



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0040UT-1 for Ogden City School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant described a good quality plan that would expand and support the district's vision and mission statement developed four years ago to maximize educational opportunities for all students and staff for it has clear expectations and outcomes for students, parents, staff, and community partners.</p> <p>The plan does include a focused reform on student outcomes that targets the four core educational areas that will be accomplished by combining six projects/programs that have previously operated separately with measurable student gains on various campuses. The recently adopted Common Core Standards as well as college-and-career ready standards which the applicant has adequately incorporated in the proposal and can be easily evaluated.</p> <p>The participation of the four leadership teams from the persistently low-achieving schools in the University of Virginia's Turnaround Specialist program provided the applicant with a foundation that through clear goals and objectives, this proposal will build upon and the results should continue to be positive as it was noted with the four schools.</p> <p>The applicant plans to design its personalized classroom learning based upon Barbara Bray and Kathleen McClaskey (2013) stages broadly outlined in a chart provided to get students more involved in their learning and support learning for students and teachers but did not clearly show how that would occur at any grade level especially when the proposal also serve students in elementary grades who may not have the knowledge base to articulate effectively in the creation of the learning environment.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The data reviewed by the applicant's grant proposal team was relevant student and staff data to determine need and which schools to include for services that included attendance data for students as well as staff appears to be extremely important to ensure continued student improvement in meeting state targets.</p> <p>In reviewing the successes the applicant had with the UVA Turnaround Specialist two year program, it seems appropriate to use its participation as a way to place schools in a cohort for the proposal. This grouping is appropriate because it makes it easier to track students as they feed into middle and high school. Four of the eight persistently low-achieving schools completed the program with continued success that includes closing the achievement gap and four others are currently participating therefore the schools will be grouped in phases of those completing, currently participating, and non-participants to serve all schools and 12,531 students in this proposal providing ease of monitoring effectiveness as students move from one school/grade to the next.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>This proposal is the scale-up of the applicants vision and mission statement written four years ago and later implemented under new leadership as its Theory of Change to ensure all students were college-career ready.</p> <p>The improved student academic achievement results from various current programs would be supported and expanded to serve all students in a differentiated format as this would foster the creation and implementation of personalized learning for all students and have a district-wide impact. The applicant has identified all students in the district to be served throughout the grant period so there was not discussion as to how to expand beyond the district. All schools will be served and impacted by the vision change.</p>		

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The four goals to foster learning are aligned with the six projects to enable students to acquire the college-career ready skills that would ensure that students met or exceeded state standards, continue to close the achievement gap of students in the district, and increase graduation rates of the two high schools in the proposal.</p> <p>For example Goal 1 included two of the projects that focus on the teachers, the Educator and Leader Project and the Digital Learning Support that would provide needed professional development to support the theory of change and access to student data in real-time so that it could be used by teachers to plan, develop, and implement individualized instruction or interventions. Monitoring these components would be important to use of as well easy with computer access to data.</p> <p>For example Goal 2 focus on the development and implementation of the digital platform would easily allow each student to have a written personalized learning plan and promote/support parental involvement in the education environment of the student. This is a great feature of the platform but may be difficult for students in grades kindergarten to second since state assessments do not occur for these students and their ability to access and interpret data available for me would be limited due to skill level.</p> <p>Although teachers conferencing with students every three weeks about the progress is beneficial but lacks substance and support if parents are not included. Students would be provided the progress data every six weeks but there was no discussion as to skills students would have acquired to appropriately interpret results or action students would need to take such as access additional resources or assignments, team study, or parental involvement. This would also be difficult for students in the early grades due to reading and comprehension levels and special needs students based upon their disability.</p> <p>The college enrollment projects are not ambitious at a 5% increase annually from 39% to 60% by year four of the proposal. The projections show all subgroups progressing at the same rate therefore not closing the gap.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant did not adequately discuss a successful four year track record that provided academic improvement for the students served by its schools. The charts provided did not correlate with the narrative of clear success for example high school graduates enrollment increased from 80 in 2008 to 233 in 2012 whereas the National Clearinghouse chart provided as support data gathered 2002 to 2008 with a decrease in enrollment. The Guaranties, Standards, and Attitudes provided and approved four years ago indicated that the graduation rate for 2012-13 would be 90% even though the data is not yet available, the applicant has projected a graduation rate for 2013-14 of 68% which is much less. The graduation chart does indicate steady growth from 2008 with 47% to 2012 with 64%.</p> <p>The chart in the appendix shows a steady increase in state assessment scores for core subject areas but the narrative description included kindergarten to grade 2 which are not administered a state assessment. The DIBELS diagnostic results of three years did show progressive improvement in reading for students in grades 1 to 3 that received the administration but scores were included for kindergarten students which it is unclear if they received the administration or the frequency since this tool is normally administered two to three times per year for these grade levels.</p> <p>Tutorial programs from Americorps and United Way placed 40 volunteer reading tutors on all elementary schools in 2012-13 with some success and the partners will remain in place throughout the proposal.</p> <p>The DATAWISE electronic student information system would allow educators to monitor student progress, develop classroom instruction, personalize interventions, and create meaningful reports of student progress to share with parents which promotes parental involvement with examples to use with students at home this a another mechanism that supports the potential of the applicant meeting its targets. It is unclear if parents and students would be able to access any students information themselves or if hard copies must be made available by staff.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p>		

The applicant indicated that the salaries of all staff is posted on the district and individual school websites as well as available in hardcopy but did not clearly discuss the breakdown as in the requirements identifying instructional staff and support staff. The expenditures also does not meet the requirement since the applicant indicated only expenditures for instructional staff were made public instead of expenditures for non-instructional personnel.

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

**10**

**10**

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

The applicant has sufficient autonomy and has aligned its projects within the proposal with State law, statutory guidelines governing the operation of local education agencies and meets all regulatory requirements supported by the state's college-career standards to be implemented and the educator evaluation system that would be created and implemented by the applicant.

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

**15**

**15**

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

The applicant took advantage of its partnerships and relationships within the community to pull various stakeholders into the planning and review of the proposal using multiple opportunities and media such as surveys, presenting at meetings, and collaboration with other grant teams. Stakeholder comments and feedback were collected and incorporated in the goals and objectives of the proposal. The creation of a format to collect stakeholder suggestion was a great way to capture comments/suggestions that could be reviewed and incorporated as the applicant finalized the proposal.

The applicant provided letters of support from various entities that include parents in many of the organizations including the PTA, nonprofit organizations for example Voices of Utah Children and United Way of Northern Utah, higher education entities, Weber State University, chamber of commerce, and governmental entities. Utah is not a collective bargaining state and the proposal has the support of the teacher association per a signed letter of support from the president of Ogden Education Association.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>

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

Since staff would need time to study how Dee Elementary staff engaged students in the goal setting strategy which is a key component of a personalized learning environment, it is unclear how effective other elementary schools will be in working with students before the study is planned or occurs.

It is important that the applicant recognize that systems must adapt to age-appropriate needs of students to ensure all students including early grades and special needs students receive adequate equitable services.

In investing funds in a contract to have college-career standards materials developed to share with families and community, the applicant shows a commitment to moving the community to a college-career ready culture.

College and college ready resources would be made available to families through various media including social media, Facebook, and shared calendar on Google are creative and innovative ways to communicate with families but even with the discount internet plan it is unclear how parents who will not have these media would receive the same information in a timely manner.

Involving the community in the example of the local grocery store offering discounts to families whose child participate in contest where they share their attendance card may pose a situation of exposing students personal information to the public and it is unclear if any steps would be taken with this public contest to protect personal information.

Per the example provided the proposal would have expectations of student that are unattainable, if a student is a teen parent and miss the last period of the day of class with a presentation due the next day, even if she cover all the video, take the on-line exam, it is unreasonable to expect a quality team presentation the next day. The resources the applicant plans to make available to students to enrich learning are excellent the organization skills the students need to be developed, supported, and monitored, encouraged for them to meet deadlines and to incorporate or address college and career required to learn.

Kindergarten to grade six students and parents would be expected to review and correlate state assessment benchmarks, other teachers made assessment to college and career standards to enable students to self-monitor or revise goals with no training but assistance from teacher.

By supplementing learning with hands-on, reality activities that include field trips focus on career pathways, college field trips, job shadowing or internship gives students the opportunity to deepen their learning experiences as they move through high school.

Attending various cultural events is on the low end of exposing student s to diversity and awareness of different cultures. The applicant made statement that teachers would attend professional learning series and learn strategies 'that specific how increasing equity and how cultural awareness can help close the achievement gap OCDS students face' but did not substantiate with was research or factual data that academic achievement is directly affected by a student culture.

The applicant is being creative in finding ways for students to work independently at home in the example about the student entering sixth grade that has been through several schools due to family mobility. The computer loan system would be instrumental to provide the student with a computer to work from home on interventions on-line enabling the student to practice more. Parent involvement is also a key component that the father in the example would be able to discuss revisions to her personalized education plan via conference call, with what would need to be careful scheduling since the father works at night.

Prekindergarten is not part of the normal school configuration for the applicant and not offered therefore it is unclear who would be served since these students do not appear in the school/grade level selection criteria. Also a substantial amount of funds have been allocated in the budget to contract prekindergarten teachers and a consultant to provide training.

Tiered level approach of instruction and intervention would be a great way to monitor student success on their personalized learning plan due to the duration of each tier. The activities to support continued learning in the summer could be effective and the applicant has partnership support giving students opportunities to build upon skills such as teamwork, perseverance, and creativity. The tiers are clearly outlined but lack the inclusion of parents/families.

The applicant discussed research-based approaches to implementing personalized learning environment for all students including professional development for staff yet instructional approaches are not discussed that support all the resources staff make available to students on-line.

The applicant has the community support to ensure all classrooms have digital, wireless capabilities to enable staff to serve all students in the personalized learning environment effectively for the Ogden Education Foundation provided the infrastructure needed to equip classrooms. The digital classroom is another way the applicant is scaling up its vision and mission as well as providing needed professional development for staff on the use of technology in the classroom and how to integrate it into instruction as standards are presented.

Edmodo is a free internet program for teachers, parents and students to access that teachers will use to review coursework uploaded by students will increase the frequency and understanding of how to use today's technology but there was not any discussion of the security of student information.

The timely receipt and interpretation of student coursework/assessments is important for teachers to be able to provide meaningful feedback to student on the progress allow adjustments to plan so the upgraded DATAWISE system will be available. The applicant will also provide training to parents and students on the system but is in unclear if parents will be able to access it.

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

**20**

**15**

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

Tiered personalized professional growth plan for all teachers and principals track based upon student data will support educators self-monitoring progress toward increasing their knowledge of the standards and supporting students as they move through their personalized learning plans. In hiring teacher specialist to coordinate professional development and assist teachers in selection of trainings and incorporation into the classroom instruction the applicant is proactive. Ongoing intensive training for school teams and support team planning for staff to ensure staff needs are met to deliver quality instruction to student. Teachers also receive coaching and feedback through the Effective Educator and Leadership Project of the proposal. Annual professional develop is provided to meet training needs ensuring an understanding of all the state Common Core Standards and College-and-Career Readiness standards.

Alignment of the educator evaluation tool with all the standards provides assurance of effective teaching of standards in the classroom. The compensation component of the proposal appears to have more weight in ensuring effective teachers

are the classroom than professional development. The three tier plan designate teachers and principals as highly effective/effective may be the motivator with a financial incentives. Staff must complete at least 24 hours of professional development per year to be eligible for the incentive.

#### 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>10</b>
<p><b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The restructured central office responsibilities made last year by the applicant should provide better alignment of services directly to schools in a timely manner to address the improvement of student learning and the implementation of a positive personalized learning environment. The central office staffs that are aligned with schools have the experience and resources needed to promote and encourage learning for all grade levels.</p> <p>All schools receiving Title I funds also work with a federal funds director and coordinators to ensure that those guidelines are followed and aligned with state and district policy as well as schools having the autonomy needed to decide on scheduling, calendars, and school leaders along with the district human resource department agree on staffing.</p> <p>The proposal includes an easily accessible digital device (laptops, tablets) loan component so that students have the option outside of school hours to complete on-line credit courses, access other resources to assist with completion of assignments. Students may check out a device but if internet access is not available at home, having the digital media would not be beneficial. Students have various ways to complete assignments but it is unclear how mastery is determined beyond teacher made or state assessments. The applicant has made adequate additional support after school hours through partnerships with Khan Academy, YMCA, and the Boys and Girls Club to support extended learning time for high needs students with access to computers for students and parents. It is unclear if volunteers would be available to assist students or parents during this time. Students receiving special education have an individualized education plan and certified staff working with them to ensure their accommodations are met as well as core content as required but not additional information or services would be provided by the proposal. There is also limited information as to how the proposal would serve English language learners.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>In an effort to ensure all parents have access to on-line materials, the applicant described a computer loan program coupled with a Comcast low internet cost for parents who attend internet classes and conference with staff on student personalized learning plan but it is unclear what other media of distributing timely materials/information would be used for those not purchasing the service. The district DATAWISE and Student Information Systems have been upgraded to work together sharing student information but it is unclear if parents would have access to this system of data beyond attendance and grades.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The project director and assistant superintendent who are part of the Leadership Team for the proposal will share the responsibility and accountability of the implementation of all six projects. They will select the members for the management teams that will manage each project and set timelines for completion of activities. It is unclear if at any time all of the managements would come together to share with each other to know how all projects meet the primary goal of students meeting Common Core and College-and-Career Readiness standards. Each group does meet monthly with the project director but time to plan together and share what works and what correlates is vital to all projects working in a collective manner. It is unclear if these five to nine member teams will have overlapping members since three to six projects would address the four goals of the proposal. It is unclear if the monthly updates with the project director will be verbal or supported by written reports for ease of monitoring progress. There is not a clear discussion of how or the frequency of</p>		

corrections or revisions to any of the projects even though feedback will be collected. The applicant provided a schedule of implementation of the projects from weekly to annually collecting feedback from stakeholders frequently but it is unclear how that feedback would be incorporated in the projects for improvement.

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

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The Teaching and Learning Team oversees the proposal and provides a visible presence weekly at all schools served by the applicant. The team provides communication, technical assistance, and hiring of staff that support all goals of the proposal. The weekly visits to the schools are a great idea but without some discussion of what the goal of the visits or what they would accomplish is not discussed. The applicant from the onset of the proposal had involvement from the community that expanded as the proposal was being developed therefore it is unclear why a consultant would be needed to create a communication outreach campaign to educate stakeholders on personalized learning environments and its benefit to the community. This may not be a good use of funds. Since the contractor would develop this two-way communication, the applicant did not provide examples of what this would look like.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant provided adequate explanation of rationale for the measures chosen for the proposal. The performance measures described are obtainable. DIBELS reading diagnostic tool has good frequency of administration to monitor student progress toward reading on grade level by third grade. The applicant did not indicate that this tool was appropriate to use with prekindergarten students or indicate what diagnostic tools are appropriate especially since this group of students are still in the stages of recognizing letters and sounds. It is unclear how kindergarten students will self-monitor their progress towards reading speed, fluency, and accuracy. It would be reasonable to develop activities for this age group to self-monitor their attendance that is also being identified as a performance measure.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
--	----------	----------

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**  
 Each of the six projects will have a management team assigned and they are not included on the evaluation team for the full proposal as per the previous description of the teams. Evaluation tools will be created or selected to gather data and analysis conducted by the external evaluator that would be age-appropriate since serving kindergarten to grade twelve. The project director works with both the management teams and the evaluator and will coordinate data collection for analysis by the evaluation team. Data to be collected include student achievement data, project surveys, and other data that has been entered the DATAWISE and Student Information System digital systems will be collected as well as participation information, focus group discussions, for analysis and compilation.

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

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

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant is requesting approximately \$25 million dollars to serve over 12,000 students over a four year period which is reasonable to ensure some academic success. The amount requested for the number of students is reasonable yet the breakdown of categories for use are confusing. Approximately \$8.5 million dollars from Title I, Title II, district funds, and state funds to name a few additional sources supporting the proposals were described. The applicant also has a grant writing team in place that continues to seek additional funding sources to enable the applicant to meet its vision beyond this grant competition. The proposal has consultant services that appear to overlap with partner services such as creating after school activities for students to be done by a consultant and the YMCA and the Boys and Girls Club as partners offer such services including a computer center for use by students and parents. The applicant has budgeted approximately \$500,000 for prekindergarten staff and prekindergarten was not listed in the students to be served and it is not in its grade level configuration. A contract with a consultant to train prekindergarten staff of \$13,000 and \$25,000 to start up classrooms. The applicant did not provide criteria for student selection for prekindergarten since these students are not currently awaiting enrollment or have a mechanism in place to identify this population. The applicant cited several research through-out the proposal as rationale for grouping schools in cohorts, activities to support learning, and budget distribution

for those selections of which additional information is needed.

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

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

The sustainability plan for the six projects in this proposal does not show adequate support as described by the applicant. The applicant has requested approximately \$6 million dollars per year to implement six projects to have a positive impact on student academic achievement through personalized learning with the intent of sustaining all projects through partners and a \$1.2 million dollar annual funding stream for an estimated three years after grant funding without dimensioning the quality/fidelity of the projects. The salary of the project director would not be needed in years two and three since those duties would be assumed by an existing assistant superintendent which would save funds. It is unclear how the contract for an external evaluator supported in the grant at \$288,000 per year would only need to be paid \$30,000 per year to complete most of the same functions without omitting tasks. The applicant does plan to put in motion a grant seeking team to locate other funding streams if this proposal is approved. The applicant has support from partners to implement the pilot Full Service Community School but since the proposal expanded that to six additional campuses it is unclear if partners would expand their commitment whether it is funds, time, or resources to sustain seven such programs after this funding ends.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

One clearly described partnership appears to be in place and supportive of the addressing student academic achievement at all grade level outlined by the applicant that was formed in 2011 with Ogden City Council, the United Way of Northern Utah, and the school district. By aligning its student level results with the targets of the Promise Neighborhoods grant the district received in 2012, the applicant takes its focus away from a full commitment to creating a personalized learning environment. The applicant is attempting to partner with itself whereas this really shows good collaboration and cooperation but does not fully support this proposal's goal of creating a personalized learning environment that fosters student academic success. This alignment is missing the intensive professional development and professional growth of campus teachers and leadership teams to ensure students learn.

The extensive collaboration with the Promise Neighborhoods contacts allows the applicant to work with partners, City of Ogden and the United Way of Northern Utah in different capacities since the UWNU completes community needs assessment that collects data from other community organizations which could become partners for service referrals as the applicant serves its families in the proposal such as health and wellness providers, child abuse prevention/intervention providers, or food pantry entities. The UWNU does not track data that correlates to the student results the proposal plans to achieve such as increasing graduation rates and college enrollment or reading skills of all students.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

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

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has put in place the key components of creating a personalized learning environment for all students and support mechanisms for staff that includes intensive professional development addressing the four core educational components. An instructional day would provide students with the tools and classroom strategies to understand and meet the Common Core and College-and-career standards. The design would move students forward in completing high school and entering college without the need of remediation in coursework or careers.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>148</b>
--------------	------------	------------



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0040UT-2 for Ogden City School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative about changes, no data included.</li> <li>• Thoughtful research-based approach for the personalized learning environments implementation</li> <li>• Minimal data specific to Ogden about what this will look like for their schools specifically.</li> <li>• General information, little specificity.</li> </ul>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong narrative about process for implementing. Data included in Appendix B was difficult to understand out of context and needed additional narrative to see the connection.</li> <li>• Unclear how UVA Phase groupings were determined and the thinking behind the staged implementation.</li> <li>• All schools in the district will participate at some point, over a phased approach.</li> </ul>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong goals and objectives. Four goals with supporting objectives that are aspirational and include clear intended outcomes for students.</li> <li>• Action steps are lacking clear information on teaching/instruction/curriculum changes.</li> <li>• Unclear how high-risk students will be identified to be provided additional supports.</li> <li>• The focus on equity is important. Would like more clarity about how, specifically, this will impact instruction.</li> <li>• Objectives three did not provide clear information on how differentiation will happen instructionally, just information on teacher training and 1:1 classrooms.</li> <li>• Objective three under goal 2 introduced a competency-based learning pathway, but there is no additional information about what this is and how it will be implemented.</li> <li>• Objective three under goal three. The action step of creating an incentive around closing the achievement gap is concerning without specific details about how this will happen. Concern is that teachers will have a disincentive to keep low-performing students in their classrooms and it would be helpful to see how this incentive will safeguard against that and protect students.</li> </ul>		
<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Theory of Action and vision are significantly lacking specificity. The intended goals are aspirational, however there is little narrative or evidence that indicates how the district will meet this goals with specific examples, curriculum or instructional changes that will take place.</li> <li>• While each goal and associated objectives are aspirational, there is little evidence of specific changes that will be made to support these objectives. The objectives state the goals and measures, but there is no information about what curriculum and instruction will support these changes.</li> </ul>		

- The data projections do not demonstrate a decrease in the achievement gap. All subgroups are projected to increase at the same exact percentage, predicting that the achievement gap will remain steady.
- Chart describing achievement gap decreases does not correlate with data projections on the previous chart.

## 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>14</b>
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data demonstrates success and growth across most subgroups.</li> <li>• District utilizes DIBELS as a tool for collecting data</li> <li>• Good utilization of GEAR UP and partnerships to support college enrollment.</li> <li>• Lowest performing schools have made significant progress, and the data presented supports this.</li> <li>• Data is available to educators, students and parents and is utilized in a variety of ways.</li> </ul>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative states that all information is available and easy to access, and available in multiple formats and in multiple locations.</li> <li>• District-level information is available on the Utah's Right to Know website and there are links from the district website and individual school pages. No link included.</li> <li>• Individual school-level salary expenditures breakdowns are published in charts on both the district's website and each of the school's individual website. It is also available by request in hard copy. No specific narrative or evidence that non-personnel expenditures at the school level are available.</li> <li>• Narrative did not include specific website addresses or citations of where this information may be found.</li> </ul>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District aligns with state requirements and has sufficient autonomy to implement their proposal as planned.</li> <li>• USOE Administrative Rules are broad enough to leave specific strategies, programming and implementation plan decisions to the individual districts based on their own needs and theories of action.</li> <li>• The district proposal mirrors the vision of Utah's Public Education Mission, and many of the plan aspects are part of existing strategies that USOE has already begun to urge districts to implement. There is a close alignment with the intended outcomes of the districts proposal and USOE policies.</li> </ul>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a clear process of how people were invited to provide feedback on the proposal and the multiple stakeholders that were invited.</li> <li>• Several letters of support from community and district stakeholders.</li> <li>• It is unclear how diverse the respondents were and what the actual number is for people engaging in providing feedback.</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>12</b>

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

- Proposal has a wide variety of instructional resources and a thorough plan that includes ways to encourage students to take ownership of their learning; multiple ways to create a college and career going culture throughout the district; and a well developed framework.
- The plan lacks specificity in regards to how instruction will change within the classroom. Lots of narrative about the new tools and resources available to teachers, students and families, but little information about how instruction will look different.
- Narrative alludes to the availability of competency-based standards, but there is no mention of them in relationship to seat-time or how students will receive credit.
- The plan is technology heavy, but there is no information about the access to resources that parents do or do not have. There is no evidence that the district has done any data collecting about parent access to technology and the internet.
- The learning plan is created initially within 6 weeks of school, but no on-going timeline for how it is adjusted and when parents, students and teachers revisit the existing plan to update and modify.
- Plan discusses students ability to self-select learning projects based on their personalized learning plan, but there is no information about how that will be supported within the school day and how current class curriculum may adjust to provide these individual student project options.
- Great discussion about remediation and potential enrichment options for students.

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

**20**

**12**

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

- The district has a well-thought plan for providing training and resources/professional development for teachers. However, there is little evidence about how instruction will change to implement a new personalized environment for students.
- The narrative provides numerous examples of how the district will provide PD for teachers, a well thought-out teacher evaluation system as well as a variety of research-based best practices.
- There is no evidence specifically of how teachers will adapt instruction to meet student needs. There are many processes available for this work to happen, but no evidence that the district has specific ways the curriculum will be adapted.
- The pay increases tied to student growth will also need to be well thought out to insure that students are not forced out of classrooms just to make sure the test scores associated with the teacher look good in order to earn the pay increase. There is no evidence that a safety net has been established to track student drop-outs or student class changes to insure that teachers are not putting their own salaries ahead of the high-risk students that they teach.

**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>10</b>

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

- The District has reorganized their central office to more fully support a strong system of teaching and learning. They have added a layer of administrators dedicated to supporting schools with student learning and have moved additional duties that are non-instructional into other departments to insure that there is a clear focus on teaching and learning. This restructuring should provide ample support for school-based administrators to insure that there are clear through lines in all schools around the grant implementation process and practices.
- The school leadership teams have autonomy and flexibility to allocate resources and structures to best support their students. Each school has a Community Council that has a variety of stakeholders as part of the team that make decisions. The diversity on this council will allow multiple perspectives to be heard at the individual school level and to insure that decisions are not made in isolation, but taken to a group to think through together.
- The district has not demonstrated that they have a plan in place for students to progress and earn credit based on mastery. They are relying on online computer aided instruction as a substitute; but have not demonstrated ways for students to demonstrate mastery within the classroom with existing content structures.
- Insufficient evidence of specific supports for ELL and Special Needs students.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district has a plan to hire additional staff to support teachers with the use of technology. This additional staffing will help facilitate teacher support as they work to learn and implement new technologies in their classrooms. Teachers are likely to need a lot of training on specific software as well as ways to enhance their curriculum with these new tools.</li> <li>The district has a good plan to support families with limited resources have access to both hardware and technical support in order to help them engage with the new technology tools. The Parent University classes are designed to support parents in understanding the variety of district systems, as well as to provide access to resources that parents may not otherwise be able to access. A computer-internet home loan program will be available for families without means of purchasing these resources. The plan also includes a pilot program to provide parents with digital devices to video conference with educators and view events. This will allow parents and guardians to be more actively engaged, even when they are unable to attend events in person.</li> <li>The district is working to insure that the varied data systems being used are able to work well together to insure smooth crossover of data and to support teachers and administrators quickly access student data. However, the plan is unclear exactly how this will happen.</li> <li>The plan does not sufficiently address the support for students in terms of technical support or training.</li> <li>The plan does not include specific information for how parents and students can access data or how the specific software programs will ensure secure personal records.</li> </ul>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district has partnered with the University of Virginia Turnaround Leader Program with some success and plan to expand this model to three cohorts of principals and schools.</li> <li>The district has a stated continuous improvement mode that includes implement, monitor and evaluate each project in both formative and summative fashion. If the district follows this process, they are likely to gain valuable information that allows for changes to be made during the course of implementation rather than waiting for formal evaluations. However, they are not clear on how revisions will take place and how ongoing improvements might happen. While the plan for collecting data is solid, there is no plan for revising and making improvements throughout the course of implementation.</li> <li>The district has identified different research (John Hattie &amp; Paul Bambrick-Santonyo) that they are utilizing to implement their continuous improvement management cycle.</li> <li>The district appears to be utilizing research and best-practices to develop the protocols for how they will continuously evaluate their work. They have yearly, twice yearly, quarterly, 60 days, 6 weeks, monthly and weekly tasks identified as part of their improvement process. However, specific implementation and how they will make improvements is unclear.</li> </ul>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District has a thorough plan for communicating the successes of the implementation, as well as the areas that are in need of improvement.</li> <li>The district has created a schedule for notifying stakeholders of efforts and results and have identified staff that will be key in making sure these communications happen. This schedule includes on-going evaluation with communications tied to each process. This is likely to insure a strong flow of information that will be available to all stakeholders within the community.</li> <li>Their restructuring of the district office has created a focus on Teaching and Learning, with part of the work of these new administrators being specifically associated with creating strong communication paths between school and district. This intentional assignment of duties is likely to insure that communication takes place.</li> <li>With project funds, the district plans to hire a communications consultant to support more specific outreach with their community. The district understands that they need to create new and different ways to communicate with all</li> </ul>		

stakeholders.

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

**5**

**2**

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

- The district has ambitious goals for overall student performance, however the subgroup goals are not well thought-out. In each of the categories, they maintain the achievement gap between white students and sub-groups, rather than setting individual goals by sub-group to show that they are specifically paying attention to lessening the achievement gap.
- The district has identified only 11 performance measures: three performance measures for PreK-3rd grade; 3 performance measure for grades 4-8; and 5 performance measure for 9-12. In each grade level there is a combination of academic and non-cognitive measures being identified to insure student success. However, the district has not met the minimum criteria of 12-14 performance measures.
- The plan is unclear in how they will specifically implement. The theory and outline of the plan seems solid, but the lack of specificity around implementation needs to be addressed.

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

**5**

**5**

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

- The district will utilize a third-party evaluator to help with the evaluation of the proposal - the use of an outside evaluator will allow the district to get a better understanding of what is working and what isn't.
- While they have not selected the evaluator yet, they have a thorough plan in place for what that evaluation will include. They want to make sure they have a team supporting the evaluation process; as well as insuring that the team develops evaluation tools including perception surveys; focus group protocols; professional development rubrics and surveys; student self-assessment rubrics; a data dashboard; an evaluation rubric for the 1:1 component; both qualitative and quantitative tools; historical documentation and an evaluation system for the educator evaluation plan. This comprehensive list will insure that multiple perspectives are gathered and that multiple parts of the implementation are evaluated at different stages throughout the project implementation.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District has provided evidence of how Federal funds will be leveraged with existing funds, as well as sources for additional funding from other sources. Total project is estimated at \$33 million, with just under \$25 million as part of the grant and other funding of just over \$8 million to supplement. They have identified a voter approved levy as well as utilizing existing federal and state funds as ways to support the project. They have identified a need for state and corporate grand funding.</li> <li>• It is unclear which funds are being utilized for one-time investments versus ongoing operational costs. Narrative does not specifically detail these out, though the narrative does describe how some of the costs will be maintained over time.</li> </ul>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district has identified an ability to partner with othes to leverage resources and funding, but have not provided specific examples or evidence of this. They have identified Ogden School Foundation, Ogden City and United Way of Northern Utah as potential partners, but has not created a high-quality plan or evidence that these partnerships will provide for long-term sustainability.</li> <li>• The narrative does not clearly identify how the district intends to maintain the increase in staffing that the project grant will pay for, instead, it alludes that existing school and district resources will be re-allocated to cover the sustainability costs. This does not seem like a strong sustainability plan and will need to be more clearly researched</li> </ul>		

and planned.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District states that it has well-established partnerships that they will build on to more holistically support students and families. They have already established partnerships with Ogden United, local universities, the business community and an existing partnership with United Way of Northern Utah, Boys and Girls Club, Mental Health Associates, local government and their 2012 Promise Neighborhoods Planning Grant. However, they are lacking specific evidence of how these partnerships will be leveraged.</li> <li>• The CPP plan has ambitious, yet achievable, performance measures. They have chosen to align with the Promise Neighborhood framework and establish similar desired results so that they may work together. They have identified four strategy teams: Early Childhood Education; Parent Education and Engagement; Extended Learning and Increased Attendance - these are four specific areas where they will work in partnership with their community. While the outline and theory of the plan is solid, it is lacking substantial evidence of how the plan would specifically be implemented and supported.</li> <li>• To track their results, they intend to partner with an outside evaluator and follow a model developed by the Harwood Institute for Public Innovation. While an outside evaluator has not been selected, the district has made a strong effort to determine how they will evaluate their work and what measures they will use. They have identified a number of data sources that they will use to determine how they are making progress. They do not provide narrative to describe how they will work to continuously improve their plan - they have only identified how they will collect data, but not how they will use that data.</li> <li>• The district intends to start small and scale this work. They seem to have a strong plan for implantation and they should reconsider the scale - starting small may not be the most effective way to harness the powerful partnerships and planning and more students and families will be supported if they expand their implementation plan.</li> </ul>		

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the district plan is comprehensive and indicates a number of tools and resources that will be implemented to support teachers, the clear connection to student achievement needs more depth.</li> <li>• The district intends to lower the achievement gap, however, their plan and data do not specifically show how they will do this or that they are intentionally thinking about high-risk students.</li> </ul>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>134</b>
--------------	------------	------------

**Race to the Top - District**

**Technical Review Form**

**Application #0040UT-4 for Ogden City School District**



**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>The applicant defines a vision that integrates the four core educational assurance areas through the district's definition of personalized learning and improved teacher and leadership training. The proposed project builds on a pilot project that included 'turnaround' teacher and leadership training offered by the Darden School of Business School Turnaround Program. The applicant broadly describes how teachers and leaders will develop personalized learning contexts within classrooms, using instructional and curricular innovations, student, family, and educator support systems, curriculum specialists and new digitally-based assessment and DATAWISE tracking systems.</p> <p>The expectation is that the district will use a multi-year roll-out plan to that bring all of the district's schools on board, beginning with those schools that have received turnaround training.</p> <p>The section is weakened by the applicant's frequent re-statement of the criteria for this section without providing concrete examples of exactly how it plans to overcome the years of accumulated unmet challenges with truly innovative approaches. The description of the personalized learning system proposes and charts a three-staged process, which is not evidence-based. The text does not specify how the applicant anticipates applying its vision to practice so that educators, families, and students move from from "stage one" of the proposed personalized learning framework to full implementation in "stage three." The statements provided lack the convincing case needed to demonstrate that its vision can be implemented.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant approaches implementation by building on its experience with the Darden School of Business, describing how it use the Darden Turnaround model to select schools for the project.</p> <p>The proposal offers a poorly defined strategy for conducting a new, long-term project in high needs schools. Its statements fail to demonstrate how the project will serve the numerous students with a host of academic needs. The evidence presented does not explain how teachers who have persistently failed to help students achieve rigorous standards will change their practices within the new framework proposed. The applicant provides insufficient documentation of how the proposed schools meet the RTTD eligibility requirements.</p> <p>While a broad vision is stated, the applicant's over-ambitious statements lack realistic examples of how it will provide the high-quality support that will be needed to implement its ambitious reform proposal across all schools and with all students the district serves.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The application provides broad outlines of its proposed reform, and it shows a skeletal plan for a gradual county-wide scale-up. It's theory of change does not make a clear connection between project's key components, project actions, and the expected mid- and long-range outcomes. The overall project goals are stated without evidence of subgoals, activities, time lines, or deliverables linked to the project's core components.</p> <p>Without these core components of its plan for reform and change the applicant has not provided a high quality plan for scaling up the proposed program in a manner that supports district change beyond the initially targeted schools. This component would be strengthened if it provided specific information about how it plans to move theory and goal setting to</p>		

an action plan and day-to-day activities that will improve educator effectiveness. The applicant does not provide the details needed to show how and what new instructional practices will achieve the ambitious student outcomes stated.

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

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

The charted performance standards that the applicant provides are inconsistent, and the narrative does not explain adequately how the indicators were derived. Goal statements are not linked with specific details of activities, time lines, or deliverables that are the central components of a high-quality plan for implementation.

The applicant provides annual targets for students using summative assessments, and it shows an intent to decrease achievement gaps, and increase graduation rates and college enrollment, but information why and how the district plans to achieve these goals is not clearly demonstrated. Targets are high for graduation rates (90 percent) and for college application rates (80 percent), but there is not strong evidence that these goals are reasonable in light the failure to meet rigorous achievement goals for all students in the past. Another unclear target is the ACT expectation. The stated expectation is for "30 percent of students to meet ACT requirements." It is not clear what "ACT requirements" actually are. National ACT test score averages range from 19-20, but this information is not aligned with the stated "national average" or the "benchmark" on ACT subtests. It is not clear where the applicant gets its information about ACT "benchmarks," "requirements," or "subtests, and how its own planned programs align with current ACT scoring criteria.

In the other charted summaries of annual growth projections, the statistical equations used seem to show erratic growth expectations for different demographic groups, especially where various high school subgroup expectations are lower than would be expected. For example, target rates for American Indians, mobile and economically disadvantaged groups are also low, ranging from 30 percent to 74 percent, that it will be statistically impossible for the district achieve its stated goals.

In sum, the rationales and foundations for the stated performance expectations are unclear or inconsistent with the explanations given.

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

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

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

The applicant describes numerous initiatives that have been implemented over varying time frames in the past, from nine years administering Dibels and including monitoring reading and family services.

The charts and raw data that quantify past initiatives show persistently poor performance rather than success. For example, in 9 years using Dibels there was very limited student growth. Although the school district states that it has implemented many reforms it has only moved from 1 % graduation rate to 3% graduation rate.

The district appears to have made an effort to implement research-based programs, but it seems to be caught in a cycle of constantly changing programs, initiatives, leaders. As a result, there is no evidence of substantive behavioral change on the part of students, teachers, or community members that make a convincing case that the district is has a solid track record of success from previous programmatic investments.

The applicant has not met the requirement in this criterion of providing a "clear record" of prior success in moving student learning and achievement forward during the past four years.

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

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

The applicant shows limited evidence of the district's transparency by showing that it reports the State's required data. It provides to the public the information it receives from the State pertaining to expenditures for instruction and school administration-related expenses. The applicant does not provide evidence of how and what information it provides in the four categories requested in this criterion.

The applicant's examples do not show how it will move from a State-required data-evidence standard to a new more transparent standard, including providing school-level information about school improvement programs, or about salaries for professionals, paraprofessionals and non-personnel expenses.

This section of the application would have been strengthened had the applicant provided examples of the web-based reports it references.

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

**10**

**8**

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

The applicant presents some evidence that its State guidelines and requirements provide the conditions to implement the personalized learning environments it is seeking to strengthen. The applicant describes how its proposed programs and innovations are consistent with the State's expectations to build more personalized learning environments that ensure students meet college- and career-ready standards. The State and the district also expect to use multiple measures to evaluate effectiveness, and to continue to offer appropriate professional development.

Although there are a number of alignments with State statute that would support the proposed project, specific examples of project and State programmatic alignments, especially time line and implementation alignments, would make a more persuasive case.

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

**15**

**10**

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

The applicant describes how it involved students, families, and educators in developing the proposal through their affiliation with community agencies such as the United Way, the YMCA, the teacher association, city leaders, and the mayor's office. Structured surveys were conducted and one-on-one conversations with stakeholders were reported. In support of stake holder engagement, the applicant documents letters from key stakeholders.

The case for engagement would have been stronger with specific information and full explanation about the ways in which stakeholder feedback altered and strengthened the proposal. Moreover, the applicant describes involving teachers in the proposal development and includes a letter from the OEA president, but critical details explaining how teachers were involved in planning are not offered. While it is fine to include the president of the teachers' association, this alone does not serve as strong evidence of teacher input.

Apparently there was moderate engagement by leaders of a core of community organizations. The letter of support from the Promise Neighborhood and the Mayor's office suggests that these organizations were aware of the proposal and offered text edits, but it is not clear how they were substantively involved. There is little to show examples of substantive inputs, ideas, or perspectives offered by the multiple stakeholder communities that the district seeks to engage in the project.

**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>

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

The applicant states the district's commitment to engaging and empowering its learners and teachers with at new levels. It proposes to use many external professional resources (e.g. the Bray and McClasky mastery strategy, Hattie's *Visible Learning*, DATAWISE, the Covey program, and AVID, the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SLOP), among others). The application states the commitment to more fully serving the educational and social emotional needs of the district's high need students, and it indicates proposed new initiatives, strategies, tools, and resources that will be differentially available to students in schools according to their "change" status. Programs will seek serve Tier 1, 2, and 3 schools by providing different levels of service, depending on schools' readiness for each initiative. It also suggests programs for pre-kindergartners, although the school district does not appear to host a kindergarten program and there is no evidence of how kindergarten will be introduced.

A limitation of the proposed program is that the applicant appears to add many innovations into a system that has been subjected to nearly ten years of constant school change, and these prior efforts have apparently achieved little successes. This proposed teaching and learning program will add new technology tools, take advantage of social media resources, and increase its use of digital access to connect with students and families. While these ideas are laudable, there is too little information about how participants, including students and educators will manage these many new tools

to truly make personal contact with the students and families they serve.

The approach proposed shows no meaningful analysis of how previous innovations failed and how these numerous "new" and "tech"-oriented systems will avoid similar failure. The school district seeks to illustrate its plans with case study examples of high-needs students and how they will serve them, but the examples do not suggest realistic scenarios. The applicant mistakenly focuses so much on the students' disadvantages that the reader wonders if the district leaders are aware of the assets-focus orientation their proposed learning seek to build. The applicant plans to "put the learner in the driver's" seat and envisions the teacher as a back-seat facilitator. A careful read of the research evidence about personalizing learning, however, demonstrates that skillful teacher diagnosticians who have deep subject matter expertise are not in the back seat, but, instead, they actively lead and guide learners with careful knowledge of the interaction of student needs and the resources available to serve those needs.

There is a stated plan to meet with families "within the first six weeks" of a school year, missing the critical opportunity for pre-school year planning. Furthermore, creating 3-4 year goals is a long lead for young children, especially for children and families that balance so many personal life complexities. While it makes sense for long-range planning and thinking, the beginning of a school year should focus on more immediate learning priorities.

Many examples are offered that illustrate the vision of a different, more personalized teaching system, but the examples are limited by the applicant's failure to demonstrate how the district will avoid the pitfalls of years of failed innovation. As presented, these approaches are over-busy, and often poorly aligned with the real needs of the target students (e.g. an example describes how a teen mother will manage to shoulder a large on-line assignment and create a report in the few night hours that she is with her infant baby; or of a second grader who will somehow completely on-line homework without adequate support at home). The innovations also assume families will have the resources within their homes to access the internet late in the evenings or will be able to reach libraries and other centers where computers can be accessed.

The applicant proposes a top-down approach without explaining its strategy for engaging partners, participants or families in these complex learning systems. Teachers are identified as recipients of training and direction, rather than active initiators and change agents. Teachers, students, and families - many of whom are already overwhelmed with family and work demands - appear to be subjects of an outside change plan to which they must accommodate with little or any apparent input.

Finally, the applicant proposes to engage families by providing a range of "courses" and activities dedicated to "empowering" parents to participate more fully in supporting their children's learning. The applicant does not address how already over-loaded parents will find the time for "learning sessions" at the "Parent University."

In brief, the applicant has introduced an overload of "new" ideas and concepts without a well-thought out implementation plan. The vision is worthy, but the strategy for how "more will be less" is not addressed.

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

**20**

**10**

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

The applicant proposes a two-pronged leadership and teacher development strategy which is grounded in a new professional educator evaluation system which is based on the State's new *Teaching and Leadership Standards*. The stated intent is to design a system that aligns with RTTD goals.

The systems proposed by this applicant commit to improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback through a newly designed teacher and principal evaluation system. The commitment is to changing the "one-size fits all" system into a more responsive and integrated professional development and growth learning system.

The applicant claims to "currently [have] a structure in place to implement a high quality plan" to improve professional practice, however, a coherent system is not evidenced in the proposal. The example tools and frameworks are lacking in evidence of pilot studies or of how the tools will integrate observation of teachers and achievement evidences from State tests in a manner that is valid and reliable. No evidence is provided that demonstrates any start-up or pilot work that brings professionals more fully into the proposed designs for change. The applicant introduces numerous new ideas, many of them technology-based, which have all the characteristics of early "reform" systems, but there is no apparent recognition of the challenges of imposing new systems over old systems on a weary "reformed" professional community.

The plans proposed would be strengthened by more evidence of start-up or of pilot programs that include teachers in planning and trial testing the proposed tools and resources. Significantly new systems require meticulous planning and evidence of buy-in from participants and the applicant does not show evidence of that this level of planning and engagement has occurred. Without more

information about such trials and buy-ins and positive indicators of the potential of these new ideas, there is significant potential that the new systems will falter as the previous efforts have.

Ironically, in a search for personalization, the applicant proposes a strongly standardized set of models, systems, and strategies, external carrot/stick incentives without making clear how professionals will be respected as professionals and given choices, collaboration opportunities, and meaningful personal (not mechanistic) feedback and self-reflection and learning opportunities.

A particularly troubling idea proposed here without indication of adequate planning or prior evidenced-based research is the proposed teacher "incentive." Strategies described here seem to replicate highly-visible, largely failed evaluation systems that have attempted to "pay for performance." As early examples of such systems have played out over the past decade, researchers have demonstrated that much piloting and pre-planning is essential to their success. This proposal fails to demonstrate awareness of the complex planning, the teacher and leader buy-in, and the many levels of trial that are necessary for the future success of the programs they propose.

As written, this applicant's broad statements about new ideas and systems are not adequately supported with the high-quality planning that must establish the building blocks of a careful program development process, created with and by educators and experts who design and trial test the component parts. Especially lacking is evidence of how the applicant has verified the reliability and validity of the observation, assessments, and overall evaluation components it proposes.

#### 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>7</b>

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

The applicant proposes a many-faceted central office- and school-level reorganization. This builds on what appears to have been multiple structural reorganizations implemented in the past decade.

Numerous new positions, new ideas, and new organizational plans are proposed to enrich student opportunities for learning through multi-modalities, in different kinds of learning contexts, and with additional teacher and technological support.

The weakness of the applicant's proposal is that it is hard to follow and no clear plan is itemized. If it is difficult to track the many shifts and changes proposed. The proposal would be strengthened by better charting and visuals that make clear the connections between the current organizational structures and the newly proposed structures. It is also not clear how schools at different "tiers" of the reform will be supported differently by new positions or new organizational structures.

Additional concerns include the following;

- Proposed technology-based mastery systems anticipate new assessments and assessment systems and adaptive features, all linked to new curricula, but none of these systems appear to have been piloted even for a single year;
- The promise that students will master standards through technology is not supported with evidence that the proposed new systems have worked viability within the district or elsewhere;
- Limited details demonstrate how they are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.
- It is expected that low-income families will have ready access to the internet systems they will need to connect with the new teaching strategies, assessments, feedback systems. The applicant does not itemize the costs, logistics, or parent and community training that would be required to make available under-resourced and inexperienced families how to work with digital technologies. Critical issues are not addressed, e.g., costs to families and community centers, strategies for finding time and opportunity to offer training, and mechanisms for providing families with updated computers.

The proposal fails to present the quality plan needed to ensure that the proposed systems would be successfully put in place within the time frame of the project's funding.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

The applicant proposes to restructure both the LEA and schools to implement ambitious programs, technologies, resources, and personnel. A range of strategies (e.g., peer support, online support, or local support) are suggested. The central problem with this vision is that insufficient evidence shows how newly proposed programs will build on and integrate with untested innovations. The application lacks adequate evidence of necessary in-depth planning, coordinating, and implementation of its proposed ideas. For example:

- The applicant does not detail how new roles, teams, and responsibilities connect to one another at both the district levels and within and across schools.
- A new central office organizational structure is envisioned without evidence of new job descriptions, strategies for creating effectively functioning cross-role relationships, or a plan for how new roles and positions will be phased into the current skeletal structure;
- New school leadership team structures are proposed but the roll-out plan, defining new organizational structures and working relationships, is unclear;
- The budget structures for the proposed new positions and resources to fund such components as hardware and software, multi-level training, access and security measures, etc, are not clearly spelled out. The applicant's lack of experience with complex systems such as those proposed is evidenced by statements which imply these changes can occur without long lead times, careful prior piloting and tryouts, or specifications about how budgeting and account will be "electronically transferred to the general ledger" without defining detailed data entry requirements.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>

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

The applicant proposes to implement a "continuous improvement management cycle" directed by the RTTD Project Director, who will report to the district's assistant superintendent. Under the Project Director, the district's Teaching and Learning Team is tasked to oversee technical assistance and staff hiring for the proposed grant. To monitor and manage the program, the application defines a narrow set of continuous improvement activities and expected report cycles for a year-round monitoring and continuous program assessment.

The weakness of this section, however, is that it is very broad and provides very general plans for how the process and the teams will be monitored. There is also no evidence of specific school- or project-level improvement activities or plans, data collections, or feedback loops.

As written, the applicant has not made a persuasive case that the Race to the Top investments will be closely monitored; activities, timelines, responsible leaders, or deliverables are not defined. There is no certainty that all levels of the project's participants and stake holders will implement a continuous improvement data collection, analysis, or reporting cycle.

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

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

The applicant provides a very limited internal and external communication plan. The Teaching and Learning Team members are expected to serve as the points of contact between schools and management; a consultant will be hired to develop "an effective communication and outreach plan" to reach stakeholders.

Communications is a vital dimension of an effective school change initiative and this brief plan outline of intent does not make a convincing case that the district has thought out its communications strategy to ensure the success of its proposed school change process. Although a consultant is anticipated to guide a future communications plan, the plan is weakened by the absence of parameters that define the activities, timelines, and expectations for the consultant. Moreover, *after* the project is underway is late to begin communications and engagement. A skillful communications team is a vital part of a successful roll out and it should begin immediately not after a long selection process.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
---	----------	----------

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

The applicant proposes to measure the performance of its proposed project in different ways at the three grade clusters (pre-k through grade 3; grades 4 - 8; and grades 9 - 12). The performance measures incorporate only the State's assessment program as its strategy of assessing the project's College/Career Ready outcomes; to provide full evidence of outcomes, however, the applicant should be expected to go beyond the State's assessment program and to multiple measures of success.

The rationale for defining each of the specific outcomes offers no explanation of how the identified measures align component-by-component with the proposed project elements. Outcome measures rely heavily on State-mandated assessments; the proposed non-cognitive measures are vague and their purposes are not clear (e.g., a plan to report the status of "assessment-ready learning" based on self-monitoring), reducing their value as "rigorous" and "formative" assessment tools.

The overarching goal statements are ambitious but not consistent among the subgroups listed. It makes no mathematical sense to project overall targets of 80 or 90 percent, when the subgroups are not consistently required to meet this goal.

Finally, the measurement plan does not align with the schools system's grade level configurations. The plan includes measuring preschoolers and post graduates without an explanation of how the measurement systems will be used in the lower grades which are not part of the school districts' current service structure.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
--	----------	----------

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

The project evaluation plan is proposed to be conducted by an evaluation team that will be identified within the first three months of the project. The proposal provides a rough outline of skills that will be sought in an evaluation team and lists the within-district key players that will work with the evaluation team to facilitate the evaluation.

The plan is merely an outline for an evaluation process and it is inadequate to make clear how the proposed evaluation will achieve a rigorous evaluation standard. Evaluation is central to an effective implementation, and it is necessary to define the expectations and goals to recruit a strong evaluator. Of particular importance is that the applicant does not seem to have thought through its expectations for evaluating professional development and teaching, or learning, and parent-outreach, and there is insufficient information for assessing how the value added of the proposed new technologies and technology systems.

**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:**

The applicant's budget and narrative is difficult to follow. A summary of the budget elements is so general that it is difficult to tie to the budget line items with project components. A chart indicates "leveraged funds," but this chart appears to show only the district's match for the proposed projects, so it is not clear what funds are indeed leveraged. The applicant has not made clear exactly what resources will come from each anticipated funding source or partner organization.

Specifically, the applicant does not provide necessary specific information that delineates

- (a) the annual costs of specific project components, and which budget sources are expected to fund those components;
- (b) the total funding for each program element does not make clear what revenue sources will fund each component;
- (c) the rationale for proposed costs not provide clear or "thoughtful" explanations of the how the proposed resources will be dispersed within each component.

Absent from the application is a sufficient description of exactly what amounts of funding will be allocated to each component by each funding stream. Also missing is evidence about which funding streams will support which program

components.

The sustainability budget summarizes salaries and wages for three years, but it does not provide a function-related analysis for how specific programs will continue their funding, and it is not clear what the funding sources budgeted amounts are allocated to specific projects. Budget categories (totals of projects, subtotals, and bottom lines) are unclear and inconsistent across budget charts.

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

**10**

**4**

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

The applicant provides evidence of how the school district has enhanced its program during the year that preceded its RTTT application. It states that it has created strong community partners and piloted some aspects of proposed innovations, including an "interim educator and leadership evaluation" system.

However, these signs of past performance do not describe how the district plans to sustain project components in the future. It is not clear which partners have supported past project components, and past support by local governments and community partners cannot be relied on to make future investments. The applicant plans to identify a "sustainability action team," but the application does not state the possible funding streams or the reasons to believe these resources will be available at the project's conclusion.

Also missing from this section of the proposal is how the applicant will evaluate the project's productivity, a necessary precursor to ensuring the district post-grant funding for three years after the term of the grant concludes.

**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:**

This section of the application only broadly explains -- with little detail -- the range of supplemental services that will potentially be available to support the project. The information does not offer the 10 population-level desired results for students in a clear and measurable way.

The proposed partners and partnership relationships are not coherent described so, for example, it is not clear what role different partners will play in the program's implementation. In lieu of plans for action and responsibilities of different partners, the applicant lists partners and the services they currently offer the community.

A significant weakness is that the teacher's educational association role and relationship with the project is not detailed. In a project that so relies on teachers for its success, and because of its high expectations for new approaches to teacher evaluation, the absence of details about roles, relationships and supports from the teachers association is glaring.

The applicant has not provided clear evidence of its plan for ensuring that the proposed program strongly connects pre-school through career-readiness and high school graduation goals. It does not provide strategies for reliably measuring pre-third grade academic outcomes and progress or how the project will reliably measures family and community supports.

The applicant's proposed strategy for measuring population-level results is does not address non-academic results or alternatives to data provided by the State's testing system.

The applicant addresses the idea that data and program indicators will be tracked for all results categories, but the plans do not clearly show how the partnership will collect and integrate data to be collected across city-wide systems and from different agencies. The applicant also does not address how it will ensure individual, family, and agency privacy as it seeks to collect cross-agency data to monitor implementation and assess results

The stated strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students is limited by an inadequate explanation of the collaboration strategies participants will use to achieve the project's goals.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

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

Absolute Priority 1		Met
<p><b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant addresses how it plans to personalize learning environments for both children and educators. Although the priority is broadly addressed, the applicant does not demonstrate an in-depth understanding of how it intends to put to use new systems for personalizing learning through digital devices and mechanistic tools.</p> <p>To fully achieve the goal of this priority, the applicant will have to work very hard with educators in the "front lines" - including teachers, non-teaching support staff, and school leaders - to ensure they do not become so over-committed to technology that they lose sight of the people-to-people connections which are and will always be the central and most critical ingredients of personalized learning.</p> <p>Computers and digital gadgets can create an appearance of usefulness, but, as described here, they are more likely to overwhelm their end-users with process demands. This applicant would be well-advised to more carefully examine how the digitalized tools will work at the service of learners and teachers rather than expect students and teachers to work at the service of the tools. There is a particularly great danger that parents of highly disadvantaged students, with a whole set of complex demands on their lives, will also be expected to serve the technology rather than to expect the technology to be accessible and responsive to parents.</p> <p>The applicant technically meets this Absolute Priority, but in a cautionary manner.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	210	103