongoing job embedded professional development.

The applicants plan represents a clear approach that allows educators to adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches as indicated by the following:

Teachers are able to integrate technology through all core areas and use Thinking Maps along with visual supports, anchor charts, and work stations to build in practice to reach mastery of the common core standards. The support of the new curriculum design, using the Understanding by Design framework, benefits teachers as they plan their lessons and deliver content. In addition, the use of Thinking Maps and workstations allows for more teachers to release control to students in their learning and, therefore, makes the classroom more engaging. As teachers are incorporating these instructional best practices, students will benefit from an environment that infuses college and career readiness into all aspects of their day.

The applicants plan consists of a high-quality component that frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators. For instance, the district maintains school-wide data boards/systems to monitor student progress and guide discussions about specific interventions. Staff has to pull data from multiple sources versus being able to access the data from one location. In addition, classroom teachers as well as students develop goals and maintain whole class and individual data tracking systems that allow them to review progress. The district uses both spot observations and formal evaluations to monitor and give feedback to instructional staff about the effectiveness of the delivery and resources used in meeting student needs. Teachers also receive one to two formal observations and one summative from building leaders as part of the overall

evaluation system.

The applicant's plan includes a comprehensive approach relative improving teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems as evidenced by the following: The district uses both spot observations and formal evaluations to monitor and give feedback to instructional staff about the effectiveness of the delivery and resources used in meeting student needs. In addition, teachers also receive one to two formal observations and one summative from building leaders as part of the overall evaluation system. Leadership effectiveness is monitored in a variety of ways including consistent site visits by district-level principal supervisors, a quarterly systemic process that brings together a review of achievement data and staff performance, and a summative evaluation that all translate to an overall effectiveness level on the Effectiveness and Results Plan tied to the principal's salary.

The plan clearly evidences a high-quality component that includes allowing all participating educators access to actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs. For example, during structured professional learning and common plan times, teachers analyze data, share instructional strategies and resources, and brainstorm next steps for individual students. Response to Intervention team meetings allows a multi-disciplinary team to look at individual students from a broader variety of perspectives to establish specific interventions. Schools also build their daily schedules around grade level common plan times to further encourage collaboration and discuss individual student needs.

The applicant's plan clearly evidences high-quality learning resources including digital resources, as appropriate, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and the tools to create and share new resources. Some of the learning resources include but are not limited to Edmodo, Google Forms, Google Documents, Prezi, and Wikis to Blogs.

The applicants plan sufficiently makes allowances for teachers to have access to resources that support instruction as well as the knowledge and understanding of how to use those resources to promote student learning.

The applicant evidences a convincingly high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects. On-going professional development that is tied to the school's curriculum goals, designed with built-in evaluation, and sustained by adequate financial and staff support is essential if teachers are to use technology appropriately to promote learning for all students in the classroom.

Overall, the applicant demonstrates a comprehensive and 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 plan is inclusive of all of the high-quality elements identified by the following criteria: This plan include an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students that enable 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.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the high range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

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

The applicant provides sufficient evidence that the LEA central office or the consortium governance structure is organized in a manner to provide support and services to all participating schools. For example, the applicant indicates that three School Leadership Officers are assigned to a cluster of schools at either the elementary or the secondary level.

Relative to providing school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient 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, the District's Strategic Plan provides focus and the goals of the School Unified Improvement Plan give details and autonomy to each individual school community.

The applicant sufficiently evidences that the plan is inclusive of giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. For example, students will have a greater degree of personal responsibility in their learning and will be given the tools and feedback to set goals, monitor their

learning and resources to learn. The district uses varied resources like the Kahn Academy to further mastery of skills and add cognitive rigor to any content or grade level.

The applicant sufficiently demonstrates that the plan is inclusive of providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners as indicated by the following: With personal devices the opportunity for students to access resources 24-7 is possible. They can accelerate or remediate their own learning on their own time with teacher direction and facilitation. In addition, English Language Learners will also have the opportunity to access web-based learning.

The plan does not evidence giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable wa

With the exception of the plan not including giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery multiple times, overall, the applicant evidences all of the elements of a high-quality plan that is sufficient to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the high range.

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

**10**

**3**

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

The applicant evidences an adequate plan for ensuring that all participating students and educators have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal.

As indicated by the applicant, all of the devices are managed by the District.

The applicant proposes much generalized possibilities relative to how students and teachers would have access to the personalized learning technology. For example, the applicant proposes the following scenario: Students and their families might be given a stipend to purchase the device of their choice... perhaps \$200 per student. Classrooms would have 5 or 6 devices that could serve as a "loaner" if the student's own device was broken or lost for a period of time. Teacher devices might remain managed by the District, or teachers might operate in a system similar to students with a stipend of perhaps \$500 to offset the cost of purchasing their own device.

Relative to technical support, the applicant indicates that students would then purchase, support and repair their own devices. Teacher may also be afforded the same level of support. However, the plan does not sufficiently include a process for ensuring that parents and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies. In addition, the applicant only references technical support relative to broken or malfunctioning device. The applicant does not indicate that support would be offered relative to students understanding the operations aspects of the personal learning devices.

The applicant's plan does not include a process that includes using an information technology system that allows parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems.

Further, the applicant's plan does not include a process for ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems inclusive of human resources data, student information data, budget data, and an instructional improvement system data.

Overall, the applicant does not evidence a comprehensive, well thought out, high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. The majority of the necessary elements necessary as defined by the grant requirements are not evident to substantiate a high-quality plan.

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

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

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

The following components of continuous improvement indicated by the applicant are not rigorous in nature. The applicant proposes constant internal assessment of the progress toward meeting the goals of the grant and will make the necessary adjustments according to what the data reveals concerning students adopting, maintaining, and achieving individualized college- and career-ready goals.

The applicant also proposes collecting meaningful data that relates to expected outcomes of achievement measures of the grant. This means of data collection does not equate to a robust process inclusive of timelines for collecting and analyzing data to determine progress and or challenges, and how the possible challenges would be addressed.

In addition, the applicant does not evidence an improvement plan that addresses how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

The applicant does not contain element of a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the low range.

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

**5**

**3**

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

The applicant evidence four general means for implementing an on-going plan for communication as indicated by the following: 1) The applicant proposes the continuation of regular meetings with the Superintendent’s Advisory Panel. 2) Twice per year, Harrison mails more than 30,000 copies of its Village Voice newsletters to community partners, parents and residents where Race to the Top updates could be provided regularly. 3) Each year, Harrison School District conducts random, third party administered surveys with random district residents and parents to ascertain the level at which residents (external) and parents (internal) are adequately informed regarding the condition and direction of the district. Questions to measure those audiences level of knowledge about the Race to the Top grant’s implementation could be easily added to those instruments. 4) The district holds bi-weekly/monthly meeting will building level administrators (principals and assistant principals) where all matters of district importance are discussed with district level administrators and leaders.

The applicant also does not indicate what the meetings with the superintendent’s panel would entail relative to the RTTD grant.

On-going and regular communication is limited, to school level administrators.

In addition, venues of communication to external/community stakeholders as well as parents are very limited.

The communication plan would be strengthened if other means of communication relative to the implementation and progress of the proposal with external stakeholders and parents included, television, local newspapers and school and district Web sites.

Overall, the proposal does not sufficiently boast a comprehensive and high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

**5**

**3**

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

The applicant clearly evidences ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures.

The applicant adequately addresses these criteria by indicating that district administers multiple performance measures that are age and grade level appropriate as part of the current pay for- performance plan. The measures are differentiated by grade level, content, and subgroup.

The focus of every reform effort implemented by Harrison is student achievement. The intensity of Harrison’s focus on student achievement is readily evident in the 2013 Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP) tests, standardized tests given each year to students in grades 3 through 10.

Each of these measures is listed, along with (a) the rationale for selection, (b) link to the theory of change, and (c) methods for continuous review of measures. Twelve of these measures are listed, categorized by all populations. The rationale for their selection is also provided. For example, the Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP) serves as the state

standardized assessment for student proficiency in the core academic subjects of Reading (Grades 3-10) and Math (Grades 3-10) as well as high school graduation rate.

Although the applicant indicates that an extensive review of data at the identified schools revealed a need for more comprehensive focus on math instruction, the plan does not specify the method for each measure within the criteria. In addition the applicant does not evidence a plan for how it will improve the measure over time.

The applicant demonstrates an approach of adequate quality relative how it proposes to continuously improve its plans.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

**5**

**4**

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

The applicant evidences a comprehensive and high-quality plan with essential components as indicated below to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology.

The District to hire is a Research Analyst to evaluate the effectiveness of the personalized learning program.

The district will compile multiple data points to ensure all teachers, including those in non-tested grade levels and contents, have a sufficient body of evidence to rate them. District assessments, performance tasks in the specials, benchmarks, and State assessments provide the District with various checkpoints that allow us to monitor the effectiveness of District initiatives on student learning.

The applicant will also identify professional development needs and monitor whether or not professional development learning is being transferred to the classroom.

The applicant has proposed using a learning management system which will assist students in creating a personalized learning environment while also providing data to the teacher and district.

Data that is currently collected will be available to monitor changes in instruction and student achievement throughout the implementation of the Race to the Top grant program.

Although comprehensive in nature, the plan does not indicate how it would address needed changes informed by its system of evaluation.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the high range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>

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

The applicant clearly identifies all funds that will support the project to include the grant funds and funds from other sources (General Funds and Title I Part A) used to support the project.

The project proposes to use Race to the Top funds to continue dramatic student growth via secondary students, in grades 6-12, each receiving a technology device to facilitate personalized learning beyond the classroom. Educators directly involved with the implementation of the project will receive intensive professional learning and related supports that will help implement blended learning strategies into the district. The project will also serve approximately 8823 students in grades 6-12 to cover the cost of implementing strategies that will improve their academic achievement and increase their college- and career-readiness. With a total four-year project cost request of \$17,868,026, this amounts to approximately \$2520.00 in annual program costs, per student participant. The total cost is also inclusive of the following defined line items: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractals, training stipends and indirect costs.

The applicant provides a rationale for the investments and priorities, including a description of all of the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal.

The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables are adequately evidenced. However, there is no evidence that the applicant's budget includes the identification of funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that

will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period that focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments, thus decreasing the strength of the proposed budget.

Overall, the budget appears to be reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal.

The applicant scored in the medium range in this section.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

Some elements of the applicant's sustainability include the following: The district relies heavily on the use of E-Rate funds to provide a number of technology initiatives and also has a consistent budgeted amount each year that is used for replacement costs and other technology needs indicated in the District Unified Improvement Plan. Schools will also continue to plan and use their building and Title I allocation for technology needs.

A post-grant budget that include an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant inclusive of potential sources and uses of funds to support the budget is evidenced.

The sustainability plan is of adequate quality, does not include all of the required elements and its future success beyond the grant period is predicated on the economy as indicated by the applicant. In addition, the plan does not include a description of how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments.

The applicant scored in the medium range in this section

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not provide a response to the Competitive Preference Priority.

This section was assigned a score in the low range.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that offers a credible approach that focuses on significantly raising student achievement, improving the quality of instruction for every teacher and improving administrator effectiveness. This comprehensive and coherent reform approach sufficiently addresses how it will build on the core educational assurance areas.

The proposal 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. For example, the applicant proposes to develop curriculum documents that will promote increasing student achievement and support teacher and administrator effectiveness. Participating schools will focus on five principles relative to extended year learning opportunities in the summer, extended day learning opportunities inclusive of a dinner program, effective teaching and administrative staff, mathematics fellow programs, and high expectations for all. The applicant also proposes to implement a K-12 technology Curriculum where students will utilize digital tools to access, manage, evaluate, and synthesize information in order to solve real-world problems individually and collaboratively. The technology curriculum is robust in nature and undergirds what is necessary for the continued student academic achievement.

The applicant evidences a convincingly high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects. On-going professional development that is tied to the school's curriculum goals, designed with built-in evaluation, and sustained by adequate financial and staff support is essential if teachers are to use technology appropriately to promote learning for all students in the classroom.

The applicant has evidence performance measures relative to student achievement, closing achievement gaps, and college and career-readiness. The applicant's vision for improving student learning and performance is comprehensible and should result in improved student learning and performance outcomes. The proposal projects and anticipates a steady growth for all identified subgroups relative to student achievement, closing the achievement gap and college and career-readiness.

The applicant's reform plan includes a comprehensive technology curriculum that is sufficient to supports students being able to experience a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable them to achieve their individual learning goals and ensure they can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>139</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0187CO-4 for Harrison School District Two

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

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

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

The applicant deserves a moderate/high score because:

(a)

- It builds off the core areas. It has set forth a 5 point plan that is coherent and addresses the core areas. For instance, a number of initiatives directly address the core areas. The district has re-designed its compensation system for educators, rewarding teachers for student performance. This addresses the area of retaining, recruiting effective educators. Moreover, the district addresses the core area related to adopting assessments and standards that prepare students for college and career (e.g, program allowing for credits in partnership with Colorado St. & Community College). Allowing access to these college level programs, by definition, provides access to career/college standards. Additionally, the district has developed a technology curriculum, beginning at the earliest grades. The district's vision of the use of data, however, (another core area) lacks detail. It is unclear the extent to which data will be housed, organized, and used to make curriculum decisions, at least in this subpart.

(b) The district's implementation of Understanding by Design is a research-developed approach to curriculum and has had success in improving student achievement, and deepening student learning. In addition, the district's partnership with colleges demonstrates some support for their idea that they can increase equity.

(c) The applicant could describe, with detail, the experience for students and how the daily experience for students might be under this plan.

The district has identified a number of positive programs (Understanding by Design) with credibility in improving student achievement, including integration of technology This a mid-high score is warranted.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) the description of the schools selection is stated (all schools in the district were included, except the charters). The process is lacking detail however. There is no rationale for all the non-charter schools being incorporated. As such, it appears that there was little thought into the schools that might be most appropriate for participation, other than they would include them because they were part of the pre-existing reform.</p> <p>(b).The list is provided in the application.</p> <p>(c) the total number of students is provided and along the categories described in this subpart.</p> <p>The application could have described its reasoning for including all the schools (except the charters). This reasoning would have assisted in assessing whether <u>all</u> schools here would have the intended success. Conceivably, some schools would have been more/less appropriate for the grant. Attention to the nuances of each school context as they relate to the grant would aid the district in being able to assess chances for successful implementation. Given this omission, which is significant, a low score is warranted.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The district appears to be grafting the reform on already underway initiatives that the district has embarked upon (e.g., using improved evaluation systems). The elements of a high-quality plan could be elaborated upon but are, generally, missing at least from this section. The specifics included in the diagram appear to be a organization flow chart. While this is helpful, it does not necessarily reflect a high quality plan that will help the district reach its outcome goal, although there should be credit noted for the support structure that can assist schools. Moreover, the organization structure does not appear to be anything "novel" that might invite reform and outcomes success. That said, the district has had success in implementing reform in a core area that is closely linked to improving outcomes such as those identified in the grant (e.g., a rigorous evaluation program, accounting for student performance). Thus, a mid score is warranted.</p>		
<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's vision rests heavily on improving teacher effectiveness and using student achievement/growth as a means to reach or exceed state performance targets (a)(b). With respect to (a) and (b), the emphasis on improving teacher effectiveness is likely to lead to success because, as research suggests, improving teacher quality is one of the most effective ways to do this. Moreover, the use of PD and improving educator and principal effectiveness also contributes to (c) and (d). Graduation rates have improved since 2008, when the district appears to have initiated some of these changes. Thus, there is evidence that the likelihood of continuing these reforms through the grant funds here, which propose to continue and expand, will have the desired results. Moreover, the goal of moving to 90% graduation rate, from the current 74% i both achievable (based on the current progress since 2008) and ambitious. The called for growth in the area of summative assessments in the subgroups ranges over the term of the grant, but generally calls for a 10% improvement in proficiency levels over the years of the grant, an achievable and ambitious number. It is ambitious in the sense that the district was, at one point, declared by the state to be in "failing status."</p> <p>Thus, given the district's success in this area already and its promise to continue with stated reforms, its changes of success are relatively high to reach its goals.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant deserves a high score because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It has demonstrated success in the course of four years in improving its outcomes and closing achievement gaps on the stat TCAP test (e.g., in 22 of 27 tests, the district improved its achievement level). The scores are impressive in terms of</li> </ul>		

gains in the areas of math and science. Moreover, the growth appears to be in subgroups (e.g., ELL achieved growth in 14 of 20 schools that exceeded state growth rate in same subgroup; ACT scores increased). Importantly, these gains have occurred over four years, thus demonstrating a clear record. Finally, the districts cited have high rates of poverty, thus these gains do address (a) nicely.

- The applicant has had success in lowest performing schools (e.g., 3 schools in district under "improvement" status have been exited from the designation). (b)
- The extent to which applicant addresses (c) is unclear, thus warranting some reduction from a high score.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
---	----------	----------

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

The applicant should warrant a high score here because

- It submits financial data to the Co. Dept of Ed Finance Unit that can be filtered to address the subparts of (a)-(d). Additionally, the CFO submits a report with the requested information to the Co. Dept of Ed and a Civil Rights report. All of these are publicly available.

To the extent that the "filtering of data" impedes transparency, then the score deserves a reduction.

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

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

The state context is favorable for the implementation of the reforms which largely relate to improving effectiveness through redesign teacher evaluation measures.

- According to the application, the state constitution gives considerable autonomy to LEAs which this collaborative has used to implement Individual Learning Plans (ILPs). Indeed, the state constitution requires local control.
- A number of state legislative initiatives support those including CRS 22-63-103) which requires at least half of an evaluation be based on student performance. CRS 22-54-104 requires the development of Ind Career and Academic Plan, made in coordination with educators, parents, etc.

In sum, the context is very favorable - and the district has taken advantage of the context - to implement reformed, warranting a high score.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

(a) The district created a number of councils/committees to include students, families, and principals (e.g. Very Involved Parents, Superin. Advisory Councils). The district represents that it used feedback from these constituencies to designs its program. The specifics of that feedback is not entirely clear.

(b) There are a number of letters from key stakeholders supporting the grant.

However, troubling was the statement that the district did not solicit feedback from any Teacher Organization. To be sure, the district does not have bargaining. However, the application requires solicitation from teachers, even in district's without bargaining. See (a)(ii). That is missing and, for that reason, the district deserves a moderate score.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>

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

The applicant relies heavily on the teacher evaluation system to address these goals. If implemented successfully, this holds promise to achieve the goals. It deserves a high score with some reduction because of the lack of the discussion concerning parents, as required by the application. Improving teacher quality is one of the most promising ways to improve student outcomes, according to the literature.

(a).As discussed the educator evaluation system has the components of a high quality plan (e.g., timelines, feedback, involvement of stakeholders). It does include goals that will assist students linking their learning/understanding to their success in achieving goals and success in addressing the content standards. (holding educators accountable for making sure that they "involve students in their own learning." It also proposes to implement a district wide personal improvement plan. It is not clear however how this goal accords with elements of high quality plan (key deadlines, etc.). Additionally, the applicant has designed curricula aligned to tstandards , with a curriculum map. The applicant cites its connection to "College in Colorado" as one means to address (a)(iv) however the extent to the diversity of the exposure to different cultures through this means is questionable.

The skills of collaboration, etc., are also linked to the educator evaluation thus this connection helps ensure compliance to (v)

(b) The district favorably addresses this subpart in a number of ways

- Again, the evaluation rubric is linked to individualization of instruction and use of data. This link is an effective means to tailor instruction, based on individual need.

- The district proposes that students receive access to a technology device to access education resources. However, access to a technology device does not, directly, indicate the use of/access to high quality digital content.

- The district employs curriculum maps (monthly pace) and daily objectives aligned to curric goals (e.g. Demonstration of Learning objectives). Thus, the feedback connected to these timely currilcum maps will provide timely feedback.

- The district also suggests that it will have individualized learning plans linked to each student. Again, individual learning plans, if instituted, provide an excellent means to provide personalized instruction.

- However, lacking is a sufficient attention to the parents involvement, as required by this subpart.

(c) There are various mechanisms suggested for use here (e.g., personal device, individualized learning plans). However, more detail would improve how these mechanisms will be offered with training and support to students so they fully understand their value.

Given the lack of attention to incorporating parents, as required under the subpart, and the general oversight to high-needs students, the score should be mid/high range

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

(a) and (b)The applicant addresses this subpart and notes that teachers are assisted in personalizing learning through several mechanisms that are largely related to professional development and evaluation. Professional Learning Communities and Evaluation that is closely linked to aligned curriculum standards (as is the case here) are effective ways to ensure that this personalization occurs. The district uses other forms of information (spot evaluations) to provide feedback. The district has implemented, and will continue to implement evaluation linked to student growth. This is an effective means to improve teaching and leading. Importantly, the standards are aligned to career and college standards. Significantly, the district also has embraced - and educators apparently are being trained/use Response to Intervention. Research suggest that this is an effective way to understand and personalize student learning. Structured data and RtI meetings are led by leadership with educators, so that the data are translated, providing feedback on student growth/progress. See (a) (i)-(iv) as well as providing actionable information, and tools to personalize instruction. See generally (b)

(c) As discussed the evaluation system combines student data as an integral part of its system to improve performance (i). The systems appear to be in place (frequent RtI/Data meetings) that are effective means to improving achievement and closing achievement gaps (ii) and the district.

In addition, the applicant has provided elements of a high quality plan (e.g., goals, timelines, person responsible) regarding the use of data for the purpose of improving outcomes. The objectives of of the evaluation system -- linking teacher performance to student growth

(d) The educator evaluation system is of high quality - has clear goals and timelines, components of high quality plans - for improving effectiveness and in particular for the students in high-needs areas. The application could have developed a better sense of how high quality teachers may be transferred/distributed around the district, once identified, thus ensuring equity across the district, in terms of high quality teachers.

Other than the weakness in (d) the applicant deserves a high score.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
<p><b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(D)(1) The applicant has elements of a high-quality plan. It has a small district leadership team coordinating reform efforts already, with instructional coaches. (a). Importantly, principals are viewed as instructional leaders and empowered to make significant building-level decisions (b). The district has suggested it is open to using varied resources (e.g., use of Kahn Academy or IT Academy). This would address (c) and (d) as both are unique means that allow students to demonstrate mastery in different ways. For instance, KAHN is a different medium for delivering and assessing material than a typical classroom structure.</p> <p>However, the plan lacks, in this regard, elements of high quality in that the timeline, person responsible is not sufficiently clear. Likewise, the district proposes using "Adaptive technologies" for certain students and web-based programming for ELL. It does not specify which adaptive technologies would be appropriate and for which group. Thus, the elements of high quality plan are lacking sufficient attention to detail here.</p> <p>Thus, the score here should be in the moderate-high range.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The district deserves a moderate/low score. To be sure, the district sets forth several different possible options that it would employ if it received the grant. Moreover, the district has developed a Technology Unified Improvement Plan that sets these forth.</p> <p>(a) The district suggests a number of options to ensure that students would have access to a device.</p> <p>(b) The report lists that it will have high degree of technical expertise for implementation. Yet the connection to students and parents in terms of support and open data (b) and (c) is not sufficiently described. Indeed, the focus is on the total cost and different management of the systems. Little, if any, attention is devoted to the connection between the data systems and allowing parents to use the systems.</p> <p>As well it is unclear as to how the data systems will be interoperable for the various needs (e.g., human resource info). The focus on technology is instructional, lacking more information on the items requested in this subpart (e.g., budget data). Again, no information is presented regarding the interoperability.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>It is unclear how this portion has a high-quality elements. It is missing specific deadlines and timelines. For instance, the applicant states sharing data will be "frequent and transparent." Specifics in this regard would add to the elements of a high quality plan (e.g., identifying the person and timelines). To be sure the district commits to using data and an external evaluator to assess the goals. However, again, timelines are not sufficiently established, although responsible parties are identified (e.g., grant manager, research analyst). In other words, the "when" of the responsibilities are unclear. That said, the district does commit to create timelines.</p> <p>Given the lack of specific with respect to using data to improve and modify the plan, a moderate score is warranted.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p>		

The district deserves a high mark here. It intends to use existing mechanisms (e.g., mailings). Interestingly, it also proposes to submit random surveys to stakeholders. This is a promising sign and way to collect data and feedback from the community and other stakeholders. The applicant describes specifics relative to this point, including the frequency of superintendent meetings with the Advisory Panel, and the frequency and responsibilities of surveys (e.g., external reviewer and yearly.)

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

5

2

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

The district has identified numerous performance measures. However, the rationale for selecting at least some of the measures is vague. In general, the applicant describes that it will meet the requirements of this subpart, but does not explain sufficiently its rationale.

For instance, the district describes the measure used for K-3 that relates to non-cognitive. Yet the rationale for the selection is absent. Indeed the district relies on the fact that the state has a standards as a proxy for its rationale. Likewise, the district notes that it uses an Elementary Counselor Student Achievement Template and it describes the use of a pre- and post assessment. Missing however, is the rationale for the choice. See (a).

Similarly, the use of the data is unclear. The district does not describe how it will use the chosen data to assess its progress and review its progress. (d)

Because of the lack of specificity and connection between the rationale of chosen goals and their review to improve the plan, a low score is warranted.

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

5

2

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

The district proposes to hire a Research Analyst to evaluate the effectiveness of RttT. Locating the responsibilities with one person, with appropriate expertise, can be a high-quality plan, so long as the analyst's findings are valued and considered. However, the specifics (e.g., timelines connected to deliverables) are missing. Thus, elements of a high quality plan are missing, warranting a low score.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

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

The budget identifies the source of funds and most are from the RttT. (a).

The funds are reasonable - they focus on the two areas that require the most attention to this grant - personnel and technology.

The rationale for the funds is also rationale and includes an assessment of the current resources. The applicant also identifies one-time funds (e., transportation and summer supplies from Title I). But the budget lacks discussion regarding the post-grant items and therefore the sustainability of the items.

The district describes the nature of the funds (e.g. grant versus from other sources), but lacks specifics. see (c)(i),

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

10

7

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

The district's plan is of high quality to support sustainability, with the exception (see bullet 3 & 4). Thus, because of these detractors, a moderate score is warranted.

- The technology resources are one shot injections (with some upkeep) thus focusing the grant in this regard is strategic.
- The plans to absorb the additional instructional coaches into the responsibilities of the existing, budgeted coaches as the aims of the grant are embedded over the next few years

- The reliance on the use of technology to reduce costs associated with paper, textbooks. However this is likely not a "zero sum game" and e-resources will likely cost money.
- The applicant has clearly thought out and established a timeline for the elimination/absorption of personnel (a major expenditure under the grant), thus demonstrating an important element of high quality plan. However, the transfer of the responsibilities is not well described (e.g., the technology department personnel would be continued but it is not clear of the source of financial support).
- The district includes support from local leaders (e.g., director of regional business alliance) and state leaders (e.g., a US Senator; state commissioner of education).

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b> Not addressed.		

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant has satisfied this priority in part, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it has closely linked its educator evaluation system to developing a personalized learning structure (including ratings of teachers based on student achievement to common core). Additionally, it has exhibited a commitment to using professional learning communities, data teams and through this grant, technology to continue this effort of personalizing learning. It has developed relationships with several colleges, demonstrating a commitment to providing space for students to develop a career/college track.</li> <li>- The applicant has success in decreasing achievement gaps, thus it has a solid foundation from which to grow. This is also evidence that the applicant has had success in developing personalized learning instruction. For instance, the district has exceeded state gains in 24 of 27 state assessments. Thus, the district has already provided some indication that its efforts have resulted in gains.</li> <li>- The use of personal learning devices - as suggested in this grant - will go a long way to providing the link between school and home, something that will also assist in developing a personalized learning environment. Indeed, the leveraging of technology is a wise way to link school to home and personalize instruction. Moreover, the district proposes to use technology, such as IT Academy and Kahn academy to personalize instructions. Although the applicant lacks details in this regard, these are both innovative ways to use instructional time and allow students alternative means to master competencies at their own pace and in an alternative setting (e.g., online).</li> </ul>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>141</b>
--------------	------------	------------

