



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0172AZ-1 for Pima Prevention Partnership dba Pima Partnership School

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. The applicant demonstrates a strong, clear, and credible approach to accelerating student achievement and learning. This approach is comprehensive in that it includes components of revamping the curriculum, incorporating technology, and personalizing the learning environment. The applicant explains that the learning environments will be facilitated by teachers that are data experts. The applicant explains that the development of teachers in the use of data is important because data provides a lens into the effectiveness of the student's learning and the teacher's ability to deliver a lesson. In addition, the applicant will utilize technology as a means to share data, video conference, and allow students to take virtual field trips. These innovative approaches will make learning engaging for the students as well as the teachers.

The applicant explains various, sustainable approaches to evaluating personnel to create an environment of continuous learning. One of the most effective ways of evaluating personnel will be the development of an evaluation system for teachers, principals, and superintendent. This will be extremely beneficial because it demonstrates a level of accountability each and every level. The applicant also includes a comprehensive approach to attracting, developing, and maintaining the workforce. The use of innovative professional development strategies and pay for performance options will more than likely keep highly effective teachers from leaving to work in other schools systems.

The applicant outlines a plan in which continuous learning will lead to a culture of student achievement which will be easy to sustain over multiple years. This approach will be easy to sustain primarily because it promotes teacher leadership. In addition, the approach to continuous and consistent learning will help lower performing schools to more consistently diagnose and fix the areas of weaknesses because of competent workforce. The applicant continues to describe how they will build on the core assurance areas. One of the most effective approaches is addressing the curriculum deficiency by implementing the Common Core Standards. The Common Core curriculum is an effective curriculum in that lends multiple opportunities to focus on student learning. It is beneficial that the applicant will start the introduction of Common Core in the early grades in order to create a scaffolding impact as students matriculate through the grades. This consistency in curriculum and eclectic activities will promote and increase student engagement and ownership. The applicant provides numerous details that outline this approach ranging from implementing CCS through hiring and retaining effective teachers to focusing on resources that are available for parents and students. The applicant explains that the Consortium will use benchmark testing such as AIMS to measure student proficiency. The applicant does not expand how they will build their data system.

The applicant has addressed most of the areas in this section. The applicant comprehensively details their plan to address students learning and teacher development. The applicant provides a comprehensive and coherent reform vision, however, the applicant does not adequately describe how they will build their data system. As a result of this omission, the applicant receives a low-high score of 8 out of 10 score.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation. The applicant provides a description of the process they used to select schools to participate. However, the applicant did not include adequate, specific justification of why the schools were selected. The applicant explains that each school apart of the Consortium has the common thread of addressing disadvantaged youth.

The applicant outlines a detailed plan to create uniformity between each of the schools that will

promote consistency. The consistency is facilitated by the protocols that have been established for conducting meetings, group decision-making, and scheduling. Also, the four guiding principles of accountability, equity, partnership, and ownership provide four strong pillars in which the schools can periodically refer to throughout the reform. The applicant outlines the four standards of accountability, equity, partnership, and ownership promotes shared leadership.

The applicant provides a list of schools that will participate in grant activities. In addition, the applicant includes the total number of participating students, students from low-income families, participating students with high-needs, and participating educators.

The applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation, however, the applicant did not provide adequate, specific justification of why the schools were selected. As a result, the applicant receives a low-high score of 8 out of 10 score.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes most of elements of a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools, and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals. The applicant describes that they will first entail fully institutionalizing the strategies in each LEA beyond the participating schools. The applicant continues by explaining they will use a train the trainer approach to facilitate the Dreamcatcher model to reach more teachers and students. The applicant does not provide specific information about the process as to how this plan will be scaled up to other schools in the district.

The applicant also outlines their Theory of Change model. The applicant explains that this theory presents an inclusive approach to appropriately identifying areas of concern and developing a strategy to correct those areas. The applicant also provides extensive steps or details to outline the process of changing the culture of the Consortium.

The applicant provides information regarding their approach of implementing CCSS, expansion of Professional Learning Communities, and meaningful professional development grounded in shared leadership. PLCs allow multiple opportunities for the educators to share, learn, and work together in the area of student learning to facilitate the scale up process.

However, there were major components of a high quality plan missing in this section. The applicant did not provide specifically the people that would be responsible for implementing the activities and a timeline for the activities. The applicant includes a plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools, and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals, however, the applicant did not provide the people responsible for implementing the activities and timelines. In addition, the applicant did not thoroughly explain the process that would be followed to facilitate the scale up. As a result of these omissions, the applicant receives a medium score of 6 out of 10.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's vision regarding student learning and performance will likely result in student achievement. The applicant outlines strategies and approaches that will translate into good teaching, and ultimately, high student learning. The applicant

details how they will be making the transition from the current curriculum, which is measured by a state assessment, to the Common Core curriculum, which will be assessed by PARCC during 2014-2015 school year. As a result, an adequate baseline will not be established, but the applicant makes projections based on the most recent data from summative assessments. The applicant has a goal of a five percent increase each year after PARCC is implemented. However, the concerning statistic is when they reach the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years, when the goal is students achieving at a rate of 90% and 95%, respectively. This goal is ambitious; however, it may not be achievable due the large amount of progress during this time frame. Moving an entire group of students 20-25 percentage points over the course of five years when the starting target is above 70% is difficult. The new assessment will focus on critical thinking skills, skill application, and in-depth understanding of a concept. These skills are being anticipated as harder skills to acquire than the current expectations.

The applicant explains that the goals for decreasing achievement gaps will be focused in reading and math using the Individual Progress Monitoring Instrument. The applicant outlines that in the area of reading, students scores will increase by an average of 20% in reading from the beginning to the end of the year. In the area of math, the applicant outlines a goal of students increasing their scores by 10%. However, the applicant does not clearly identify the subgroups that will target for decreasing the achievement gap. In addition, the applicant does not provide goals over time that would show specifically their ultimate goal.

The applicant outlines an expectation of the graduation rate will increase approximately five percent each year. This is considered a realistic expectation based on the tracking system that has been implemented and will continue to be monitored closely. The applicant will be implementing some strategies that will definitely promote success of their students. In addition, the applicant lowers expectations for African American students during the 17-18 school year decreasing their graduation rate by 27%.

The applicant describes the college enrollment expectations. The outlines that their will be a 15% annual increase in students at each LEA enrolling in college. The applicant details that they will use FASFA and college enrollment record review to keep track of these numbers. The applicant indicates that by 17-18, 100% of their African American students will be enrolling in college. This goal does not seem achievable because the applicant's past record does not demonstrate that this is achievable. Currently, African Americans enrolling in college at a rate of 63% and the expectation is 100%. Conversely, Whites are enrolling in college at at rate of 75% and there expectation is to achieve 91% by 17-18.

The applicant's vision regarding student learning and performance will likely result in student achievement. However, the applicant does not provide a clear picture of how they will address the achievement gap between subgroups. In addition, the applicant lowers expectations with graduation rate of African Americans and provides college enrollment rates that do not appear to be achievable for some subgroups. As a result, the applicant receives a high-medium score of 7 out of 10.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching in the past four years. The applicant highlighted the progress of three schools and their ability to increase their grading scores by one to two letter grades. The applicant was able to show some improvement in student outcomes. For example, the improvement on Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), displayed significant improvement in the area of reading. However, in math, very little improvement was made over the course of three years. This was consistent with all of the schools that were highlighted. In addition, only one particular grade was highlighted for the school. The section was lacking significant documentation of a clear record of success due to the limited scope that was highlighted. Furthermore, the AIMS is the main source of statewide assessment data, so in turn, this would be one of the highest weighted assessments regarding making progress or not. Based on the information provided, these schools were making good gains in reading and marginal gains in math.

The applicant indicates ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools. The applicant outlines the achievement of Pima Partnership High School. The applicant details that PPHS is in the lowest five percent of Title I schools in Arizona. PPHS was a turnaround school in 12-13, and received a B letter grade. The applicant describes that this was accomplishe by integrating systems that address standards implementation, professional development, and evaluation of teachers and leaders. The applicant also details the ACE/Youth Works as a Title I underperforming school. The applicant details that this school made progress from a 2012 D letter grade to a B. Both of these schools demonstrate significant reforms in low-achieving schools.

The applicant provides information on how they will make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. The applicant is committed to utilizing the Family Link module as an online way to provide timely data to students and parents. Currently, most of the schools are providing data using customary vehicles such as PTA meetings, Back to School nights, Facebook, and website. The applicant provides a record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching in the past four years, however, the applicant does not provide a clear record of success in math. In addition, the does not provide sufficient documentation of a clear record of success. As a result, the applicant receives a medium score of 10 out of 15.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not demonstrate a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instruction support, pupil support, and school administration. The applicant made reference to the Arizona statute. However, the applicant does not specify which statute. The applicant informs that an Annual Financial Report and LEA budget is mandatory at each school. In addition, the applicant describes how each school must propose a budget that should be made available through the Arizona Department of Education and posted on each school's website. The applicant did not provide a detailed explanation that outlines exactly the personnel salaries for various staff. The applicant provides information that lacked specificity. For example, the applicant did not provide personnel salaries for school level teachers only nor non-personnel expenditures at the school level. The applicant does not demonstrate a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instruction support, pupil support, and school administration. As a result, the applicant receives a low-medium score of 2 out of 5.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not clearly provide successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments. The applicant references that Arizona receives high praise for its progressive and flexible charter school legislation. However, the applicant does not specifically address the State legal, statutory, nor regulatory requirements specifically. The applicant outlines that Arizona charter school law provides significant flexibility administrative and fiscal decision-making. The applicant did not specify exactly what decisions they have made or will make based on this flexibility. The applicant does not clearly provide successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments. As a result, the applicant receives a low score of 1 out of 10.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	7
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided marginal documentation for this section of the application. The applicant referenced that the LEAs had gathered parents' opinions over the past year. The venue to facilitate this opportunity for input was parent conference nights and PTA conferences. This approach will only reach a limited amount of parents because not all parents attend these types of meetings.

The applicant does not have a collective bargaining unit. However, the applicant did not provide any evidence that 70% of teachers from participating schools supported the proposal.

The applicant provided letters of support for various stakeholders. These stakeholders included, but not limited to, Mayor's office, Superintendent's office, Arizona Department of Education, and a few more. However, one important constituent that was missing was a letter of support from multiple parents. Including parents' viewpoints is extremely important since they are group in which teachers provide the service. As a result, the applicant did an inadequate job of collecting input from various stakeholders, especially the parents and did not discuss how that input was used to develop the proposal, calling into question how meaningful the described engagement was. As a result, the applicant scored 7 out of 15.

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

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

(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided basic information in outlining the plan for improving learning and teaching. The applicant mentioned the Teach for Success approach as a form of high-quality instruction. This approach provides deep learning experiences based on the following areas: student-friendly language, cognitively appropriate lessons, scaffolding instruction, vocabulary, and providing environment conducive to learning. The aforementioned approaches are all effective techniques in increasing student learning and achievement. The noteworthy of these techniques cognitively appropriate lessons.</p> <p>The applicant also lists a scaffolding approach that is within the Dreaming framework. This systematic approach gradually builds on the previous year. The applicant also outlines the many different personnel that are involved in the process of providing deep learning experiences. Not only is the applicant focused on academics, it is focused on educating the whole child. For example, the applicant describes how they will address the social and emotional issues via Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale. This approach provides personalized learning recommendations because so many factors go into how a student learns.</p> <p>The applicant also offers a variety of approaches that will focus on teacher strategies, technological programs, and student self-awareness that will help facilitate this process. Conversely, the applicant omitted some very important components that should be included in a high quality plan. The applicant did not adequately provide a timeline and the parties responsible for implementing the goals. In addition, the applicant did not specifically address the mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided in order to track and manage their learning. As a result, the applicant receives a medium score of 12 out of 20.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant outlines a high-quality plan to develop effective teachers, upgrade recruiting processes, provide teachers support, reward effectiveness. The applicant did not identify an approach to developing highly effective teachers. The applicant explains that they will develop an implementation plan that will ensure strategies for meeting student's academic needs. The applicant provides a three phased development process in which the teachers are focusing on standards, assessment, and data. This approach seems as if it would be successful, however it is missing the critical component of instruction. Instruction is mentioned in various parts of the application, but is not cited as a part of the core development. Along the professional development continuum, are the three phases – awareness, application, and integration. This is a logical progression to address how to take professional development and integrate it into the classroom.</p> <p>The applicant discusses adapting the content and instruction. The applicant explains that the Dreamcatcher approach will allow them to systematically improve teachers use of real-time data to inform learning environments and instructional practices. The applicant also explains that the Dreamcatcher Consortium participating members will have access to the data warehouse which includes formative assessment data, summative assessment data, and educator effectiveness data. The applicant continues by describing how the educators will have access to actionable data through teacher-instructed and on-line curricula.</p> <p>The applicant describes how teachers will have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress. The applicant describes that teachers and students will be able to use iPads, netbooks, digital response systems, and online curriculum management systems. The applicant explains how each School Team will be able to participate in leadership training.</p> <p>The applicant also details the approach to improving the evaluation system for all professionals including teachers, principals, and superintendent. For the applicant, having the ability to adequately evaluate teachers and administration is key to providing consistent development. For teachers, this development will be focused on the following areas: planning, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. All of these areas are key to students learning and being successful. A more detailed, area specific evaluation provides a focused approach for the administrator and focus targets for the teacher.</p> <p>The applicant describes a variety of ways in which teachers will have opportunities to obtain external support or development. This approach to teaching and learning outlined by the applicant is comprehensive. A applicant provides a mixture of LEA resources and external resources with the correct amount of technological integration. Conversely, the applicant omitted some very important components that should be included in a high quality plan. The applicant outlines a high-quality plan to develop effective teachers, upgrade recruiting processes, provide teachers support, reward effectiveness. However, the applicant did not provide a timeline and parties responsible for implementing the goals. In</p>		

addition, the applicant did not provide a plan to provide student personalized learning opportunities, nor a plan to meet college-and-career academic standards. The applicant did not provide a plan how school leaders and leadership teams will be provided with tools and resources to help them meet the academic needs and accelerate student progress. As a result, the applicant receives a medium score of 10 out of 20.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	13
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has listed some very credible approaches to facilitating personalized learning. The applicant describes the organizational structure as one be governed by a Leadership Team comprised of different individuals from each LEA. This approach appears to reasonable because in a project such as this, each LEA requires adequate representation and a voice in the decision-making process.</p> <p>The applicant describes how the charter school organizational structure is conducive to shared decision-making and school-level autonomy. The applicant highlights that charter school system is organized in a horizontal organizational structure. This kind of structure limits the power struggle that is usually customary with a hierarchy. In addition, the schools are allowed to make personnel decisions without too much interaction from a central office or outside entity. This flexibility of making personnel decisions make it easy for the individuals working closest with the students to make the most appropriate choice.</p> <p>The applicant addresses giving students the opportunity to progress and demonstrate mastery of standards. The applicant explains that the LEAs are at various stages of moving away from a structured seat-time system. The applicant continues by explaining that high school students have an individualized learning design which helps understand what has to be learned in order to earn the credit. However, the applicant does not describe a process in which students are provided the opportunity to earn credits based on mastery.</p> <p>The applicant provides adaptable learning resources and instructional practices. The applicant describes how the learning resources and instructional practices are fully adaptable and fully accessible to all students.</p> <p>The applicant outlines various opportunities in which students will be able to demonstrate mastery of standards. The most noteworthy of these opportunities is the opportunity to come to school on Saturdays. This provides an additional day to practice necessary skills and in addition provide the students with access to information that they may not be able to get at home. The applicant provides a multifaceted approach to personalizing learning. The applicant receives a score of 13 out of 15.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide sufficient details outlining the tools that parents and students will have available to them. The applicant does mention that additional tools are being researched to provide students from low-income families the tools to be successful. This is will be a major concern for all systems moving towards a digital curriculum or communication system. On one point, it opens the possibilities of educating students a variety of different levels, but on the other hand, a cost is usually associated with technology from the perspective of families. The applicant mentions that support will be provided by varied staffs and partners in education. The applicant describes using information technology systems such as SchoolMaster to allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format. The applicant also describes the process of using interoperable systems of collaborating with the Arizona Department of Education. However, the applicant only provided limited information because no specific evidence as to how the support was going to take place was mentioned. The applicant did not provide specific details as to how they were going to support parents and students. As a result, the applicant scores 5 out of 10.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant outlines a high quality plan for rigorous continuous improvement. One of the most effective strategies the applicant is using is to contact an external organization to provide feedback. The applicant indicates that Pima Prevention Partnership and a non-profit parent group will be working in conjunction to conduct evaluations on various facets of the project. Throughout this process, both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected. This makes the information that is being received more well-rounded and credible. One set of data can possibly support or dispute potential claims of success or failures. In addition, the applicant details that various assurances are going to be made to ensure data is being collected properly and managed. The applicant specifies types of questions that should be answered to ensure each on the established goals are met. This is an effective guide to make sure the goals of the project remain in the forefront of all thought processes. This chart allows for an opportunity of self-evaluation. The applicant has included most of the elements of a high quality plan in which it considers rigorous feedback in a timely manner. However, the applicant did not provide any timelines, responsible persons, nor plans to share with the public. As a result, the applicant receives a score of 12 out 15.

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

5

4

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a high-quality plan to maintain ongoing communication and engagement with stakeholders. The applicant outlines that the Leadership Team will meet on a monthly basis to receive updates, to discuss successes and failures, and to learn about different approaches to problems. The applicant details that principals will video-conference and blog to communicate student achievement. This will be another opportunity to learn in a professional learning community. Also, the project director will establish and maintain consistent communication, including external stakeholders. This will allow stakeholders to stay abreast of the developments that are occurring in the school system. The applicant provides a high-quality plan to maintain ongoing communication and engagement with stakeholders, however, the applicant did not provide rationale. In addition, it is unclear how they will communicate with external stakeholders, which impacts the overall credibility of the plan. As a result, the applicant receives a high-medium score of 4 out of 5.

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

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant selected 12 performances measures that clearly met the established criteria. Each performance measure included rationale, means for acquiring information, and review protocol. The applicant focused on academic measures for each grade level band. This approach is most logical due to high stakes testing and evaluation. The applicant did not specify the actual percentage target for each grade level. The applicant outlines the expectations for highly qualified administrators and teachers. The applicant describes that in 12-13, that 15% of the teachers were considered highly effective. The overall goal by 2016-2017, is the have 100% of teachers rated highly effective. While an admirable goal and certainly ambitious, it does not seem likely they will reach the goal of 100% by 16-17 school year. The goals for this section were ambitious, however, may not be achievable. The applicant also details that the BERS Strength Index score will increase during the year. The assessment is administered to all students at each level. Overall, most of the applicant has 12 strong measures that are ambitious and achievable with the exception of the 100% goal for teachers to be highly effective. The applicant receives a score of 4 out of 5.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide extensive details regarding a high quality plan to evaluate effectiveness. The applicant does not outline specific plans to evaluate effectiveness regarding the professional development plans. The applicant also does not elaborate on the possibilities that are associated with evaluating the various types of technology that are included in the plan. The applicant provides a very general statement in which its focuses on the summative assessment scores in relation to the amount of funding that is invested in the programs. The applicant does not include all elements of a high-quality plan, as a result the applicant receives a score of 2 out of 5.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a comprehensive budget. The budget outlines specific items and is outlined in each section based on the categories. This makes the budget easy to follow and interpret. The applicant outlines three major areas of the budget – Effective Teachers and Leaders, Educational Technology, and College and Career Readiness. Each of these areas is appropriate in expecting success from teachers and students. Providing appropriate technology is key to the project in order to provide students opportunities for exposure to curricula or experiences that might otherwise not be available. College and career readiness is also appropriate category to invest because a system main goal is to make sure students are able to either make a living through obtaining a career or going to college to pursue a degree.</p> <p>The applicant goes into details regarding some of the descriptions, including total revenue. However, there are a few discrepancies for individual salaries and travel funds. In addition, the applicant failed to properly identify local or federal funds that would aid in the project continuing after RTTT-D funds were depleted, and budget lacked itemization. The applicant describes paying for 30 students to take an AP Exam. This does not appear to be an efficient use of funds because it targets such a small percentage of the students. The applicant provides a comprehensive budget, however, the applicant did not clearly identify one time investments versus ongoing investments. In addition, the applicant did not show efficient use of funds in some categories, which calls into question whether the proposed budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the proposal. As a result, the applicant scores a 5 out of 10.</p>		

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provides the elements of a high quality plan in maintaining of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The applicant details that Consortium is organized to build capacity in the areas of human, data, and technology. The human capacity will be facilitated through the investment in professional development and leadership. The various types of professional development that the applicant describes seem to be easy to maintain by the schools. The applicant describes developments such as job-embedded coaching and professional learning communities. These types of developments are are likely to be able to maintain because teachers can facilitate them. The area of social capital will be improved through the use of professional learning communities and rewarding teachers for doing a good job, as to reducing isolation between coworkers and promote the retention of teachers. The technological capital is the ability video-conference with teachers, interactive classrooms, and virtual field trips. All of these activities will promote student engagement and increase teacher satisfaction. The data capital will be effective because it allows teachers and students to receive real-time data.</p> <p>The applicant makes a strong case for how they are planning for sustainability with outlining the various types of capital. The applicant did not provide extensive details about how they will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use the data to determine future investments. This omission is concerning from the standpoint of the programs and activities that were implemented may be in jeopardy once the funding is finished. Secondly, the applicant did not identify additional sources of funding from state, local, or other.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has outlined an adequate plan to ensure sustainability of the project goals after the RTTT-D funding is complete, but did not present a sufficient plan for evaluating the effectiveness of past investments to inform future planning. The applicant receives a score of 7 out of 10.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not address this section within the application. As a result, a score was not assigned for this section.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score

Absolute Priority 1		Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a plan that coherently and comprehensively addresses how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college-and-career ready standards. The applicant addresses the area of adopting standards through their willingness to implement CCSS and adopting the new assessment of PARCC. The applicant indicated that this would be the last year of the current assessment, AIMS, but would be transitioning to PARCC during the 2014-2015 school year. The applicant describes how they implementing data systems that will provide real time feedback with summative and formative assessments. The data, when up and running, will be available to students and parents. The applicant details how they provide various learning opportunities to accelerate learning by students. Through the incorporation of technology and offering outside resources and opportunities such as Saturday drop-in will provide students an opportunity to learn at their own rate. Lastly, the applicant outlines the approach of PLCs in which teachers and administrators will be able to collaborate on a consistent basis to discuss excellent teaching strategies and approaches to make sure students learning at all schools within the consortium. The applicant provides a plan that coherently and comprehensively addresses how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college-and-career ready standards. The applicant clearly meets Absolute Priority 1 through the details provided in this application.</p>		

Total	210	123
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0172AZ-2 for Pima Prevention Partnership dba Pima Partnership School

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(1) The applicant, Arizona Dreamcatcher Consortium, has set forth a reform vision that describes how the schools want to provide a "learning environment in which youth are encouraged to dream and set goals for college and career with the help of cutting edge technology used creatively by teachers and students in all classrooms and real-time data that drives daily instruction supported by a regional professional learning community that inspires educators and leaders to be their best."

- (a) Although the applicant has had success in school reforms (i.e. 6 of 7 LEAs are no longer on school improvement and reading scores have improved), there was not a clear plan to build on this reform work in the four core education assurance areas.
- (b) Applicant articulates a somewhat clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement through blending learning environment that includes tools to help students and teachers to access career resources and opportunities for using electronic-learning. The plan to offer concurrent enrollment and AP coursework should provide opportunities for deepening student learning. There was little evidence provided for the criteria of increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.
- (c) Applicant states that students enrolled in a Dreamcatcher Consortium LEA will have effective teachers and principals. The application proposes that the students will all have individualized learning plans that contain college and career readiness goals that will follow them throughout their school years. Their plan calls for a an avenue for communication to parents and

community, and it is likely, based off of what was proposed, that students will have opportunities to have access to technological tools.

Since strategies have already been implemented that support the vision statement, it was unclear how the vision was expanded to be specific to the RTT-D grant and the four core educational assurance areas. Applicant did have a vision statement that supported this criterion, but because of this lack of clarity with how much the vision was related to the RTT-D grant, this criteria was scored in the high-medium range.

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

10

9

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(2) The vision for Dreamcatcher Consortium supports that all students, in all grade bands, and in all subjects will be included in the reform initiative.

(a) Applicant has identified all schools that will participate in the program and all schools collectively met the competition's eligibility.

(b) In reference to (A)(2)(b) and (A)(2)(c), the applicants proposal showed a table with a listing of schools that will participate in the program, the total number of students from low-income families, and who are high-need, and the number of participating educators that will be involved in this project.

(c) There is a discrepancy on the School Demographics table. It shows 100% of students are from low-income families, yet raw data shows that only 1,525 of the 2,112 total number of students are from low-income families.

The applicant has provided convincing evidence that it has a vision for implementing a reform proposal to support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation. Its approach involves providing a learning environment that encourages dreams, supports cutting edge technology, aligns students' needs with real-time data, and encourages a strong leadership team. Because of the data discrepancy, a point was taken away from the scoring, but still a high range score on this criterion was awarded.

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

10

5

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(3) The Dreamcatcher Consortium provides a framework and logic model, but there is no clear, and credible high-quality plan provided that would explain how the applicant plans to scale up and translate its reform into meaningful district-wide change. Although several strategies were described that would support program goals or a scale-up model (i.e. train-the-trainer model for future training, to model successful activities of the program to other Charter School Districts, Dream Book and K-12 College and Career Readiness program, expand PLCs), the application had no evidence such as a timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan to know how it would support district-wide change. Points were awarded for the strategies described, and the score fell in the mid-range.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(4) Schools that are part of the Dreamcatcher's Consortium have already experienced positive school reform in many aspects, so their vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity.

(a) According to the proposal objective, Dreamcatcher Consortium is expecting an average 5% annual growth on performance of summative assessments for reading and mathematics in grades 3, 8 and 10. There was no baseline data made available since the PARCC assessment they intend to use to measure has not been implemented. There was no rationale provided to know why the applicant chose this target, nor was there enough evidence to assess if this is an ambitious or likely an achievable goal.

(b) According to the proposal objective, Dreamcatcher Consortium is setting goals of increasing its State's overall reading score averages by 20% and its math score overall averages by 10%. The applicant states that it will be implementing a new PARCC assessment instrument, and provide no baseline data, it is unclear how targets were chosen and applicants provides no rationale for determining these targets.

(c) There was no explanation provided on the determination of the target to increase graduation rates.

(d) With the implementation of dual enrollment, AP coursework, and digital learning opportunities, college enrollment rate targets are most likely achievable.

The applicant completed all of the required tables in the application. Because there was no rationale provided in the narrative to determine targets, nor was there any State ESEA targets to make determinations about targets in relationship to the State performance, points were deducted. There was evidence provided that the district has had prior success in increasing student

performance as described in criteria (b); therefore, a mid-range score was awarded.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(1) A few LEA's have demonstrated a clear record of success in the past four years.</p> <p>(a) Applicant highlights in the proposal successes, such as improved student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps in areas of academic achievement (reading and mathematics), school letter grade improvement, graduation rates, and college enrollment.</p> <p>(b) Pima Partnership High School and ACE/Youth Works have both demonstrated the ability to make substantial progress in one year by implementing reform efforts (i.e. established benchmarks and performed progress monitoring, data-driven decision making; developed K-3 literacy plans).</p> <p>(c) Consortium has adopted principles of turn-around, including providing on-going mechanisms for family and community engagement, but there is little evidence from some schools of a record of success to involve parents or encourage students to access their own data. There is no mention how schools plan to ensure that parents will attend open house or parent nights, and applicant has not provided evidence that LEAs that are using, or plan to use, the on-line Family Link module of Schoolmaster that parents and students can access it outside of school hours or without coming to the school during the school day.</p> <p>The applicant has provided some evidence of a clear track record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement, and it was successful in achieving ambitious and significant reforms in a few of its high-need schools (ACE/Youth Works for grades 9-12; Presido School for Principal Leadership, and 7th grade writing program). There was no examples provided of how schools had specifically had successful programs of increasing equity in learning and teaching. A mid-level score was awarded.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(2) Other than a statement provided in the narrative that says that the personnel salaries described in sub-criteria a through d are highly transparent, there is inadequate evidence of transparency in the LEA processes, practices, and investments. Because the applicant states that the required data for school-level expenditures is published on the school's Web site, which is an adequate way to make data public, a minimal number of points were awarded.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(3) The applicant does not provide evidence that there are successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. Because the applicant states that Charter Schools are allowed to be flexible in its decision-making, one point was awarded.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	3
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(4) The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence in this proposal that they have stakeholder engagement from everyone described in this criteria.</p> <p>(a) The proposal provided very little evidence of how students, families, teachers, and principals were engaged in the development of the proposal or how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback. Applicant states that the leadership met regularly to "map out the specifics of the Dreamcatcher model," and had asked for input from teachers, but the application did not contain relevant documentation of these meetings. The applicant states that charter schools do not have collective bargaining staff. There was no evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from each of the schools support this proposal.</p> <p>(b) The application contained an inadequate number of support letters from community businesses and civic groups to support the proposal. The support letters received were from the mayor of Tucson, the assistant superintendent of JTED, and the president of the</p>		

Arizona Charter School Association.

This selection criteria received three points because there were a few support letters included in the proposal, but overall the proposal lacked sufficient evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement and support, resulting in a low score.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(1) Dreamcatcher's plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment is proposed by implementing an initiative called "We Walk, We Run, We Fly". Although the applicant provides sufficient details on how this framework is designed, it does not provide the components of a high-quality plan when describing how Pima Partnership will implement this initiative.

(A) The plan for student learning relies strongly on educators support and not parents.

(i & ii) The applicant describes how students will design their own 'Dreambook' beginning with all 3rd grade students. The Dreambook will follow the students through to 12th grade. Students will write short and longer-term goals, structure their learning to achieve their goals and measure their own goals. It is likely that students will recognize the importance of learning and how it relates to their successes, as the Dreambook described will be a product of the students. Although each of the three grade spans describe the goal(s) for students learning, there was vague details provided for the activities and timelines. Most everything described in the framework depends on educators to carryout the programs, with very limited support required by parents.

(iii) Students are most likely to experience learning opportunities through programs and activities and resources, such as Arizona Career Information System/My Career Plan & ECAP; Character Education Curriculum; instruments to help counselors measure social and emotional well-being; academic/career exploration through the Joint Technical Education District; dual enrollment; Advanced Placement courses; blended learning opportunities, and host career fairs. Again, the proposal was weak in addressing all of the components of a high-quality plan (*key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan*).

(iv) The applicant did not provide evidence that students will have exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning.

(v) Although vague, the proposal provided a few strategies and resources that would most likely allow students the opportunity to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits, such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving (e.g. virtual field trips - students working to find solutions to abstract social, architectural, mathematical and biological real world problems, and activities related to career fairs - students will be involved in real-world work-force activities).

(B) The plan for student learning relies strongly on educators support and not from parents.

(i) The on-line teaching tools described in the application (i.e. Credit Tracker, ADE Data Warehouse) should be adequate to provide students with a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable him or her to achieve individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

(ii) Applicant's plan to impose a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments lacked detailed information required in a high-quality plan. The proposal talks about a character education program, implementing a blended learning environment, *Teach for Success*, and Close Reading approach, but there is no mention of a timeline for implementation, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities.

(iii) Proposal describes several research based high-quality content (Academic software, Electronic learning support tools, formative assessment), which are aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), but it is not presented in way to see a timeline for implementation, the deliverables, or the parties responsible for implementing the activities.

(iv) (A) Applicant has stated a solution to get updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards, or college- and career-ready graduation requirements by using the new ADE product, which is a warehouse that the Arizona Department of Education will implement . The applicant provides no evidence to support a high-quality plan for implementation. (B) There is no evidence provided of a high-quality plan that demonstrates

how personalized learning recommendations would be supported.

(v) The applicant has presented a science based strategy of RTI to ensure accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students. It did not appear that there was a plan for the RTT-D grant to add anything more than what was already in place.

(c) Application doesn't provide a clear plan on training students and providing them with the support they may need to use the software and track their progress.

Although there were parts of the criterion that the applicant addressed, the proposal did not demonstrate all of the components of a high-quality plan for each of the criterion. The proposal failed to identify key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan. Therefore, mid-range points were awarded.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	5
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(2) The applicant has presented a weak approach to teaching and leading that would help educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards.

(a) The applicant has provided insufficient evidence to address how the district will support educators in implementing personalized learning environments.

(i) Details about Dreamcatcher framework for teacher and principal evaluation was described, but the proposal lacked clarity of how the evaluation would support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs. There was no data referring to the current status of ratings for teachers and principals; therefore, it is difficult to determine a goal, timeline, etc. for using the RTT-D grant for improving learning and teaching.

(ii) The applicant did not provide a plan to address how it plans to adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches.

(iii) The applicant did not provide a plan to address how it will frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards, or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators.

(iv) The applicant did not prove a plan to improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems, including frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness, as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement.

(b) The applicant describes resources and tools that educators have access to, but a clear plan to address training timelines, implementation and feedback processes is not provided.

(i) Applicant describes various ways they plan to adapt content and instruction (Edmodo, Project based learning with Webquests, instruction from Khan Academy and use of manipulatives, such as Illuminations), which are all feasible ways to adapt learning approaches.

(ii & iii) Applicant did not provide evidence of a high-quality plan that included how they will use RTT-D grant funds to create and share resources, and the process that they will use to match student needs with specific resources and approaches to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting students' needs.

(c) The applicant has not provided a high-quality plan to address how school leaders and school leadership teams will be provided the training, policies, tools, data, and other sources to assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, as well as to progress toward the goals of increasing student performance. The applicant does propose that school leadership teams will participate in leadership training, but does provide specific components that would be included in a high-quality plan (key goals, activities and rationale for the activities, timeline, deliverables, parties responsible for implementing the activities).

(i) The applicant references that teachers will be observed weekly by a school leadership team to look for key elements of effective instruction. It is unclear what training has been already provided to leadership or The leadership member will use a West Ed developed tool to provide feedback and guidance towards setting goals, but there was no formal teacher evaluation protocol used, and there was insufficient evidence provided to understand how the

leadership and the West Ed tool will support teacher's capacity to implement a personalized learning environment. The applicant provided no information on the number of teachers or leaders who are currently considered effective.

(ii) LEAs have provided some evidence that training systems and practices are ongoing (e.g., support for new teachers is given by way of orientation, mentorship and professional development on tools used in PLC environment; each school has developed leadership teams that will participate together in trainings; PLC groups meet regularly for student data disaggregation and create curriculum maps).

(d) The applicant has not provided a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. The one-line statement made in the proposal that says that by providing resources and training, the district will be able to "support filling the hard to fill positions in the areas of mathematics and sciences" is not sufficient in addressing this criterion.

Although the application described teacher and principal evaluation components, there was no details provided on how feedback provided by teachers and principals would be used for needed improvement. The proposal lacks evidence of a high-quality plan that describes how the RTT-D grant is needed to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers. There was little evidence that supports that Pima Partnership School has the capacity to implement an initiative that would support educators building a personalized learning environment. The criterion was scored in the low medium-range of scores.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	10

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(D)(1) The applicant described a minimal number of practices, policies and rules that they plan to use to personalize learning.

(a) There was convincing evidence presented (see bullets below) that the consortium structure has been established to provide support and services to all participating schools.

- MOUs support LEAs involvement and support in the governance structure to services.
- Consortium supports efficiency and centralization for meetings and video-conferencing opportunities.
- Charter School status of the schools allow for flexibility to self-rule how the consortium supports personalized learning and making their own decisions on performance-based hiring and retention of teachers.

(b) There was evidence presented that the LEAs all have representation on a leadership team to make decisions on such things as school schedules, and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets. Although the LEAs have flexibility, it was unclear the process and the timeline of this leadership team meeting to discuss factors such as staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school level budgets.

- All schools have at least one representative in advisory and decision-making process.

(c & d) There was evidence presented that students will have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not seat time, and at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. The applicant states that each school has various ways of providing students with the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards (i.e. software, and each LEA has their own way to determine mastery).

- LEA's practice allows for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at their own pace and provide for supports to accelerate their learning.

(e) The applicant had insufficient evidence that the learning resources and instructional practices that are needed to personalize learning for its 25% of students who receive special education services or are ELL would be any different than they presently are (academic road maps, Intervention Tiers, ILLPs).

The applicant did not provide a sufficient high-quality plan that would support project implementation to address the LEA policy and infrastructure of a RTT-D grant initiative. The applicant provides a goal for each selection criterion, and discusses activities, but the timeline, deliverables and the parties responsible for implementing the activities are not described. There were strengths described of the infrastructure in several of the criteria selection (e.g., flexibility to make real-time changes and extended learning day), but only enough to score in the mid-range of points.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(D)(2) The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p> <p>(a) The applicant did not sufficiently describe how the LEAs will ensure that the students, educators, and parents will have the necessary tools to support the implementation; therefore, the reviewer did not have sufficient information to assess this sub-criterion.</p> <p>(b) The applicant did not describe how support would be provided; therefore, the reviewer did not have sufficient information to assess this sub-criterion.</p> <p>(c) The applicant provides some detail about the Family Link module of SchoolMaster that would be used for parents and students of two of the seven LEAs, but there was not a high-quality plan provided showing the LEA's intent to implement the technology systems in the other participating schools</p> <p>(d) The applicant plans to use the Arizona Dept. of Education's data warehouse, which will ensure that the schools have the opportunity to use interoperable data systems to improve assess data and improve instruction.</p> <p>It is not clear how the RTT-D grant will support schools in the consortium with any services not already included in existing infrastructure. Application states that few parents have Internet access, so it's unclear how the technology infrastructure and the technology systems listed in grant application will allow parents to receive services. The proposal does not provide sufficient evidence or a strong infrastructure that would support personalized learning;; therefore, a low-range score was awarded.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E)(1) Applicant provides certain elements of a high-quality plan for addressing the Dreamcather's continuous improvement process. The plan has established four goals (increase performance on summative assessments, decrease achievement gaps, increase graduation rates, and increase college enrollment) proposed to use for monitoring progress. The plan includes objectives and questions that will be used to determine progress monitoring. The plan does not include a timeline of when the objectives will be carried out, nor does it name the responsible party who would be publicly sharing information on the quality of its RTT-D grant investments.</p> <p>The applicant's measurements identified in the proposal would most likely not provide timely feedback. The applicant proposes using a summative assessment, PARCC and the FAFSA. The assessment results from both the PARCC and the FAFSA are not provided for some time following these assessments, which would prevent applicant from timely monitoring opportunities. There is also not sufficient evidence provided for reviewer to know what kind(s) of feedback the "Individualized Progress Monitoring Instrument" would provide, nor for the "record reviews" proposed to use to determine graduation rates.</p> <p>Although the applicant proposed partial elements of a high-quality plan for addressing continuous improvement, it did not provide the necessary timelines and assessment data required to continuously monitor progress and make improvements. The applicant also does not provide evidence of its plan to publicly share this information. This selection criterion scored in the mid-range.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E)(2) The applicant did not provide all of the elements of a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. Although the applicant mentions plans for teacher resources to be digitally 'banked' and made available to teachers, there was no plan to communicate to external stakeholders. This selection criterion did not address specific goals for making adjustments and revisions. The applicant described how the project director would be responsible for scheduling meetings with the principals and stakeholders. The project director would also be responsible for facilitating PLC work with teachers, and other grant activities.</p>		

Although a few elements of a high-quality plan were briefly described, the applicant did not provide sufficient quality evidence to address this criterion. There was no evidence of how stakeholders would share in the approach to improve the program. A low mid-range score was given for this criterion.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(3) The applicant has provided a table that lists the performance measures by grade span. The table provides a description of the performance measure, the rationale for selecting the measure. Although the applicant provides a statement that addresses how the measure will be reviewed and improved, it is not clear the process that someone would use to determine how to make improvements.

(a) The application contains ten performance measures. Measures #1 - #3 focuses on students provided with effective and highly effective teachers and principals. There was no evidence provided, such as evaluation models, of how the district determines effectiveness. Measure #4 proposes to use the PARCC scores. The applicant refers to this assessment as being both a formative assessment and a summative assessment. There are no academic performance measures addressing kindergarten through first grades. Measure #5, #7 and #10 provides an assessment, BERS, to use with kindergarten through eighth grade students to assess the social and emotional wellness. Measure #6 and #9 focuses on fourth through twelfth grade students who are on-track to college and career readiness. The performances measures will be attendance records, PARCC, and Dream Book completion records. Measure #8 focuses on the number of students who complete and submit their FAFSA.

(b) The tables that show performance measures does contain adequate explanation for how the measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative information tailored to the plan. The applicant does not provide sufficient information on what the expected data will look like from the five assessments that PARCC will provide. It is unclear how the BERS assessment will be used to strengthen the personalized learning environment or help determine the quality of the approach.

(c) It is not clear how measures will be reviewed and improved, if it is determined that they are not sufficient.

Although the applicant provides the required table and data, there was not a clear and high-quality approach described to know that the applicant plans to continuously improve its plan. The applicant wrote performance measures and targets in the tables that were provided in the application, but without any rationale provided in the narrative or tables to understand how the measures or targets were chosen, it was too difficult to determine if they were ambitious yet achievable. The score fell in the mid-range.

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

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(4) The applicant does not address how RTT-D expenditures related to improvement and quality professional development, technology, or for staff will be evaluated to determine the quality of its investments. Although the applicant presents a vague plan for continuous improvement, it is not clear how that proposed process would be used to evaluate effectiveness and does not constitute a high-quality plan. The reviewer was unable to award points for this criterion.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(1) Applicant supplied a budget in the table provided in the application.

(a) All sources of funding are identified in the budget.

(b) Budgeted amount for professional development was not reasonable since the plan was not clear on the professional development activities to be implemented. Some items budgeted (i.e. 30 students each year for AP exams), does not reflect that all students will be served. There was no narrative explaining how students would be chosen to receive such things as AP exam fees or tuition costs.

(c) Budgets were clear on what was considered one-time expenditures versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs. The budget does not identify any local or Federal funds that will be used to support carrying out grant

objectives. There was no evidence provided of strategies that are planned to ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environment.

Although some of the criterion was addressed, the budget narrative did not provide adequate descriptions and justifications that link the investments proposed in the budget back to the reform initiative. A low-range score was awarded.

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

10

5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(2) The applicant has not provided sufficient details in its description of describing the components of a high-quality plan to sustain the grant objectives once the funding ends. The proposal does describe adequate strategies that will be used (i.e. continue increasing the number of highly effective teachers, building a solid foundation of technological infrastructure, continuing the use of the data network system/ADEConnect, which the ASDE supports, Implementation of the Train-the-Trainer approach allowing for master teachers to remain in the system and continue carrying out professional development activities). There were no key goals, a timeline, or parties responsible listed for this sustainability plan.

The applicant indicated sources that would be used to finance some initiatives after RTT-D funding ends (i.e. local PD money), but a plan to address how the applicant will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget was not available, nor were there an estimate three-year budget post grant.

Although the applicant presents a vague plan for maintaining sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant, it is not clear how that proposed process would be used to evaluate effectiveness of past investments, and use this data to inform future investmentsiveness. It also does not constitute a high-quality plan. This section scored in the mid-range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not directly address this criteria, nor did they show evidence of any partnerships that were formed with public or private organizations outside of the consortium. There were no points awarded for this section.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides sufficient evidence (i.e., goals and performance measures; Dreamcatcher vision) to determine that they have met the Absolute Priority1. The applicant coherently and comprehensively built its proposal around the core education assurance areas. It was obvious that the consortium of schools desire to create learning environments that are designed to improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards, accelerate student achievement and deepen learning by meeting the academic needs of each student, increase the effectiveness of its teachers, and expand student access to the most effective educators. Although this application did not score strongly because sections were not fully developed and supported in some instances with a high-quality plan, there was elements of the proposal that are designed to create learning environments that would most likely improve learning and teaching.

Total	210	92
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0172AZ-3 for Pima Prevention Partnership dba Pima Partnership School

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Dreamcatcher Model supports a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on the work in the four core professional assurance areas. Pima Prevention Partnership validates a vision that will provide teachers with the necessary tools and support system that will enable them to meet the needs of each student and deepens each student's learning ability.</p> <p>The applicant articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support, the DreamCatcher model builds on reaching desired goals. For example, the plan calls for implementing the Common Core Standards with no evidence indicating how the teachers and leaders will be trained to incorporate the Standards in the curriculum. Furthermore, the plan calls for implementation of rigorously evaluating teachers, principals, and superintendents. There is no evidence indicating the procedures and instrument to be used.</p> <p>The applicant outlines what a classroom experience would be like in a personalized learning environment. The design plans to have highly effective teachers that will enable students and teachers to communicate progress by individualizing instruction designed to enhance the strengths of the students and teachers. There is no evidence indicating how the teacher will be trained to become highly effective.</p> <p>Weaknesses: The applicant lacks evidence of extending beyond initiatives that are already in place.</p> <p>As evidence the applicant has set forth a reform vision that will accelerate student achievement; however, there is a lack of evidence addressing issues beyond the current initiative already in place. This section score reflects a score of 8.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation</p> <p>The applicant includes a description of the selection process for the participating schools; a list of participating schools; and the total number of participating students including low income families, high need students and participating educators. The extent to which schools were selected and the caliber of students participating has provided the Dreamcatcher Model an opportunity to further embed the expectation of further growth in student achievement.</p> <p>Weakness: The applicant did not provide a rationale to indicate as to why the participating schools were chosen.</p> <p>This section reflects a score of 8 because there was no rationale given for the choice of participating schools.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

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

The applicant presents a plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district wide change beyond the participating schools will help the applicant reach its outcome goals. The applicant's theory of change is outlined stating the ultimate goals to improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served by the applicant. The applicant's plan does not demonstrate how the reform proposal will support district wide change beyond the participating schools and has the potential to improve outcomes for all students in the consortium. There is a lack of evidence supporting the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the persons responsible for carrying out these duties. The plan is not quality because it is not clear as to what the applicant plan to incorporate when the funds are dispersed.

Weaknesses: There is no scaling up, as well as, no timelines nor deliverables.

Based on the evidence provided, this section reflects a score of a 4 due to the fact that the plan is not scaled up to support district wide changes beyond the participating schools.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents data in narrative form to indicate its performance on summative assessments. The applicant outlines performance on summative assessments for the participating LEAs. Based on the data presented, the data trend over the past two years were the same and the applicant is projecting a 5% increase each year during the grant period, this does not indicate an ambitious nor achievable goal.

(A)(4)b Decreasing achievement gaps

The applicant outlines goals for decreasing achievement gaps in the targeted service area for academic performance. Achievement gaps will be determined through data analysis and individual student support and specified in the reform vision. There is no data presented; however, the applicant is projecting a 20% in Reading as measured by the Individual Progress Monitoring instrument and increasing Math Scores by an average of 10% as measured by the Individual Progress Monitoring instrument. Looking at the data trends over the years, these are not ambitious nor achievable goals.

(A)(4)(c) Graduation rates

The applicant outlines attainable goals for graduation rates. The goal is set at an annual average increase of 5% which will be measured by reviewing the student records; however, the rationale justifying to meet the 5% increase is not evident. Looking at the data trends over the years, these goals are not ambitious nor achievable.

(A)(4)(d) College Enrollment

The applicant outlines goals for college enrollment. The applicant has projected a 15% increase for students enrolling in college based on FAFSA and college enrollment record review; however, the rationale justifying ow it will to meet the 15% is not evident..

Weaknesses: There is not sufficient rationale indicating how the positive results will occur in all criteria.

As evidenced, the baseline data and the year the program will be implemented does not reflect an increase; and they did not state their methodology for setting the goals. The applicant's score reflects a score of 5 because there was no methodology presented to determine the rate of increase in decreasing the achievement gap, the graduation rates, and college enrollment.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(1) Demonstrating a Clear Track Record</p> <p>The applicant details information to demonstrate its efforts to advance student learning and achievement within the last four years that will improve student learning outcomes, close achievement gaps, achieve ambitious and significant reforms for its lowest performing school.</p> <p>Based upon the applicant's narrative, the applicant demonstrates some reasonable success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement for each participating school. Significant increases in proficiency levels is reflected on data charts for reading and math. The applicant also shows evidence of significant reforms in its persistently lowest achieving schools through various methods. The applicant demonstrated what practices were in place to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.</p> <p>As evidenced, overall the Consortitum experienced success; however, there was a decline in Math and Reading as measured by the AIMS in one school during the second year. The was no rationale for the the decline.</p> <p>Weakness: Within the Consortium, the applicant did not explain the decline in Math and Reading. There was limited evidence of available data.</p> <p>The applicant's score reflects a 10 due to not give the rationale for the decline in Math and Reading and a limited record of making data available.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates a moderate level of Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments. For example, school level personnel and other personnel issues are mandated by Arizona statute. This information is part of each school's Annual Financial Report and LEA Budgets. Each school must post a proposed budget which is made available through the Arizona Department of Education and posted on the school's website. The Consortium will be guided by a Leadership Team which is comprised of decision-making representatives from the seven budgeted collaborating LEAs to ensure accountability, equity, partnership and ownership; however, the Lead LEA acts as the fiscal agent on behalf of the Consortium to ensure compliance with Arizona statutes regarding procurement, accounting practices and all other relevant areas of law.</p> <p>As evidenced, there was very little information demonstrating how the applicant will increase transparency in LEA, processess, practces, and investment. The website was the primary means to support this criteria. The proposal lacked examples.</p> <p>This section scores a 3 because of the lack of examples to substantiate the narrative.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(3) State context for implementation</p> <p>The applicant's narrative merely states that there is autonomy under State, legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environment. There is no supporting evidence.</p> <p>This section scores 0 because there is a lack of information.</p>		

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	3
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support</p> <p>The applicant produces some evidence of meaningful stakeholders' support throughout the development of the proposal. The applicant has signatures from a superintendent, mayor, and local school board president from each LEA, along with signatures of principals. In as much as stated in the narrative, the leadership teams from each LEA have met during the process. The applicant did not include documentation from the meetings. There were no parent letters included in the proposal. During the meetings, there were no indication that data was collected. There was no evidence of 70% of teachers from participating schools supporting the proposal.</p> <p>Weakness: There was no evidence of letters of support for such key stakeholders as Parent Organizations, local civic and community based organizations and the business community. Also the application lacked evidence of the support from 70% of participating teachers.</p> <p>The score of a 3 is given due to the lack of evidence to support stakeholders. engagement and support from participating teachers.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	8
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(C)(1) Learning</p> <p>The applicant has designed a plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support for college and career ready. The plan included three frameworks to engage students. The plan also called for the identification of barriers to success, self-identification of deficiencies, visits and partnerships with institutions of higher learning and business and industry, self-awareness of personal learning styles; collaboration of stakeholders in developing plans of study; and immediate feedback on assessments. There is no clear plan as to how the teachers and students will be supported or trained to implement the above indicators.</p> <p>One of the strengths of the plan was a consortium wide video conference system; however, there was no evidence of how the stakeholders would be trained to use the system.</p> <p>The plan addressed developing skills such as goal setting, problem solving, critical thinking, etc., but there is no indication of how these skills will be implemented into the curriculum.</p> <p>The plan also addressed the concept that each student will have a personalized sequence of instructional content designed to ensure graduation on a timely manner and college and career ready; however, there is no plan of action.</p> <p>The plan gives a list of instructional approaches and environments but does not give strategies for incorporating these approaches in the curriculum.</p> <p>A list of digital learning content aligned with college and career ready standards has been addressed; however, there is no indication how it will be incorporated within the curriculum.</p> <p>Weaknesses: The applicant has designed a plan; however, the plan describes what is in place presently, and does not expound on how the grant fund will be used to improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment.</p> <p>As evidenced, the applicant produced a plan that engaged all learners but does not go beyond what is already in place.</p> <p>This section scores an 8 because there are no strategies in place for the applicant to go beyond what is already in place. The application vaguely include the elements of a high quality plan such as goals, timelines, deliverables, rationale, and responsible parties.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant outlines an approach for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This plan involves developing effective teachers, providing technology, and personalizing learning for all students. Although the plan outlines an approach for improving learning and personalizing learning, there is no evidence on how the plan will be implemented beyond what is already in place. The plan details teacher and principal evaluations and professional development. These strategies are already in place, and there is no indication of how the applicant will incorporate of other strategies to improve learning and teaching to personalize education.</p> <p>Support for effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help them to graduate on time and college and career ready is mentioned in the plan; however, there is nothing in place besides what the applicant is already doing to help students to be successful.</p> <p>Adapting content and instruction to the needs of all children, monitoring students' progress, and improving teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by providing feedback are discussed in the proposal; however, the applicant discusses what is already in place, and not what it will do during the grant.</p> <p>Weakness: The applicant elaborates on what they are already doing. There is nothing in place detailing what the applicant will implement with RTT-D funds.</p> <p>This section scores a 10 because of the lack of building upon what the applicant has in place currently. The applicant does not demonstrate a high quality plan because there were no timelines, deliverables, rationale for activities, parties responsible for implementing the activities.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	8
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes appropriate Local Education Agency practices and rules to help demonstrate it has a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student the support and resources needed. The plan does outline guidelines, policies, and rules that will occur during the process.</p> <p>The applicant indicates the tools that are in place currently to give the students the opportunity to progress and demonstrate mastery of standards. There are no additional strategies in place.</p> <p>Those opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways is included in the proposal; however, these opportunities are already in place. There are no new opportunities proposed for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.</p> <p>Providing adaptable learning resources and instructional practices are discussed in the proposal; these resources and practices are currently in place.</p> <p>Weakness: The applicant discusses practices, procedures and policies that are already in place and does not extend beyond them to te polcies and practices it will implement during the grant period.</p> <p>This section scores an 8 because there is no information in regards to how the applicant will incorporate other practices than those already in place. There are no goals, timelines, deliverables. There are activities, but no evidence of who will be responsible.</p>		

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure</p> <p>The applicant describes Local Education Agency and school infrastructure to help demonstrate that it has a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student the support and resources needed. The plan allows for participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders to have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of project implementation; however, the applicant does not provide details for a ongoing project implementation.</p> <p>The applicant has in place those individuals who will provide support; however, there are no other plans in place to describe their responsibilities and how they will be trained.</p> <p>The applicant describes how information technology systems are currently used to allow parent and students access to data and indicates how the data is uploaded. There is no evidence indicating the training process, or how this will continue while implementing the proposal.</p> <p>This section scores a 5 due to the fact that the applicant does not have plans other than those that are already in place. There are activities in place. There is no indication of who will be responsible for carrying out the activities. Neither timelines nor goals are given.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E)(1) Performance Measures</p> <p>The applicant outlines a plan for a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on the progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements. The applicant has outlined goals and objectives. The applicant also identified the process for evaluating each goal. The applicant discussed how the applicant will monitor, measure and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by RTTD. Qualitative data collection methods will be used by the evaluation team. Methods used to gather information will be focus groups and individual interviews. There will be training sessions to train personnel, evidence to ensure that data is properly collected, and evidence to make sure data is collected corrected.</p> <p>Ongoing communication and engagement was demonstrated through meetings, video conferencing and video blogs weekly. Teachers will be involved in Professional Learning Communities and students and parents will attend field trips.</p> <p>The applicant has proposed to use the AIMS data for the baseline data for the Performance Measures; however, in SY2014-2015 the PARCC will be administered. The applicant outlines the performance measures, rationale for selecting the measure, how the measure will provide information tailored to the plan; and how the measure will be reviewed and improved over time.</p> <p>The applicant gives a timeline as when the data will be collected and analyzed. Professional Development will be provided also.</p> <p>Weakness: The applicant does not elaborate on who at the LEA level will be responsible for conducting and monitoring the strategies.</p> <p>This section scores a 13 because the applicant does not describe the person at the LEA level who will be responsible for conducting and monitoring the strategies.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement

The applicant describes an ongoing system of communication and engagement. This is evidenced in the applicant's response by holding monthly communications meetings conducted by the Leadership Team. The Program Director will facilitate the conversation to all stakeholders. The principals of the consortium schools may or may not sit on the Leadership Team; however, they may use video conferencing and video blogs weekly to discuss student achievement celebrations and strategies used on each campus. In addition, teachers will create a Professional Learning Community made up of consortium teachers and will use video conferencing and video blogs to discuss student work and plans for the coming weeks. The LEAs promote and utilize social media as a means to engage students, parents and the community with updates and announcements concerning students' progress and achievement. The ability of members of this consortium to promote and foster community and school relationships will be vital to ensure the success and achievement of the goals which have been established in this reform vision, and establishing clear lines of communication among all stakeholders will enhance and promote a culture that will value education and post-secondary training. Additionally, the use of websites will also enhance communication efforts with stakeholders.

Parents will be invited to take trips to colleges and career opportunities events across the consortium, thus supporting external and community engagement. In addition, the Consortium coordinator will disseminate information providing weekly updates going out every Monday via newsletters. The meeting within and outside of the Consortium will allow leadership to promote and communicate progress toward the components of the reform vision.

In as much as the applicant demonstrates ongoing communication and engagement with all stakeholders a score of 5 is assigned,

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(3)

The applicant outlines achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. In specifying performance measures, the applicant indicated that the selection of measures is guided largely by the AIMS state mandated assessment which will be replaced by the PARCC during the 2014-2015 school year. The targets for each year will be utilized for planning and performance management for the RTTT reform efforts from each level of implementation - for all LEAs. Additionally, each measure is also set and identified by each subgroup of students (race/ethnicity, poverty, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners). The applicant demonstrates their plan of meeting yearly mastery goals by 2017-2018 in the 3rd, 8th and 10th grade levels in reading and math. As evidence the applicant also demonstrates a plan to increase graduation and college enrollment rates each year during the grant period. Although the applicant has a plan in place, data from the PARCC assessment will be collected during 2014-2015 school year as the baseline target and then projections will be made from that data. Based on growth trends over the past two years, the applicant's targets are achievable. The applicant has included target goals for number of participating students and the subgroups. The applicant has not included target goals for Prek-3 and therefore is not fully responsive to the criteria.

Based on the evidence presented, this section results in a score of 3

Weakness: There is limited data to show where the students are currently achieving. All assessment is based on the PARCC and the applicant left these targets blank..Therefore, the applicant should receive a score of 3.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plan showed funding was spent in 2012-2013 in the areas of Common Core Standards, professional development and building a professional learning community, using classroom technology, providing teacher performance incentives for percent of change on summative assessment in reading and math per grade level. After receiving the RTTT-D funding the data will then be compared and analyzed by the Leadership Team to evaluate the impact of investments.

Although the applicant stated a plan for evaluating effectiveness of investments; the Consortium did not outline specifics

and did not elaborate. Therefore, a score of 0 is assigned to this criterion.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Costs associated with the development and implementation of the initiative are evident. Overall costs appear reasonable to support services. Costs are presented for all major line items. The applicant demonstrates that funds will be budgeted to provide the required services to eligible schools. For example, costs for a Project Coordinator to oversee the program are requested; costs associated with an Individualized Learning Platform to increase student achievement are requested; and costs of technical support for teachers' instructional development.</p> <p>Weaknesses: Professional Development Funds were not itemized. No evidence of how the applicant determined the 30 students for dual enrollment. No identification of local funds after grant.</p> <p>The rationale and cost assumptions are unclear.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided, the applicant's score reflects a score 5 because of the the rationale and cost assumptions are unclear.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide details for sustainability after the grant period. The plan is weak. the proposal describes some strategied the applicant plans to use, but the details a vague. The plan did not include key goals, timelines, deliverables or parties responsible for implementation. Nor did it includ a post-grant budget.</p> <p>Weakness: There is no indication of receiving fund after the grant.</p> <p>This section scores a 3 because there is no indication of how funds will be used beyond the grant.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not present information for the Competitive Preference Priority for the competition.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented a reform initiative that will build on the core educational assurance areas as a personalized learning environment while implementing personalized learning environment. The model upon which this reform initiative is built upon "The Dreamcatcher" allows the students to build upon their bright future with an opportunity to excel. The initiative uses collaborative, data-based strategies and 21st century tools such as online learning platforms, computers, and learning strategies to deliver instruction and supports tailored to the needs and goals of students, with the aim of enabling all students to graduate college and career ready.

Total	210	102
--------------	------------	------------