



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0020CO-1 for Mapleton Public Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closing all schools and reopening is innovative and courageous.</li> <li>• The reform vision includes narrative for each of the four core educational assurance areas. Adoption of standards is clearly described including an exemplary college acceptance rate of 98%.</li> <li>• Classroom experiences for students and teachers are based upon constructivist, hand-on, inquiry-based learning experiences that are rigorous, personalized, and engaging.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant has identified closing all schools and reopening them as small-by-design schools as their key strategy for turning around the lowest-achieving schools yet a clear description of the process used to select small school designs as well as who was involved in the process is not provided.</li> <li>• Three of the core educational assurance areas are poorly developed or lack persuasiveness. The data systems described by the applicant are a collection of assessments rather than systemic processes used to analyze student learning. The argument presented for recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals utilizes strategies such as competitive salary packages and extending the school calendar as long-term solutions but are seeking to instigate these with grant funding. Using intersession to eliminate or reduce summer learning loss is only effective if the students most in need are in attendance which is not possible with an optimal program therefore the claim that this will turnaround the lowest-achieving schools is not supported.</li> <li>• Clear description of the classroom experience for teachers and students at each school is not evident.</li> </ul>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application incorporates all schools into the proposal.</li> <li>• A list of all schools and participating students is included and appropriately filled out. The district has high levels of poverty and the narrative indicates these numbers have significantly increased over the past few years.</li> <li>• All participating schools meet eligibility requirements.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses</p>		

- A clear description of the process used to modify and enhance the existing small-school-by-design programs other than checking with the school principal is not provided.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

**Strengths**

- The logic model and reform plan collectively provide the pieces of a high-quality plan.
- The applicant seeks to make shifts from "pockets of reform" to systemic reform.
- The applicant indicates they have already "undertaken a thorough analysis of local, regional, and national data".

**Weaknesses**

- References to "the designers" are made throughout the reform plan yet this group is not defined.
- The argument that more time will have a positive impact on student achievement is unsubstantiated because a clear, detailed description of current instructional practices across the various instructional designs is not provided. Without clear, detailed, current instructional practice descriptions to show the shift the applicant is seeking to make, another possible outcome may be students increased exposure to poor quality lessons.
- Extended time through intersessions is not mandatory therefore is not likely to impact each student in need as the applicant states.
- The root causes and assumptions upon which the logic model is based include faulty reasoning. For example, two of the root causes that include the expansion of the calendar are based upon time in the school day to personalize instruction and to utilize data. The solution to these causes is to add more days to the calendar rather than extend the instructional time during the day. Adding more days that are not long enough to accomplish everything that is needed to provide personalized instruction is not likely to bring about the systemic change the district is seeking.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

**Strengths**

- Attainable goals are included for each grade level 3-10 in reading, math, writing, and science.
- Attainable graduation rate goals are included

**Weaknesses**

- There is a misalignment between the LEA reform goals used for subgroups that are represented in the tables found in A4(a) with the achievement gap table provided in section A4(c). The tables in part (a) present subgroup proficiency achievement goals that increase 5% per year for every subgroup, regardless of the range of scores, thus not closing achievement gaps and even widening gaps in between some subgroups. The table presented in part (c) represents the percentage point spread between the comparison group (white) and each subgroup. Every subgroup line indicates the complete elimination of any achievement gap by 2017, which is contradictory to the goals set out in table A4(a). This indicates a lack of intentionality to setting these targets.
- College enrollment goals are not provided.
- High school graduation targets while attainable, are not ambitious and do not include the white subgroup. If the white subgroup has less than 10 students, it still needs to be noted as a subgroup, with the appropriate asterisk, for comparison purposes. Ambitious goals would close

the gap between IEP students and the district overall percentage of graduates. As these targets stand, the 15 point gap actually represents an increase of .7%.

- The application includes programs for each student in the district yet is not collecting qualitative, quantitative, or anecdotal data or Information on students in grades PK-2. Total program effectiveness includes data from all grade spans, even if they do not take standardized tests. By overlooking this pivotal grade span, the applicant runs the risk of overlooking significant root causes for academic failure in later grades.

## 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>8</b>
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
Strengths		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes district-wide, aggregate data for past 6 years</li> <li>• District-wide trend data indicates growth above state averages</li> <li>• Require college applications as graduation requirement</li> <li>• Began implementation of small school designs in 2002 including the splitting of the comprehensive high school into 5 small schools by design</li> <li>• Open enrollment with transportation provided increases equity</li> <li>• Equity substantiated by the Cuban report, an evaluation of Mapleton's reform initiative conducted in 2010.</li> <li>• Successful bond passage indicates community support</li> <li>• Utilizing Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) to create a collaborative, inclusive conversation about a student's achievement between the teacher and parents.</li> <li>• Site specific, aggregate data is provided for 2 persistently low-achieving schools is provided.</li> </ul>		
Weaknesses		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant mentions additional assessment data that shows "consistent improvement over the past several years" such as Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) yet does not provide these reports as evidence.</li> <li>• All data provided for this section is aggregate. However, the applicant states that "District-wide achievement has risen consistently over the past five years and subgroup populations have generally kept pace with that increase" yet does not provide disaggregated data to substantiate the claim.</li> <li>• Rationale for the flat student achievement scores is that "teachers have not yet been able to adequately personalize learning for all students", yet personalized learning is not time specific and should be happening in each classroom regardless of how many days a student attends school.</li> <li>• Disaggregated data for each persistently low-achieving school to show growth over time is absent.</li> </ul>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
Strengths		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive and detailed budget expenditures, for the district and each school, are available for review by the public</li> <li>• Additionally, each LEA selects their own instructional materials based upon the needs of the students in their jurisdiction rather than the state approving materials available to the LEAs.</li> <li>• Stakeholders informed and provided an opportunity for feedback on RTTT-D application</li> </ul>		
Weaknesses		
No weaknesses identified		

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b> Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local boards have direct control over curriculum, graduation requirements, school calendars, and classroom policy</li> <li>Open communication w/ state from the beginning of the reform process (2002)</li> <li>CO is RTTT Phase III state "supporting districts in implementing the new Colorado Academic Standards".</li> <li>'Open enrollment' state</li> <li>"Minimum of 50% of teacher and principal evaluation must be tied to student achievement data"</li> </ul> Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No weaknesses</li> </ul>		

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b> Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Varied stakeholder groups offered an opportunity to comment on executive summary of application</li> <li>Description of stakeholder involvement in reform efforts prior to this application was extensive and thorough as indicated by the inclusion of over 1,300 community members</li> <li>Support letters include one from Superintendent's Student Advisory Committee</li> <li>Letter of support from Linda Darling-Hammond</li> <li>A description of how teacher feedback was incorporated into revisions was provided.</li> </ul> Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A description of how stakeholders were involved in the actual development of the application is not provided. Providing input on proposed instructional calendars is different from actually deciding what the application should include. The applicant indicates the superintendent is the leading force behind the specific ideas put forth in the application.</li> <li>No letter of support from university partner involved with the school utilizing "University Partnership" design</li> <li>A description of how stakeholder feedback from all stakeholder groups was incorporated into application revisions is not evident.</li> <li>The letter in Appendix 13 from the CO Department of Education Race to the Top State Director indicates that the application is overly focused on personnel and pay increases that are not sustainable after the grant funding ceases.</li> <li>"School directors ... played an active role in shaping the District's plans to move to a student-centered calendar" but community and teachers are only provided opportunities for feedback rather than being part of the planning and development team.</li> </ul>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An overview of each school's instructional design is provided in appendix 1</li> <li>Each overview includes an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all students at the school.</li> <li>An action plan including goals, strategies, activities, timelines, budget links, deliverables, and persons' responsible is included in appendix 2.</li> <li>Action plan includes a 'fidelity review' as initial assessment of each school's implementation of their identified instructional focus.</li> </ul>		

Educator effectiveness experts assigned to each school, content area, and grade level

- The Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) provides a bridge between home and school with specific tools for parents to use to support their student in mastering standards.
- District structure with small-by-design schools offers parents an opportunity to select a school who's instructional design best matches their learner.
- Appropriate research, including citations, is provided for the K-12 math and elementary science curriculum in appendix 8.
- iPads, apps, and central office support for implementation are currently in place.
- Utilize Aimsweb for progress monitoring.
- The applicant shows commitment to their reform initiative with the addition of 18 calendar days this school year, regardless of the RTTT-D grant decision.

#### Weaknesses

- All examples of student level goal setting, learning pursuits, and measuring progress towards goals are at the secondary level. Lack of elementary and preschool language could indicate a lack of attention to these students' needs.
- The action plan is not discussed in the narrative including the creation of School Support Teams (SSTs).
- Goals lack baseline data. For example, one goal identified by the applicant is "To ensure maximum impact of RTTT-D funds, support schools in their implementation of the RTTT-D plan, monitor project effectiveness and continuously improve the plan". Data regarding where schools currently are in their implementation process to use as a baseline or benchmark indicator, is absent.
- Overviews are lacking any narrative description or goals making it difficult to determine specifically, where each school is in their implementation. A chart delineating how the designs overlap as well as how they are distinct, including specific targets met and to be met would clarify exactly where each school currently is in their process.
- Rationale of accelerated learning is dependent on intersession attendance, which is optional thus logic is flawed.
- Lack of narrative about how goals are used, by students, in an ongoing manner to support them in their learning, regardless of grade level.
- The applicant provides examples of some schools that provide a piece of a required element for all students. For example, the applicant identifies York International School and Global Leadership Academy as the two schools that have a focus on providing access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives to motivate and deepen student learning but no mention is provided regarding how students at other schools have access to diverse cultural perspectives.
- Description as to how each school model will specifically support all students, regardless of grade level or school of attendance, in goal setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, problem solving, etc is not provided.
- Unclear on what specific professional development will be provided for all teachers districtwide and what is site specific.
- The applicant indicates that students have exposure to a variety of "high quality instructional approaches" because of their unique district structure. This does not however include description of how teachers in every classroom and at every school provide a variety of instructional strategies to best engage and meet the needs of all students.
- Analysis provided in appendix 8 to support the effectiveness of high school science and K-12 reading and writing curriculum lacks citations. Additionally, middle school science curriculum evidence is not provided.
- Again, time is used as the rationale for not implementing engaging instructional strategies such as technology and small group instruction. The use of these strategies is not time specific but requires utilizing the time provided in a different manner. Continued reliance of this flawed rationale could indicate a lack of deep understanding of effective instruction or inability to provide personalized learning opportunities for each teacher to implement them.
- "Teachers express that the [science] curricula is highly effective" is provided by the applicant as rationale for not having enough time for implementation. No evidence of 'highly effective' is provided.
- Description regarding how students will receive feedback and ongoing personalized learning recommendations is not directly addressed. The narrative refers to 'student-level data' rather than strategies for providing feedback to students regarding their learning thus bringing them into partnership, regardless of their age.
- Indication that Aimsweb is not appropriate for emergent readers such as those found in PreK-2<sup>nd</sup> grade reveals a gap in progress monitoring for all students.

**(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)****20****15****(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:****Strengths**

- The plan provided in appendix 2 includes goals, activities and rationale, a timeline, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementation.
- Offer induction programs for teachers and site administrators
- Mention site-specific professional development will be aligned to RTTT goals and each school's instructional model with support from onsite coaches for teachers and administrators.
- Educator effectiveness leaders provide differentiated, job-embedded professional development to administrators and teachers matched to each site's instructional model.
- Educator effectiveness leaders also provide curriculum coaching support to site administrators working with teachers to improve instruction.
- Instructional rounds used to observe professional development implementation at the teacher level
- Classroom and school walkthroughs to ensure effective instruction
- School Support Team model provides coaching for site administrators to positively impact student learning.
- Systemic, benchmark assessments are conducted to assess progress toward college-and career-ready graduation requirements
- Student data is used with teachers and site administrators as well as site administrators and central office administrators to evaluate program effectiveness.
- Demonstration classrooms and release time are provided for teachers needing additional support in instructional strategy implementation
- Instructional materials are evaluated for impact on student learning. Unsubstantiated materials are discontinued.

 **Weaknesses**

- The quality of the plan provided in appendix 2 is concerning for the following reasons:
  - Unclear what the districtwide professional development entails and how it is aligned to the site-specific professional development.
  - The action plan in appendix 2 identifies curriculum fidelity reviews. These are not discussed in the narrative therefore the reader is unable to clearly picture how instructional coaches, school directors, educator effectiveness leaders, and others will assess the specific implementation needs of each school, and each teacher and administrator in the school. A flow chart showing how all of the instructional coaches, teacher leaders, educator effectiveness leaders, central office personnel, design-specific coordinators, and site administrators are connected would aid in completely understanding how the pieces of the professional development model work together.
  - Specific details regarding how administrator evaluations are used to identify professional development needs for administrators is absent.
  - Professional development for school instructional personnel who are not teachers, such as paraprofessionals, is not described.
  - The description provided by the applicant regarding assessment tools is confusing and reflects potential misunderstandings about what are formative, diagnostic, and benchmark assessments. The applicant indicates "interim, formative assessments [are used to] assess progress toward college-and career-ready graduation requirements". Additionally, the applicant indicates "curricular assessments (provided by curricula developers)" are of high quality and "give clear, weekly or monthly indication of student progress toward standard mastery" which may or may not be formative in that instruction is changed daily based upon the collective learning of the students. Furthermore, The applicant indicates, "NWEA MAP's is administered three times per year. [to] provide a clear snapshot of student progress". No description of assessments used formatively is

provided nor is mention given to whether instructional pacing and delivery are modified tomorrow based upon the formative information provided today which is the core of formative assessment. This leads the reader to question exactly what data is used by teachers and administrators to inform daily instruction and if educators truly know what types of data they need in order to accelerate student learning.

- The applicant provides an example of how time negatively impacted the opportunity to utilize high-quality learning resources that describes an intervention program requiring "two full class periods a week to implement" in a pull out schedule. According to the applicant, "Unfortunately, the only school using the program had to stop using it, despite its effectiveness, due to time constraints." asserting that additional school days will rectify the situation. Description of how all educators will have access to resources that will provide actionable information to identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests, and process and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches is not evident.
- A description about how school climate and culture are specifically addressed is not evident.
- Description about how school leadership teams are utilized is not evident.

**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>8</b>

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

Strengths

- The applicant's reform plan, when taken in conjunction with the narrative and logic model includes, all of the pieces of a high-quality plan.
- Applicant has practices in place to facilitate the implementation of personalized learning at each school site.
- The LEA governance structure demonstrates a desire to provide support and services to all students.
- School Directors have flexibility and autonomy to implement the schedules, personnel and staffing, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators and school-level budgets.

Weaknesses

- The infrastructure necessary to achieve the reform goals presented in the applicants plan, is very difficult to understand. Multiple committees, coaches, and directors are charged with pieces of the the plan yet without an organization chart or other graphic to organize the information, the infrastructure is unclear and challenging to evaluate.
- A description regarding policies and rules, either already implemented or to be implemented, to facilitate personalized learning are not evident.
- Description regarding how school leadership teams are utilized is absent.
- Clear description of how a student earns credit based on demonstrated mastery is not provided. The applicant indicates students in grades 1-10 present learning to demonstrate their master to an adult panel before receiving a passing grade but does not reveal how students would accelerate their learning, how often the panels meet, how teachers provide specific opportunities for students to move forward even if it is at a different pace form their classmates, etc.
- The description of how students demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways does not address the prompt. Description of how one student would be afforded

an opportunity to show their learning through a research paper and another through a group research project is not clearly articulated by the applicant.

- The applicant presents a list of programs and curriculum such as Every Child a Reader, Lindamood-Bell, Camelot Math Intervention, and University of Chicago Math for addressing high-needs students rather than instructional practices specifically designed for ELL or students with disabilities. The rationale for this is that these "were field tested extensively with low-income, ELL students by developers". Recognition that the developer will generally indicate their product meets the needs of ELLs in order to make a sale, and that it is the district's responsibility to assure these products are aligned with current research on effective ELL instruction and their own pedagogy is necessitated when working with this fragile student population.

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

**10**

**9**

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

**Strengths**

- The applicant's reform plan, when taken in conjunction with the narrative and logic model includes, all of the pieces of a high-quality plan.
- Use of weighted formula for budget allocations
- "Anythink" Library centrally located on the campus also utilized for athletic and fine arts occasions for easy access to all members of the community. Have cafes, large meeting spaces, computers and online resources
- Applied for and received over \$6 million in grant and gift funding for instructional materials
- intentional, onsite technical support when new technology rolls out
- provide community and parents with information regarding internet packages designed for low income families.
- Infinite campus provides families with anytime access to student information

**Weaknesses**

- Specific description about how outside stakeholders, such as parents, have access to content instructional tools is absent.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>

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

**Strengths**

- The applicant includes all pieces of a high-quality plan by adding a section within their reform plan focused on continuous improvement.
- Structure of the reform initiatives, including the School Support Teams (SSTs), is inclusive and innovative.
- Includes parents and central office in the reform process.

**Weaknesses**

- Further description in the narrative or the specific plan are needed in the following areas:
  - Specific description of who the District Learning Services Team (DLST) is comprised of is lacking.
  - Description regarding how specific reform areas are identified is not evident.
  - Clear description of how many SSTs will be operating, specific central office administrator and visiting school director, how parents and teachers are identified to serve on the team, how visiting school directors are paired, what criteria will be used to capture SSTs's observations, and who and how teams will be trained is not presented.
  - Detailed description of how instructional rounds, SST observations, informal walkthroughs, School Support Team (SST) meetings, and other formal and informal observations fit together is missing.

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

**5**

**2**

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

**Strengths**

- The applicant includes all pieces of a high-quality plan by adding a section within their reform plan focused on continuous improvement.
- Includes teachers' organization in the roll out of the grant.
- Senior central office administration is responsible for communication plan implementation.

**Weaknesses**

- Description of how community involvement will be assessed throughout the grant as well as a measurable target is lacking.
- While "listening tours" are identified as a feedback tool, a description of what these are and how they work is not provided.
- Parts of the communication plan in appendix 2 are not included in the narrative for section (E)(2) including the use of "existing community and civic publications such as neighborhood newsletters, chamber newsletters, email listservs".
- Detail regarding school and community meetings including frequency, purpose, who is facilitating, where they will be held, etc. is not provided.
- Description of how the teachers' organization, and other represented employees, are involved after the initial roll out is absent.

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

**5**

**2**

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

**Strengths**

- The applicant includes all pieces of a high-quality plan by adding a section within their reform plan focused on continuous improvement.
- P-2 performance measures in math and reading are included
- Utilization of measurements already in place provides longitudinal data to assess grant activity implementation impact based against growth from years when the grant was not in place.

**Weaknesses**

- Descriptions of how each measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information is not provided. Each measurement identified only addresses the number of times it will be administered.
- Detail regarding how performance measures were identified is unclear. For example, the table detailing performance measures for grades 9-12, the applicant selected "The number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal

Student Aid (FAFSA) form" as their performance measure. All targets are identified as "TBD" with a note indicating that the data for one school was misplaced. Rationale regarding why the applicant would include this measure if their disaggregated baseline data set is incomplete is not evident.

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

**5**

**2**

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

Strengths

- The applicant includes all pieces of a high-quality plan by adding a section within their reform plan focused on continuous improvement.
- Frequent classroom observations from all levels of the district at all schools are identified

Weaknesses

- The continuous improvement and reform plan is lacking description of how the process describing regarding qualitative data about professional development and how it will be collected by the SSTs. The description is not clear nor does it address how frequently SST teams meet in addition to the 2 days per month when observations are being conducted. Furthermore, observation protocols, instructional rounds protocols, informal walkthrough protocols, etc. are not included in the appendix so that a common instructional objective can be evaluated.

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

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

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

Descriptions of personnel expenditures funded by the grant proposal is provided although not complete. External funds are not detailed. The applicant refers to annual external funds provided by community groups and foundations of \$2.5-3.5 million annually yet no description of how or if these funds will be used to support proposed activities is included. Additionally, inclusion of in-kind funds from the district are not mentioned, detailed or described including expenditures for office furniture and supplies for newly created positions, materials, computers, and other necessary materials to set up a new office or program. The Intersession specific budget includes expenditures for materials that include workbooks, which are not explained so as to avoid supplanting of funds for instructional purposes. The budget narrative, consisting of a paragraph, lacks description of specific professional development offerings, current scheduling of professional development offerings to use as a comparison, a timeline or description of what will be offered, how frequently, and who will be providing the training. The Clayton Partnership School is requesting funds to create an Intern Coordinator who is the "full time student intern supervisor and instructional coach". In their program description, the school identifies the need to "go slow (implement carefully and thoughtfully, particularly with outside organizations) to go fast (improve student achievement)". No letter of support from an institute of higher education is provided raising concerns as to the viability of the relationship. Also, no in-kind contribution from the university to supervise the student interns is included as would be expected from a collaborative university/LEA program and no job description is included in the appendix for evaluation. Similarly, other positions "critical to implementation" of school's program design are allocated funding yet lack job descriptions as well as detailed program descriptions so as to evaluate the appropriateness of the expenditures.

Other concerns include:

- No travel budget for central administration staff in any capacity including conferences where effective reforms could be shared and networked.
- Equipment costs that do not account for devaluation and replacement costs, particularly with small, mobile devices.
- Description of ½ of the RTTT Project Director salary being paid out of "District Funds" in year 4 with \$0 funds allocated out of the grant.
- Professional development for paraprofessionals is not allocated.
- The plan does not include measurable goals. No description or table of in-kind support, whether from district or outside funds, is provided including the Effective Educator positions referred to throughout the proposal

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

**10**

**1**

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

**Strengths**

- The applicant notes they will use per pupil funding from anticipated growth to sustain programs.

**Weaknesses**

- The only strategies identified for sustainability is for the district to grow, and generating additional revenue from mill levies, neither of which are sure things.
- Seventy-five percent of the budget is allocated for personnel including adding 18 days onto the instructional calendar. Should the growth the district is anticipating not transpire, the proposed activities and changes would not be sustainable.
- The project budget table detailing the calendar extension indicates that this reform has already begun. No narrative regarding why this expenditure would be transferred to grant funding is provided.
- Elimination of all four central administration positions after the funding ceases without description of how the responsibilities of the Intersession Coordinator and Assessment Coordinator will be integrated and sustained to assure continuous improvement once funding ceases.
- Support letters do not indicate any financial contribution either now, or in the future.
- Plan does not include measurable goals
- Projected growth and per pupil increases are based upon a 4% per year increase of students. Four percent was recognized by the applicant as the "largest increase in last 10 years" yet all enrollment predictions are generated from the historic increase.

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

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

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

**Strengths**

- 2 signature programs; one focused on early childhood and one focused on mental health services for students and families
- The Incredible Years is a research-based, proven effective program for the target population (P-K) Model Blueprint program designated by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence
- Has classroom, parent, and teacher component
- Additional, differentiated support from coaches at Invest in Kids whereby teachers experienced

in the program have fewer coaching sessions than those new to the program.

- Central administration support person available
- Senior level central administrator chairs the county-wide youth initiative that is "dedicated to improving service availability and coordination among youth-and-family-serving agencies" and seeks to align community assets with identified needs

## Weaknesses

- The Incredible Years program is currently in place and the applicant indicates they provide in-kind resources to support the implementation of the program and that no grant funding will be used to sustain it. However, there is no MOU, contract, budget narrative, or budget table as evidence of the partnership. A letter of support from Invest in Kids is included where the Executive Director indicates they have been "proudly partnering with Mapleton Public Schools for over a decade" but specific detail about that partnership or other financial evidence is not provided.
- The role of the District Prevention Coordinator in overseeing or facilitating these programs is not provided.
- Clear explanation about current prevention programs at each site is not evident. The applicant states, "at least one full annual [SST] meeting [will be dedicated] to student behavior and school culture/climate supports, which may include bully proofing, Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS), Love and Logic or other programs" without identifying if these programs are currently in place in any schools, which ones, what is the district approach, etc.
- The Adams County Youth Initiative has been designated as the existing agency charged with oversight of both programs. Detail regarding how the organization functions, how this agency will evaluate these programs, who is involved, etc is lacking.
- Responsibility for the selection, implementation, and evaluation of supports that address each student is charged to each school's Progress Monitoring Team, yet the decision-making process and infrastructure of these committees is unclear.
- Neither program addresses in clear detail how they will integrate into the proposed RTTT umbrella. In fact, the applicant states, "Because The Incredible Years program is delivered in classrooms by classroom teachers, there is no additional need to integrate education for participating students." Yet, coaches from the partner agency will be in classrooms, supporting teachers to enhance the socio-emotional welfare of students with the implied purpose of helping each student be the best they can be. Ignoring the need for close, ongoing dialogue and coordination between the 2 agencies, even though the program is currently in place, is detrimental to the future success of the overall program. Furthermore, coaching is a cornerstone of Mapleton's application with numerous coaches, guides, administrators, and mentors working with teachers at every level. Clearly detailing how those programs integrate with this program, beyond the SST meeting, is critical to a positive, seamless delivery of services for students.
- integration for mental health services is determined to be not applicable by the applicant because of HIPAA laws however, overall trends at each school site and throughout the district as a whole can and should be discussed at every level. Mental health services easily integrates with student achievement goals, coordinates with classroom, school, and district initiatives, as well as every area of family interaction and must be intentionally planned and incorporated into any reform effort.
- How capacity is built within the Community Reach Partnership is not addressed. Supporting educators as to warning signs, easy accommodations, parent tips, etc all build the capacity of the educator to better serve each student under their care.
- The performance measure targets for the 4-year graduation rates are omitted.
- Engaging parents and families into decision-making roles is addressed by the applicant through

the SSTs yet, a description for how parents are selected for participation on the team, and recognition that the team only includes 2 parents from an entire school limits the opportunities for this stakeholder group. Discussion regarding the integration of RTTT decisions in general, and the competitive priority decisions in particular into already existing groups such as a district advisory panel, student advisory panel, school site council, ELAC, DELAC, etc. is a natural fit yet was not detailed in the application.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

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

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

Mapleton Public Schools has put forth a creative and innovative application that indicates systemic leadership grounded in making decisions that are in students' best interests. Having the courage to close every school in their system and recreate small-school-by-design learning environments that empower parents to select a school best suited to their student reveals a district willing to do the hard work of systemic change and they are to be applauded for their initiative, tenacity and persistence in what was most certainly not an easy past ten years. This is the greatest strength of the application- having the foresight and courage to do the unthinkable.

The details in both the past and future reform initiatives however are lacking throughout every section of the application and fail to clearly address the core educational assurances. As an outsider to the district, I have a very murky picture of what my classroom instruction would look like, particularly in regards to personalized learning environments, and how many different coaches would be working with me each of whom may be saying different things. Educator Effectiveness Experts, Instructional Coaches, Delivery Design Experts, The Incredible Years Coaches, and others are all identified as providing support and coaching to school directors and teachers throughout the district. Numerous school and district committees were mentioned including School Support Teams, Progress Monitoring Teams, District Advocacy Team, etc. but who is on these teams, how they are selected for inclusion on the team, what their purpose is and how they integrate with other existing teams at the school and district level is not detailed. Frequently flow charts, organization charts, schedules and other graphic organizers could have been inserted to provide clarity to the reader. The feedback given to many writers of 'show not tell' is relevant when summing up the application as a whole: communicate to the reader using clear details and specifics so that a persuasive and confident case is presented for your creative and innovative ideas.

The assertion that more time would produce better academic achievement, without the use of site specific details regarding instruction, is not persuasive. Furthermore, over reliance on a 4% growth rate and additional mill levies in these uncertain economic times weakens the argument that these proposed programs will be sustained after the funding ceases. This is compounded by 93% of the grant budget needing to be sustained and 67% of that funding going to salaries and benefits that will continue to rise far beyond the funding cycle.

Total	210	114
-------	-----	-----



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0020CO-2 for Mapleton Public Schools

#### 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>

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

MPS has instituted and proposed interventions that are consistent with the four core educational assurances. 1) Students are instructed via curriculum that is aligned with Common Core State Standards; 2) The district uses a tiered system of assessments that include student-level data analysis that measure student growth; 3) MPS rewards and retains effective teachers and administrators with competitive compensation packages, utilizes differential professional development, and ties teacher and principals' evaluation to student growth (50%); 4) prepared a proposal which can impact MPS's ability to turn around the lowest achieving schools.

MPS has articulated a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity. The MPS approach includes three specific interventions to accomplish this task 1) Deepen the Existing Small-by-Design School model, 2) Creation of a student-centered calendar that eliminates summer break and adds 18 instructional days, 3) Provides 15 days of intersession programming.

Students in MPS have the option of choosing a school design that meets individual interest and need. Each of the individual schools incorporates a different learning model, however all schools utilize an inquiry-based approach connected to the Common Core. The inquiry-based approach minimizes whole group instruction leading to increased individual interaction and increases the possibility for a personalized approach.

MPS has articulated a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that is consistent with the four core assurance areas, defines the approach to accelerating student achievement and increasing equity, and describes the classroom experience, resulting in a maximum score.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The MPS proposal includes all 14 district schools. All 14 schools are listed in the School Demographics table. The School Demographics table includes the number of participating educators and number of participating students in each of the demographic categories and each school independently meets the requirement criteria.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**  
 MPS included a logic model outlining the root causes and assumptions, based on local data and peer-reviewed research, specifically related to closing achievement gaps and increasing equity. The targets identified are the specific outcomes identified in the competition and the reforms they have proposed can be evaluated with the indicators they have selected. MPS has adopted a series of reforms over the past 10 years, their proposal will enhance and extend these reforms and provide additional time and resources to students and teachers to personalize learning for all. The proposal contains the majority of elements of a high quality plan including key goals, activities and deliverables. What is unclear is the extent to which who the primary responsible parties are for achievement, teachers or teacher effectiveness experts.

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

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**  
 MPS identified the Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP) as its summative assessment instrument. The district also included an appropriate methodology for assessing both proficiency and growth using the state-defined achievement levels and state formula for growth. MPS has committed to an elimination of all achievement gaps. While these targets are ambitious, it is difficult to see that they are achievable. The most significant gaps exist within the special education student population (e.g.. Math Grade 3 37%, Reading Grade 3 37%, Science Grade 10 45%) other populations with gaps less than 20% are both ambitious and likely achievable. MPS reports an overall graduation rate of 58% with slight variability in rates by subgroup with the exception of IEP (15 point gap). The district notes that the Mapleton Early College High school contributes to the low graduation rate, but does not describe in a substantive manner how.  
 The district has proposed significant, ambitious and achievable targets. MPS reports a college enrollment rate of 46%, which is not disaggregated by subgroup. They have proposed an ambitious target, but student family income inhibits college attainment for many of their students, thus target may be unattainable due to factors outside of the district's control. Additionally, the district did not include appropriate measures for the preK-3 population.

**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>15</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**  
 MPS has documented their ability to improve student learning outcomes and student achievement over the past four years while seeing an increase in the number of students receiving free/reduced lunch. These gains are across content areas

and the rates exceed those of the state average. MPS has a low graduation rate and high dropout rate, but has shown improvements over time. Additionally, MPS has had a marked and dramatic improvement in the number of students applying to and being accepted in college.

In 2002, MPS closed and re-designed all of their existing schools which many would consider an ambitious and significant reform. This decision was made in response to decades of flat and declining achievement scores. The result has been a series of smaller, theme-based schools.

MPS makes student-level data available to educators using 3 data systems (Alpine Achievement, Infinite Campus, and Aimsweb). Students and parents have access to data via the Infinite Campus system. Additionally, the Colorado Department of Education provides an online tool for parents as well. The Colorado Growth Model allows parents to access summative assessment data, in context, for their child online.

The MPS proposal sufficiently meets each of the criteria for demonstration of a clear track record of success in the past four years.

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

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

MPS provides an expenditure summary which includes each of the competition criteria on their district website in the "Financial Transparency" section (it can be found in appendix 4 in the application).

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

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

There is sufficient evidence that MPS has both the conditions and sufficient autonomy under State, legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environment. Colorado is defined in the proposal as a "local control" state, there appears to be a great deal of autonomy at school sites, and there exists a history of reform.

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

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

In the development of it's proposal MPS utilized the District Accountability Advisory Committee, Board of Education, and School Accountability Advisory Committee. An executive summary was presented on the district homepage and students were consulted via the Superintendent's Council. Teacher support is evidenced by the letter of support from the collective bargaining unit and the letters of support from each school association representative.

Letters of support from key stakeholders including Staff, Elected Officials, Student Organizations, Businesses, and Local Foundations were included in the application.

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>

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

The plan developed by MPS represents a high-quality approach to enhancing teaching and learning with three specific interventions: 1) deepening existing small-by-design schools, 2) creation of a student-centered calendar, 3) providing an additional 15 days of intersession programming. Student school choice increases relevance and student motivation through a differentiated curriculum, the hand-on approach leads to less whole group instruction and more individualized learning. The individualized approach assists students in linking goal and college and career ready standards which aids in the development of an individualized pathway toward those goals.

The proposal further enhances the personalized approach through increased contact time. This time allows teachers to further develop their skill set around personalized learning, allows high achieving students to engage in enrichment experiences, and provides lower achieving students with opportunities to remediate material.

MPS provides high quality content via theme-based schools, research-based curricula, and appropriate technology.

MPS is committed to providing regular and on-going feedback including increasing its use of individual student data. Data has been used in PLCs, but it is unclear the degree to which this is standard practice as it has not been systematized.

Finally, MPS does provide interventions for many, but not all high-needs students. The district has committed to delivering interventions and progress monitoring through Aimsweb.

MPS provides appropriate tools and mechanisms to ensure students can track and manage their learning. Each student in the district has an Individual Career and Academic Planning Document and can access grades and transcripts via the online student record tool. Student-led and goal setting conferences provide students with an opportunity to access formative data and develop a plan utilizing both GoogleDocs and College in Colorado.

MPS does appear to provide personalized high-quality content and instruction and has committed to providing regular and on-going feedback. However, at this time the use of specific student level data to improve instruction and personalize learning is not in evidence. The proposal includes all of the elements of a high quality plan (key goals, activities & rationale, timeline, deliverables) with the exception of the responsible parties. It is unclear who bears the primary responsibility for personalizing learning, the teachers or the teacher effectiveness coaches, this results in score at the low end of the high range.

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

**20**

**18**

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

MPS provides differential professional development opportunities based on teacher needs. The district recently added four educator effectiveness experts who will be tasked with identifying professional development needs based on student level data, teacher experience, and other factors. Additionally, MPS has proposed enhanced use of PLCs and the additional time for student level data analysis. To improve effectiveness of teachers and principals, the district will continue to utilize classroom walkthroughs, has recently begun the process of “instructional rounds”, will conduct formal observations as well as the educator effectiveness experts.

MPS uses interim, formative assessments to track student progress toward college and career ready standards. On collaboration days, principals conduct “data dives” in an effort to accelerate student progress with support from instructional coaches. Principals meet with monthly SSTs and analyze formative assessment and develop actionable suggestions.

The district utilizes a research-based curriculum in each of its content areas and teachers have received training and engage in PLCs for effective implementation. The district also developed a demonstration classroom for new and struggling teachers.

In addition to the effectiveness experts the district adopted the Colorado Department of Education’s rubric for administrator evaluation and principals meet with the School Support Teams for in-depth conversations about curriculum, instruction, assessment and student progress.

MPS will utilize two strategies to ensure students receive instruction for effective and highly effective teachers and principals. First, the district will implement the Danielson Framework for Teaching as the foundation of the evaluation system. Second, the district will provide professional development in a variety of formats to meet the specific needs of individuals. While the district does not have specific hard-to-staff schools they do allow for \$1,000 bonuses for hard-to-staff subject areas. The district has not had difficulty in staffing.

This section of the proposal does represent a high quality approach to teaching and leading that helps educators improve instruction. Key goals include increased personalized learning via enhanced professional development and increased used of PLCs. The activities and rationale are appropriate and can, if done well, lead to the desired outcomes. Timelines and deliverables are evident, though could be more specifically identified along with the responsible party for each of the specific deliverables.

**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>

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

MPS currently has the necessary structures in place to provide support and service to all schools in the district. Schools and leadership teams have sufficient flexibility in budgeting and hiring and the district will add a second central administrator to increase the level of service provided to individual schools. Day-to-day project implementation will be handled by a Race to the Top Project Director.

MPS students will continue to have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. Mastery can be demonstrated via a variety of authentic and standardized assessments, but it is not clear that students have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery multiple times. However, one means of mastery is through the use of adult panels as being central to the system of assessment. The proposal does not explain how these panels are constituted, which subjects they relate to, how they operate, how a student can bring evidence to bear, and how that evidence might be evaluated. The proposal also fails to identify how children in the elementary schools can demonstrate mastery.

Finally, all students including those with disabilities and English learners have access to school-level interventionists (separate from special educators) who can provide additional intervention support. What is provided however, is a list of programs that are accessible, specific instructional assessments are not identified.

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

**10**

**8**

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

Due to the homogeneity of the district there are few disparity issues, the district does however, use a weighted formula to determine school budgets to ensure the most highly impacted students receive the most resources. Teachers, students and parents all receive appropriate training and technical support relevant to teaching and learning. Teachers are trained in the use of instructional technology prior to its implementation. Students and parents are trained in the use of the district data system in class and/or at parent conferences. The district system (Infinite Campus) will be modified so that students/parents can export data in an open format and MPS currently uses interoperable data systems. While the proposal includes some elements of a high quality plan (Key Goals, Activities & Rationale, Deliverables) it lacks several critical elements including a specific timeline in which all deliverables will be accomplished and those parties responsible for delivery.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The MPS strategy for continuous improvement includes quantitative and qualitative components. The district plans to monitor school and student level data monthly at School Support Team meetings. The emphasis for the Race to the Top Director and Superintendent's Cabinet will be on trends and outliers that can be acted upon. To evaluate effectiveness the district will conduct surveys, instructional rounds, walkthroughs, and qualitative feedback. Data will be shared via an annual Race to the Top Performance summary. The district presents a plan for continuous improvement, but it lacks the the components of a high quality plan. The key goals appear to be the evaluation of the effectiveness of activities (PLCs, trainings, etc.), but there is a lack of clarity as to how this will be done. The proposal identifies instructional rounds and classroom walkthroughs, but does not indicate how these will be evaluated or communicated specifically to the teachers involved. There is no apparent timeline for implementation of the specific practices, only the discussion of data at the higher level (Superintendent's Cabinet) and dissemination to the public. It is not clear what the deliverables actually are nor the parties specifically responsible for ensuring they occur.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>In addition to the summary, the district plans to utilize listening tours with internal and external stakeholders, internal communications materials, surveys, and school and community meetings. The section consists of a list of strategies (activities and rationale) but does not represent a high quality plan. It is not clear what the goals of these activities are, the timelines, or deliverables.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b>		

The MPS proposal contains a sufficient number of academic and behavioral assessments. There is an appropriate rationale for each assessment and ambitious yet achievable annual targets. For each measure the proposal states “if it is insufficient, curricula-specific measures may be added”. What is unclear in the proposal is how these measures will provide timely and formative leading information regarding success or areas of concern. The district does not provide a timeline for formative assessment, each of the measures appears to be summative. The assessments are linked to the proposed plan/theory of action, but there there is no evidence of a direct relationship between specific measures and stated goals.

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

**5**

**2**

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

MPS has proposed a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the investments by criterion type, performance measures, calendar effectiveness, and intersessions. Additionally, the district will employ a national evaluator as required. There is insufficient evidence to justify that this is a high quality plan for rigorous evaluation. The proposal lists a series of performance measures (activities and rationale), but lacks timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Additionally, the section only includes calendar and intersession effectiveness. The plan, as proposed, lacks an evaluation of the effectiveness of the required professional developed, which is key to improvement in personalized learning, and increasing the number of effective and highly effective educators and principals.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

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

MPS provided an overall and project-level budget summaries which account for all total requested funds. The budget summaries account for all funds including RTTT, District, and external sources. The summaries include both one-time investments and those that will be incurred during and after the grant period. The requested funds are reasonable and sufficient to support the proposed reform initiative. There is a lack of detail on the part of the proposal related to external and in-kind funds. The proposal does not include job or program descriptions related to the use of specific funds. There is a lack of specific detail related to the positions that will be created and funded through the proposal. There is no detail provided with regard to the specific professional development opportunities that will be provided with competition funds.

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

**10**

**3**

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

MPS has committed to sustaining the reform effort post-grant though the use of state and local funds. Some of these funds are expected to be incurred via enrollment increases, additional bonds, and their track record of obtaining competitive public and private grants. While the district is committed to sustaining the reform effort, the funding sources are not entirely reliable. It is entirely unclear as to how the reform work will be sustained without the personnel hired through competition funds. The applicant has not developed a high quality plan for sustaining the project goals. Specifically, this section lacks specific activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties for raising the required funds post-grant to sustain the effort.

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

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

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

MPS has identified two coherent and sustainable partnerships with Invest in Kids and Community Reach to offer the Mapleton’s LearnWell Initiative. The partnership provides social-emotional and mental health support to students through the use of a classroom program and school-based therapists.

MPS has identified 7 population-level desired results within two categories 1. Improved Social and Emotional Health Measures and 2) Improved Educational Measures. The proposal does articulate how each of the outcomes will be specifically measured.

Each of the selected indicators is already measured by the district and captured in the Infinite Campus data system. The data is analyzed by a third party evaluator. Student support teams will review the data in an effort to direct resources/emphasis to students needing intervention or facing significant challenges. The proposal details specific actions to be taken with each partner to improve the quality of service delivery along with a communication plan.

The program is delivered by classroom teachers and school-based therapists ensuring the availability to all students in the district.

MPS teachers will receive training on the administration of the Social Competence Teacher Scale. This measure is related to the specific services delivered and measures students' prosocial/communication, emotional regulation, and school readiness skills. Coaches visit 3 times per year and work with teachers to identify students in need of specific lessons or instructional approaches. For the Community Reach partnership, teachers work directly with school-based counselors to identify students who may need individual counseling. These counselors work with families and assess student needs and create a treatment plan for them.

MPS has identified ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the population.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

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

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

MPS has instituted and proposed interventions that comprehensively address and build on the core assurance areas.

Students in the district are instructed in a school choice system, where they are given opportunities to participate in a Common Core aligned, specific theme based curriculum. The district uses a tiered system of assessments that include student level data analysis of student proficiency and growth. The district rewards and retains effective teachers and principals and develops them with a series of differential professional development opportunities. This is a district with a track record of impressive reforms, that has presented a proposal which can further impact their ability to turn around the lowest achieving schools. MPS has articulated a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity.

The MPS approach includes three specific interventions to accomplish this task 1) Deepen the Existing Small-by-Design School model, 2) Creation of a student-centered calendar that eliminates summer break and adds 18 instructional days, 3) Provides 15 days of intersession programming. MPS has articulated a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that is consistent with the four core assurance areas, defines the approach to accelerating student achievement and increasing equity, and describes the classroom experience.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>167</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0020CO-3 for Mapleton Public Schools

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

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

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

a) The Mapleton RTT-D reform initiatives vaguely describe how they will build on the four core educational assurances. Overall, the Mapleton School District has an over reliance on personnel and tax levy to support the RTT-D reform. For example,

- RTT-D funds will be used to create more competitive salary packages based on the new student-centered calendar and increase teacher salaries;
- The applicant's decision to specify that RTT-D funds will be allocated to toward increasing teacher salary is questionable;
- The ability to sustain the proposed RTT-D personnel and salaries with district funds and partnership monies that are not guaranteed, after funding ceases is unrealistic.

Furthermore, it would be helpful to have visuals incorporated into the flow chart to thoroughly illustrate the information.

b) To recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals, the Mapleton School District offers a competitive compensation package. Teacher and administrator evaluations are connected to student growth and achievement. Although, the applicant intends to accelerate and deepen student learning by integrating the school designs (program, curricula delivery and methods) at the individualized student level a clear and credible approach has not been presented in the RTT-D plan. For example, it is unclear how the designs were selected for each participating schools.

The Mapleton School District relies heavily on the school calendar as being the primary reform initiative that will improve student achievement. However, the intersession programs that are an integral part of the calendar appear to be optional for students. The applicant does not discuss whether intersessions will be mandatory for high-needs and low performing students. Thereby, possibly affecting the level of personalized support high-needs, low performing students receive to accelerate academic learning.

Furthermore, the data illustrating correlation between FRL, ELL students to the RTT-D goals is to interpret. Also, the applicant does not explain why student growth in high-need subgroup is high and rising but achievement gap remains the same. Therefore, it is difficult to determine how RTT-D proposal will accelerate student learning, thus demonstrating how standards and assessments will prepare participating students to succeed in college and the workplace.

c) Every classroom environment in the Mapleton School District is expected to reflect rigor, engagement, hands on approach, and personalization. Students will receive quality personalized instruction that focuses on the school design and supports their individual interest. Students will participate in inquiry based standards that connect CCSS to student interests. Teachers will recognize each students' learning style and concentrate on college and career-ready standards. Although, the applicant provides a details of what the teacher and student will do, a clear description of what one would see going on, more specifically, the environment was not provided.

Overall, a prior commitment to improving student achievement in every school resulted in radical change in the Mapleton School District. This is articulated in the applicant's RTT-D vision that describes past, present and future reform initiatives. However, the applicant has not articulated a clear and credible to the goals of accelerating student achievement for all subgroups of students, ambitious and achievable goals that will measure student growth over time, thoroughly discussing the achievement data and goals that will accelerate learning, and sparse evidence to illustrate college admission rates and attendance. Based on the evidence in this section the applicant's score is 7.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

a) The applicant's RTT-D proposal is a district-wide initiative targeting all schools except for one contract on line school not managed by the District. The District is comprised of 490 educators and 6,238 students in grades Pre-K to 12. The applicant has shown that each participating school meets RTT-D eligibility requirements. A historical and chronological implementation of past and present reform, and design selections for each school are presented in sections A1 and

A2. Although, a detailed explanation of the selection process is undocumented in this section, the applicant does justify their decision as providing equity for all students. The next phase of reform relies heavily on RTT-D fund. The applicant does not provide a detailed description of a process that will ensure reform initiatives accelerate student learning in all participating schools within the RTT-D grant period.

b) A listing of participating schools is presented in the School Demographic Chart.

c) The applicant has provided sufficient data for each participating school that reflects the number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, high-needs students and participating educators.

Overall, the applicant's approach to implementing the RTT-D reform initiatives to accelerate student learning in all participating schools was vague. However, the applicant did provide appropriate documentation for criteria a, b, and c. The applicant's score for this section is 8.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The applicant describes a district-wide reform approach inclusive of all 14 schools. They believe that implementing pockets of reform tend to generate inequalities among district schools. Therefore, scaling up will occur for all participating small-by-design schools during the designated RTT-D funding period. It is unclear as to how change beyond the participating schools, if any will be executed.

The focus will be on supporting teachers in leveraging student data to personalize and differentiate instruction using design-specific strategies and increase academic achievement. The RTT-D Logic Model depicted in Figure 1 summarizes local, state and national data, root causes, and research used to develop the action plan (located in appendix 2). Additional areas in the Logic Model, such as activities, inputs and resources, and factors are insufficient. For example, engagement of continuous improvement of program activities statement needs to be clarified. The applicant also identified a need to increase the number of instructional days for students and create a year round school calendar.

Overall, the applicant provides a general overview of the RTT-D reform proposal in the previous section, A2. Based on the evidence provided in this section the applicant's score is 7.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The Mapleton School District RTT-D vision specifies ambitious goals that focus on student learning and performance. This is evident in their approach to include all Mapleton District schools and increase equity. For example, data for subgroups are far below the state average and not showing gains.

a. Summative data in math, reading and writing in 2011-12 and 2012-13 indicate small gains and declines for all subgroups in specific grade levels. For example, eight grade students with an IEP showed a 10% (2012-13) increase in performance from 4 % (2011-12). There was also a gain in math at the ninth grade level. Future goals for academic achievement improvement derived from the baseline data for each subject. However, the goals were not thoroughly defines as to how they would result in improving student learning and performance. The applicant did not provide data for grades PreK-3.

b. The applicant specified that in the Mapleton School District there are very few White, non-Hispanic students at certain grade levels, resulting in a low N for some comparison groups and wide variation in achievement (because of low number of students in the group). Therefore, it is difficult to provide evidence of a decrease in academic achievement for remaining subgroups. The data for English Language Learners (ELL) and non-ELL students shows a gradual narrowing of gaps between these sub-populations.

c. Although, the graduation rate (tables 3 and 4) for the Mapleton School District remains low and the dropout rate

high, the number of students accepted to college is 100%. The applicant attributes this to focused efforts and programs at every high school.

Data from the Mapleton Early College, a five year high school and associate degree program has an adverse effect on graduation data. Cohorts of students entering and graduating from high school on time also impact the graduation rate.

- d. All high school seniors in the Mapleton School District are required to apply to at least two colleges. In 2005, the college application rate was 50%, and in 2012, it was 100%. This data represents students who entered and graduated from high school on time. Because the data represent students who entered and graduate from high school on time the cohort of students each year would fluctuate, thus providing inconsistency in the data. The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence for this section. Overall, baseline data was submitted for SY2011-12 was 46.4 % and 51% in SY 2012-13 for students enrolled in college.

Overall, the applicant has been involved in reform initiatives for more than 10 years. Therefore, the annual academic goals detailed in this section will continue to increase at a slow but steady gain. The data presented in this section to support a, b, and c limits the extent to which the applicant can consistently increase and achieve the proposed annual goals. Inconsistencies that exist in the graduation rate contradict the data presented on students accepted to college. Applicant's score in this area is 7.

## 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>15</b>

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

a) The applicant provides standardized test data and graphs in this section that show a slow but steady achievement in science, math and writing. Additional information on achievement and equity is presented in A1. Although, there is a gradual narrowing of achievement gaps between ELL and non-ELL students the gap among subpopulations has not decreased due to the rapid growth in all student subgroups. Figures 2-5 show achievement levels that exceed the state average. In 2012, 14 schools were categorized by state standards as in priority improvement and turnaround status. By 2013, only one of the 14 schools was in the bottom two state accreditation levels. The reform initiatives presented in this proposal derive from baseline data.

Overall, the applicant has presented initial reform initiatives that generated a slow but gradual increase in student achievement. The RTT-D reforms are built upon past and current initiatives that will advance learning.

b) The applicant has demonstrated the ability to implement ambitious and comprehensive reform prior to the RTTD proposal. As a result of declining test scores the Mapleton School District closed all 14 schools and reopened small by design schools. Design models focused on building student to student and student to teacher relationships, increasing graduation rates and college enrollment. As mentioned in the first paragraph by 2013 only one school was performing below the state level. The RTT-D reform proposal describes feasible goals that will meet the needs of every student and improve the lowest achieving school.

c) All stakeholders in the Mapleton School District have access to information. The applicant has provided evidence that student performance data is available to parents, students and educators in real time using a data system and other formats. The Mapleton School District established an Academic Parent Team that focuses on student achievement. Parents are provided with instructional activities to do at home that reflect their child's academic performance. Data is also available and discussed in conferences with parents, parents and students, and students.

Based on the evidence in this section the applicant's score is 15.

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

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

The applicant has demonstrated evidence of a thorough transparency process that is accessible to the public. For example, the Mapleton School District Financial Transparency section, located in appendix 4 is made public. Principals have autonomy in selecting staff. Curriculum is available online to the public for 30 days prior to Board adoption. The RTTD proposal was also visible online for public comment.

The applicant has presented appropriate data in section B2 that supports a score of 5.

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

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

The applicant presented evidence to support that no state laws; statutes, regulations, or policies will impede or prohibit the implementation of the RTT-D reforms. Not only is the Mapleton School District committed to change but the Colorado Department of Education devotes an entire division to Innovation, Choice, and Engagement. Districts have local autonomy in the areas of curriculum, graduation requirements, school calendar, and classroom policy. The Mapleton School District executed autonomy in changes to teacher vacancies, teacher performance and ineffective teachers.

Based on the documentation presented in this section, the applicant has been able to initiate ambitious reform changes prior to the RTT-D proposal, thus demonstrating a commitment to creating conditions for personalized learning environments. Therefore, the applicant's score is 10.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

The applicant provides a detailed description of stakeholder engagement and support that occurred during the initial 2002 and 2013 RTT-D reform processes. The RTT-D proposal was discussed with stakeholders in 2012 and 2013. For example,

1. During a RTT-D public presentation, a major concern was the proposed year round school calendar. As a result of the presentation, the district was advised to make some changes. The calendar change failed to achieve support in 2012. The proposed calendar was revised to reflect and address the concerns raised. The calendar was presented again and approved for the 2013 RTT-D application. Additional calendar revisions focused on child care when school was not in session. The Mapleton School District proposed instituting academic intersessions during school recess.
2. The 2013 RTT-D proposal was presented to the Board of Education, District Accountability Advisory Committee (parents, District level staff and community members). An executive summary of the RTT-D application was posted on the District homepage for public comments.
3. Student representatives from all 14 participating schools attend monthly Superintendent's Council meetings. During this time the RTT-D application was shared with them. Feedback on the RTT-D proposal was positive. A letter of support is located in appendix 6.
4. At the school level, principals submitted written feedback on the proposed school calendar. Directors at each school also completed a needs assessment. It was unclear that the word "director" is used instead of "principal" in the Mapleton School District. This information was located in section D1. The use of both words interchangeably in the RTT-D proposal is confusing. In the text it appears to be two separate positions. Consistently using one title would provide clarity when discussing the role of the school administrator.
5. Teachers and staff attended strategic planning meetings and focus groups for each small-by design school. The applicant expanded outreach to obtain input from the broader staff via newsletters, emails, and web. Letters of support from the teachers' bargaining unit is located in appendix 8.

Overall, the candidate has presented appropriate evidence that describes past and present outreach strategies. Letters of support include elected officials, bargaining units, Superintendent's Student council, collaborative partnerships, businesses, education and local foundations. Support or involvement from local elected official is not mentioned in this section. More specifically, the mayor. Therefore, the applicant's score is 14.

### 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>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant presents three key reforms that will drive the implementation of the RTT-D reforms and provide all students the supports needed to graduate college--career ready. The reform initiatives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individualize instruction based on each student's data. Educators differentiate instruction;</li> <li>• student centered calendar; and</li> <li>• Instill a sense of relevance in all students---15 days of intersession programming.</li> </ul> <p>To deepen student learning at each small-by-design school the applicant has executed an ambitious reform process that will provide students with personalized learning environments and access to resources that will ensure that they are college -and career- ready. This is evident in the narrative in the proposal section C1. For example, instructional designs will be expanded at the school and student level; professional development will be differentiated for educators; technology will be upgraded; and instruction content-driven by student interest. teachers will gain an additional 18 days of instruction and 15 days to further personalize education opportunities for students. An overview of each design school is located in appendix 1. The applicant has hired educator effectiveness experts to oversee 5-10 small schools. They will visit classrooms and provide feedback on instruction, develop individual teacher professional and school wide development plans.</p> <p>The learning experiences in areas of academic interest for students, cultural and diversity opportunities, and resources for every student to access highly personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development is thoroughly described in this section. The applicant provides evidence of parental support from the moment a child enters school. School choice focuses on selecting a school based on the child's needs. Ongoing parental involvement to support student achievement in described in section B1. Also, the Mapleton School District has established an Academic Parent Teacher (APTT) program to engage caregivers in student instruction at home.</p> <p>Although, the applicant provides evidence for each section, a thorough explanation on how each accomodation and strategy, personalized learning recommendations, learning and development goals will be highly developed , executed, and look like in the personalized learning environment was not described in this section. The applicant's score for this section is 15.</p>		
<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>a) The applicant provides evidence of professional development and training to ensure that all participating educators are equipped to implement personalized instructional strategies to accelerate learning, meet the needs of all students, and measure student progress toward college- and career-graduation requirements. Trainings, policies, and evaluation measures are included in this section. New teachers participate in a one year induction program inclusive of three orientation days in the summer, monthly meetings with administrators, observations in demonstration classrooms and training in curriculum strategies. All teachers have access to tools, data, high quality learning resources, assessment, technology, graduation requirements and content-specific training. Standards of Practice rubrics are used by school directors. Teacher self assessments are located in appendix 9.</p>		

b) Every teacher has access to high quality curricular resources and uses interim, formative assessments to monitor student progress toward college and career graduation requirements. Students and teachers are able to access tools and resources. Those students needing Tier II or Tier III academic interventions are tracked in Aimsweb data system.

School directors (principals) are supported by central administrators during SST meetings. School directors use instructional rounds and walkthroughs to provide support to teachers.

c) The applicant has described the methods and on-going supports for the school director and leadership teams. Newly hired educator effectiveness experts will work closely with the principal on teacher development and personalized learning environments. Instructional guides and coaches also exist at many of the participating schools. Central office administrators meet monthly with the principal and SST. Additional information on principal and teacher evaluation is located in section C2.

d) Mapleton School District has a comprehensive evaluation process for teachers and principal. Fifty percent of teachers and principals evaluation will be on student achievement and student growth. The Mapleton School District provides on-going and relevant professional development for all educators. For example, if a teacher has high student growth in math but not reading, the District will provide specific training or coaching activities. Other tools may include on line lessons, and observations in demonstration classrooms. The applicant notes that because of the proximity and similar student population in the District, none of the RTTD participating schools are hard to staff,

The applicant has described a comprehensive process for ensuring that every participating student has a highly effective teacher and principal to guide them in completing college- to- career graduation requirements. Teacher and principal accountability measures have been thoroughly established. These measures demonstrate a commitment by the Mapleton School District to ensure student achievement remains a priority. The training, resources, tools, data and policies cited in this section are integral to the effectiveness of the RTTD reforms. Based on the extensive evidence provided in this section the applicant's score is 20.

**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>9</b>

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

a) Overall, past reform efforts in the Mapleton School District demonstrate the applicants' ability to execute change. To that extent, the Mapleton School District is committed to providing an infrastructure that supports the proposed RTT-D reform initiatives and resources that every school, classroom, teacher and student needs. For example, the applicant will ensure the integrity of the RTT-D process is maintained by requiring central office administrators to visit all participating schools each month to observe, support, and engage in conversations with staff. Also, an additional staff solely responsible for RTT-D reforms, such as a central office administrator and project director will be hired.

b) Although, the applicant's approach to ensuring that each participating school has the resources needed to support design specific reform initiatives that individualize learning for students and improve instructional practices, a description of how participating teachers and students are able to regularly access these is not discussed. The opportunity for each school to be accountable for the design-by school outcomes is reasonable. Each principal and school leadership team have complete autonomy over the daily school schedule but not the proposed RTT-D student calendar. The principal is also responsible for the budget and hiring of staff.

c-d) The applicant described how students will achieve mastery. For example, all students in participating schools will be required to demonstrate mastery before a panel of adults. A description of the adults who sit on the panel was not provided. Also, the applicant does not present the number of times the panel will meet with each student. It is unclear whether student presentations are required for all subjects. An example of what the process would look like at the elementary and secondary levels was not presented. The applicant provides extra academic credit for students who take the ACT.

The applicant does provide a description of how students will demonstrate mastery through multiple pathways. For example, students have access to formative and summative assessments, pen and pencil assessments, a portfolio of work is submitted to demonstrate mastery for students who are at level 1 and recommended for retention, and other methods in every subject area were presented. However, the applicant does not thoroughly discuss how mastery will be achieved for the participating lowest performing and high-needs students. A detailed description of a process designed for these

students and persons responsible was not provided. In addition, the applicant did not describe what other methods of assessment would be administered.

e) The Mapleton School District is focused on presenting multiple innovative resources to support personalized instructional practices that are accessible to all students, including English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD). For example,

- Appropriate resources will be aligned to the individual interest of each student;
- Teachers will receive support in differentiating instruction that will accelerate student learning; and
- Interventionist will be hired to provide Tier II and Tier III intervention for students and model for teachers.

Although, the applicant presents instructional practices and learning resources, a description of how specific practices and resources will be made adaptable and accessible to the most high-needs students and lowest performing students was not thoroughly discussed in this section. Also, the applicant does not thoroughly discuss the resources that will be provided and who will deliver them to students and teachers.

Overall, the applicants goals are ambitious, however the evidence presented does not fully demonstrate all of the components of a high-quality plan. For example, parties responsible for implementing the activities and deliverables were not thoroughly discussed to ensure the applicants' ability to provide an infrastructure to support comprehensive policies and practices that will maintain accessible resources for teachers and students. Furthermore, a thorough description of the implementation process for mastery that includes high-needs and lowest performing students was not discussed in this section. Therefore, the applicant's score for this section is 9.

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

**10**

**8**

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

a) The applicant describes policies that are currently in place to ensure equity for schools and students. For example,

- The majority of students in every participating school are from low-income families. This has resulted in an increase in students receiving free or reduced lunch. Therefore, distribution of budget funds to each school is determined by a formula and school demographics;
- Schools with the most highly impacted students receive the most resources;
- Smaller schools receive slightly higher per pupil support; and
- Schools with less experienced staff receive additional funding.

A strong collaboration with the public library was formed to provide all educators, students and families' additional access on or off the school site to resources, such as books, computers, teen reading programs, on line resources, etc. Overall, the applicant has demonstrated the ability to identify and implement reasonable resources that are equitable and accessible to all students.

b) Although, the budget for the Mapleton School District is limited, technology is available to teachers, families and students. The applicant provided thorough evidence of current access to technical supports. For example, teachers receive professional development prior to implementation of technology into the classroom.

All students access technology via classroom instruction and curriculum. They receive training on how to access the District's student data system (Infinite Campus).

Parents receive training and technical support during parent-teacher conferences. The applicant does not provide information on alternative methods of outreach to engage parents who do not attend conferences or technology trainings.

Although, the applicant provides technology training to stakeholders, a process for evaluating the appropriateness of technical support was not discussed in the application.

c) The Mapleton School District's current technology system does not have the capability to allow parent and students to export information in an open data format. Therefore, the applicant presents a reasonable timeline for implementing the RTT-D initiatives that will support upgrading the Mapleton School District's information system by 2014.

d) The applicant's evidence to support the use of interoperable data systems is explained in attachment 5. Interoperable data systems are used for human resources, student information, budget data and instructional improvements.

The RTT-D proposal for the Mapleton School District supports the criteria described in this section. The examples of evidence presented will ensure that educators and students have the necessary resources to successfully achieve the initiatives outlined in the RTT-D proposal. However, the applicant does not describe alternative methods to reach out and engage parents who are not actively involved in their childrens education. Therefore, the applicant's score is 8.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>

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

The applicant presented a process for evaluating the RTT-D reform initiatives. The Mapleton School District will use both quantitative and qualitative assessments to evaluate and monitor the progress and effectiveness in the following program areas:

- Professional development for all staff
- Curricular implementation
- instructional rounds and informal walkthroughs to ensure that 80% of teachers are adhering to fidelity of implementation models
- Student calendar personalized learning environments for each student

Feedback will include surveys for the PLC trainings, meeting minutes from stakeholder groups at each design school, data from Superintendent Cabinet meetings with executive level RTTD staff, data from each School Support Teams, All information is public and available on the District website, annual RTTD performance summary in newsletters. Continuous monitoring of the calendar change, quality of intersession instruction to support students, teacher progress in differentiating model-specific instructional strategies at the student level

Overall, the applicant does not present a high-quality plan that describes a continuous process for overseeing and

monitoring the effectiveness of the RTT-D reforms that allows all stakeholders multiple opportunities to determine areas of success and correct weakness. For example, a thorough process for providing timely and regular feedback during and after the RTT-D grant was not presented. Furthermore, the applicant does not describe a clear approach on how quality and equitable professional development trainings will be monitored, measured and provided to all participating educators. The goals and data presented to support this section does not demonstrate a rigorous continuous improvement. The applicant's score for this section is 9.

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

**5**

**2**

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

The applicant has developed a thorough process for providing and maintaining ongoing communication to internal and external stakeholders in the form of:

- Listening tours during the spring/summer of 2014 with all stakeholders to address RTT-D implementation concerns;
- Ongoing survey administered to internal and external stakeholders for feedback;
- School and community meeting to provide initial implementation information; and
- Internal communication via emails, newsletters, meeting minutes, etc.

Although, the applicant described key mechanisms for implementing and maintaining ongoing communication with the following stakeholder groups: parents, teachers, staff, Board of Education, Accountability Advisory Committee, Mapleton Education Association, Parents in Action/Volunteer Groups; there was no mention of involving and engaging students in the RTT-D process. Therefore, the score for this section is 3.

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

**5**

**3**

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

The applicant has provided data to support their rationale for selecting performance measures for each grade band and subgroup. Performance measures illustrated on the charts in the RTT-D proposal section E3 identify baseline and target measure, free/reduced lunch, student subgroups, percentage of highly effective teachers and principals. The applicant's summary of assessment instruments and processes for each grade level is achievable. For example,

- Prek-2 behavior and attendance. The percentage of students with behavior referrals will be the baseline data used as the social-emotional indicator.
- Grades 4-8-all assessments will be disaggregate by subgroups.
- 9-12 performance data will be reviewed to determine whether the measures are sufficient to gauge improvements.

The measures presented in this section are achievable but not ambitious enough to support the continuous improvement of the RTT-D plan. For example,

- Although low, the achievement measures are attainable but will continue to yield a slow and steady gain for participating students and subgroups, thus, affecting the rate to which the reform initiatives are determined to be effective in accelerating student learning; and
- The applicant will use the effectiveness of the calendar to measure change in student achievement, however a thorough evaluative process was not presented.

Overall, the applicant presents achievable measures. However, these measures will not provide rigorous and timely formative leading information that will determine the successes or concerns regarding the RTT-D implementation process. The applicant is also relying on the calendar change to accelerate student achievement. The applicant does not describe an evaluation process to determine the effect of the calendar changes. Based on the evidence provided the score for this section is 3.

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

**5**

**3**

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

The applicant has addressed additional responses to this section in E1. The RTT-D proposal describes evaluation

processes to monitor the ongoing implementation of the grant. Although, the applicant does relies heavily on the student centered calendar to accelerate academic achievement, an evaluation process was not described. Also, measures presented in section E3 are achievable but not rigorous enough to provide a clear and high-quality approach that ensures timely, and formative and leading information is used to determine RTT-D successes and concerns. The applicant indicated that assessments will include:

Student and parent surveys on pre/post intersession programs;

Debriefing meetings for educators;

Student achievement data; and

School design fidelity evaluation instrument.

Based on the evidence in this section and throughout the proposal the applicant has demonstrated a reasonable approach for evaluating the effectiveness of RTT-D funds. Therefore, the score is 3.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

### (F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) Although, the applicant identifies, external, State and other Federal funds budget funds to support the proposed RTT-D project ,detailed descriptions were not provided to support the budget, for example, a thorough description of external funding sources, how community funds and resources, if any would be used, and in-kind district funds were not mentioned. However, the proposed budget does list expenditures for each participating school.

b) The applicant presents a budget proposal that includes expenditures to support the implementation of their RTT-D reforms but does not describe any funding that will sufficiently sustain the continuation of initiatives after the grant cycle; for example, personnel expenditures, measurable goals that would determine the effectiveness of the budget, deliverables, activities to be undertaken, and goals. Concerns pertaining to sustainability are further discussed in section F2.

c) As mentioned in a above, the applicant does not provide a thorough description of all funding sources to support the implementation of the RTT-D proposal, for example,

- Undocumented evidence to support external funds or in-kind contributions during and after funding ceases;
- A description of how each RTT-D personnel will be evaluated;
- No letters of support from higher institutions or evaluation process;
- A detailed description of personnel and sustainability after the funding period; and
- Continuance of professional development stipends and salary for intersession program.

Although, the applicant identifies funds that will be used for one-time investments versus ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grand period, it is unclear whether external or partnership funding sources will be used.

Overall, the applicant has presented a budget that lists funding sources. However, the budget presented does not thoroughly demonstrate a high-quality plan that is reasonable enough to support the implementation and ensure the continuation of RTT-D reform initiatives. For example, the personnel line is too high to be sustained after the grant ceases; in-kind district contributions are not mentioned; and details for activities to be undertaken and deliverables are vague. In addition, higher education institutions did not provide letters of support for the RTT-D project or funding related to the collaboration. Therefore, the score for this section is 6.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

Overall, the applicant has aligned the budget to the RTT-D goals, identified activities, rationale, timeline, deliverables and responsible parties. Although, the budget activities and personnel are critical to the implementation and sustainability of the RTT-D initiatives, post-funding support identified in the budget is not guaranteed. For example, the applicant has demonstrated a need to create a student centered calendar that is integral to developing personalized learning environments and leads to career and college graduation requirements. Therefore, identified within the RTT-D budget are several personnel positions that support implementation and monitoring of the reforms. The applicant has described in previous sections of the RTT-D proposal, current personnel who provide similar support to principals and teachers. They are educator effectiveness and coaching instructors,

Additional positions in the budget to support implementation are: student intern coordinator- and coach, early college coordinator, IBO coordinator, RTT-D project director, grants accountant, intersession coordinator, and assessment coordinator. The applicant did not provide a thorough process for evaluating the performance of each RTT-D position.

Overall, the applicant does not provide sufficient evidence to support sustainability of a high-quality plan after the funding cycle. For example, the applicant does not provide documentation from community partners or higher education institutions that describe in-kind contributions that will support and sustain the RTT-D key goals and initiatives, and specific personnel after the funding cycle. The Mapleton School District would not be able to implement the reform initiatives without RTT-D funds.

Furthermore, the general fund budget may not be able to support an enormous personnel line. Based on the lack of evidence to guarantee sustainability of positions and activities that support deepening student learning, decreasing the achievement gap, professional development and maintaining personalized learning environments, the applicant's score for this section is 5.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

- 1) Throughout this section the applicant provides a description of coherent and sustainable partnerships that will support the social emotional needs of participating students.
- 2) The applicant provides tables to demonstrate the process for tracking student population progress using multiple measures, such as teacher surveys (PreK), self-report surveys (6-12)) and behavior data (grades 6-12). The table illustrated the population group, type of result and desired results. Tables were not located on the correct pages. Specifics of each assessment measure were described.
- 3) Data is tracked at the District level and through the Infinite Campus Student Data System. The PreK Social Competence Teacher Scale is administered twice a year. It is analyzed by a third party. Student surveys and graduation data are collected annually and assessed. Each year the SST analyze the data to identify strengths and weaknesses. School therapist and teachers work collaboratively together to identify effective interventions for students. The applicant notes that because this proposal is a district wide reform there is no need to scale up services. The Mapleton School District has partnered with several organizations to improve the quality of services to students. For example, Incredible Years--Invest

in Kids analyzes the District's pre and post social emotional health and school readiness data. The program targets communication and emotional skill building for students.

4) The Incredible Years-Invest in Kids is delivered in the classroom by classroom teachers. Teachers are trained by the Incredible Years coaches. Coaches visit experienced teachers three times a year and novice teachers seven times. An assessment is also administered. The applicant notes that there is no need to integrate education for participating students.

5) In addition, the Community Reach Partnership provides school directors access to the District prevention specialist who specializes in addressing the social-emotional needs of high needs students and making recommendations. The applicant describes a process for ensuring that the needs and assets of the community are aligned with District' goals to improve the social-emotional well- being of children. Therefore, the Mapleton School District collaborates with the Adams County Youth Initiative (ACYI). SST will also be used to evaluate the needs and assets of each school. The applicant has identified ACYI as the lead agency to provide the appropriate level of interventions and mechanisms for population support and ensure that students' needs are met.

6) The applicant provided a thorough description of achievable performance measures. Assessment instruments include the Improved Social and Emotional Health Measures, and Improved educational measures.

Overall, the applicant has presented sufficient evidence to support the criteria in this section. Each partnership described is aligned to the needs and assets of the Mapleton School District. A description of responsibilities, evaluation measures, and student outcomes was discussed. A infrastructure to ensure decision making in the following areas was presented; progress monitoring, family engagement, social-emotional data,and evaluation instruments.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

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

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has demonstrated a need to take past and present reform initiatives to the next level, thus deeping student learning and creating personalized learning environments for all students. Evidence submitted in each section of the RTT-D proposal support reform initiatives and demonstrate a commitment by the Mapleton School District to implement college- and career- ready standards for all students. The applicant presented reasonable documentation to address the four core educational assurance areas by focusing on maintaining and supporting highly effective principals and teachers, educator evaluations, autonomy at the school level, policies, student centered calendar, demonstration classrooms, process for ineffective teachers, parent involvement via Academic Parent Teacher Teams, access to technology, individualized instruction for all students and subgroups, differentiated instruction for SWD and ELL,. Charts, tables and graphs provided data to justify the RTT-D reforms.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>161</b>
--------------	------------	------------