



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0145DE-1 for Red Clay Consolidated School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The four core assurance areas are embedded in the district's strategic plan, however, despite systematizing numerous activities expected to meet the assurances, there is nothing mentioned about turning around lowest performing schools. The applicant also discusses at length the 1:1 initiative but doesn't explain what it is or what it hopes to accomplish. The applicant has established teacher collaboration and changes instructional practice as the key to reform, and is looking to create environments to foster collaboration, as well as embedding PD into the normal school day. The applicant also provides a small glimpse into the classroom experience, noting that technology will play a large role and students will have small group activities. This section receives the score of 7 however, as although details may be sparse, it does provide a strong vision for what they intend to do with the project and how learning will be personalized for students which should lead to deeper learning and increased equity.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's approach to implementing reforms allows for weekly teacher meetings to look at data and collaborate on interventions and best practices. This is important as it will allow teachers to monitor their own instruction and whether or not they are properly implementing strategies and programs. The section does list participating schools and students, but only explains they were chosen by Success Teams. The applicant does not provide detail about what the Success Teams, who is on the teams, or what criteria they used to choose the schools to participate.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section does not address how the proposal will be scaled up to the entire district or how goals will be reached. The logic model is vague, as the activities are very broad (ie develop relationships, grow partnerships) and does not explain how the mentioned processes will be implemented or evaluated. Essentially, the applicant only mentions certain initiatives, such as personalized learning plans and continuous improvement, but does not discuss how they plan to scale up the proposal to other schools in the district and eventually reach all students.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Section scores high-medium, as it does list the goals and targets, but does not explain how the initiatives discussed will relate to the goal of personalizing education for all students or how they will help the schools achieve greater personalization. The targets however were clearly defined as to how the school determined the increases they are expecting.</p>		

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	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Section scores highly, as Red Clay has shown numerous examples of improvement. DCAS scores have increased in reading and math, and have met the targets for most minority subgroups. The district has shown slight increases in SAT scores and graduation rates, however there is no mention of college enrollment. Lowest performing schools have been designated as either Focus Schools or placed in the established Partnership Zone, and all have shown improvements towards making AYP. Data is available to all students and their parents through a web application, as well as educators who have access to multiple sources.

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

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

District and school profiles are available online and include expenditures, resource allocation, position salaries and sources of revenue. The applicant states that the district makes additional salary information publicly available but does not explain where or how one can find it. The applicant uses the Community Financial Review Committee as evidence of transparency, but does not explain who makes up the committee. The applicant has mixed evidence of transparency, and only makes it partially clear whether all or only some of the information required is actually available for public view.

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

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district will be building upon the RTTT process that was already put in place by the state's RTTT grant. Already being in a RTTT state will be important for the district, as they will be undertaking activities and initiatives that are being implemented at the state level, meaning there will most likely be no pushback to what the district intends to do. The applicant states the state Department of Education will grant full autonomy to the district in establishing personalized learning environments, which is important as there are numerous activities and initiatives that must be undertaken. The section does lose a couple points as it is unclear if the district's autonomy is due to the fact that they are doing what the state would like it's districts to do already, or if they are actually allowed to implement things their own way.

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

15

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant engaged stakeholders including parents, teachers, and community organizations in establishing Partnership Zones and the District Strategic Plan. RTTTD meetings were held with parent groups and elected officials, and the program was approved by the school board. Before submitting the grant, it was made available for 10 days for public review. The district worked with the union throughout the process, and received a letter of support from the union president as well as various other education and community organizations. However, the applicant does not address what kind of feedback was received, or whether it was taken into account during the writing of the grant. It is clear the applicant discussed the grant with numerous stakeholders, but it remains unclear whether or not those stakeholders had a say in the process or were simply kept in the loop.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scores in the medium range as they do not address all the objectives laid out in the grant. For section (a)(i) it is not discussed how the schools will ensure students understand what they are learning is the key to success. The applicant does describe a personalized, career-oriented pathway for students, but does not address how students will see the importance of it. Section (a)(ii) is much more in-depth and lays out a strong plan for identifying and implementing college and career ready goals. This includes increased AP and IB programs, career pathways for students, and dual enrollment courses. These programs should allow for students to take high-level coursework, or coursework in a chosen field of study. The applicant also expresses a strong plan in section (a)(iii). Different pathways and school choice will allow students to select their own areas of interest, which should in turn allow for deeper learning, as students will be focusing on an area that is important to them. The Blended Learning model should provide students the opportunities to work beyond the traditional school day in work that can be tailored to their individual needs. Although the blended model

does provide for personalized learning, it does not meet section (a)(iv) because it addresses only a different context for learning, but not the multiple contexts or multiple cultures and perspectives that can deepen student learning. Section (a)(v) is also not addressed, as there is no mention of how critical content will be addressed outside of STEM courses.

The applicant covers the section (b) criteria well, as they outline a personalized education plan that provides different approaches and digital learning content. The plan includes extended day and blended learning programs to allow student learning to continue outside of the classroom and using technology. Personalized learning plans and career pathways should provide students with the individualized programs necessary to meet college and career standards, although the applicant does not explain what is included in the plan, how they are monitored, or what role students themselves play in their creation. The applicant does not fully address ongoing feedback. They mention a data system that is in place but provide no details of what kind of data is supplied, how often it is updated or how usable it is. The applicant also does not describe any mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scores in the mid-range on this section, as they do not provide numerous activities, but do not give enough specific details related to the outlined objectives of the grant. The applicant lists the numerous professional development that it will be focused on, such as AP, IB, and AVID, but it does not describe how many teachers will receive PD, how it will be implemented in the school, or what kind of feedback will be provided to ensure teachers are implementing strategies properly. The use of collaborative inquiry teams is a strength, as it will allow teachers to work together to look at student data and improve their own instruction. However, they do not provide a protocol for teams, how often they will meet, or how effectiveness will be evaluated. Despite the mention of personal learning plans, there is no discussion of how teachers will create personalized environments, adapt instruction for students or measure student progress. There is also no discussion of whether educators and school leaders will have training or access to tools to use data to monitor student progress and meet individual needs.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	6

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scores a low medium on this section. The applicant provides a short description of the central office leadership structure but does not provide detail of specific support and services, nor how much decision-making authority teachers will have on the various curriculum councils. The applicant does not address how much autonomy and flexibility school leadership will have over scheduling, calendars and staffing. The applicant also plans to increase use of RTI to increase reading and math achievement. However, there is no explanation of what professional development will be provided, or how teachers will be monitored or evaluated in the use of RTI. The applicant does describe how achievement for ELLs and SWDs will be addressed, by using a tiered intervention system designed to create a culture of inclusion and the creation of a more equitable education system. The applicant states they will personalize learning for students but does not provide examples of how students will be given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery in multiple ways, or whether credit will be earned based on mastery over seat time.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not include this section in the narrative. There is no mention in other sections of how content will be made available regardless of income level, whether technical support will be provided, how technology will be used, or whether there are interoperable data systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	6

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant scores medium low on this section, as they provide only a partial plan for continuous improvement. The applicant focuses on its teacher evaluation system, which allows the district to monitor growth in teacher effectiveness, and also identify areas of need determined by the district and teachers themselves, and search out and provide the necessary professional development. However, the applicant does not describe how project-wide goals will be monitored, or how information will be publicly shared. The applicant's PD 360 program will be an asset to the grant programs, as it will provide PD tailored to individual teachers, but it does not address whether it will be required for teachers to use it, or how often. The applicant also does not create a plan for monitoring the effectiveness of PD 360 and the teacher evaluation system.

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

5

2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan for communication has numerous vehicles for communicating with stakeholders, though they are one-sided and do not go far beyond telling outside stakeholders what is going on, and keeping them up to date on progress. The applicant mentions they will provide progress reports that will be available on the district website as well as communication in the form of newsletters and blogs. However, there is no detail as to what will be specified in the reports, how it will be ensured that all stakeholders are accessing information, or what mechanisms may be in place to gather feedback from external stakeholders. Communication and engagement must go both ways, and the applicant does not describe any efforts to gather stakeholder feedback or use it in the improvement process.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant lists numerous performance measures, but does not provide a rationale for that measure, nor how they will approach the goals. The applicant does not explain how the goals are ambitious or achievable. The applicant states they will regularly monitor progress on the measures, but does not provide a rigorous plan or describe how what actions will be taken. The applicant does express a commitment to timely performance measurement and monitoring implementation but falls short of creating a rigorous plan, in that they do not provide who will be responsible for oversight, how it will be ensured all parties are participating or how data will be used to drive strategic decision making.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scores medium in this section, as their evaluation plan contains only major activities and timelines with no additional specifics. The activities are very broad such as develop survey instruments, and prepare scope of work statements, without a discussion of rationale behind everything that needs to be done. There is also no mention of how evaluation information will be used, or who will ensure it is being used effectively.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant receives a high score in this section as they clearly identify all the funds that will be used to support the project as well as whether they are one time or ongoing. The applicant describes specific activities that will go to meet the goals described, such as job embedded PD, extended learning opportunities and certifications for teachers to implement personalization strategies. The applicant also provides rationale for items as they provide specific activities and purchases that will go towards identified goals. The applicant has a strong sense of what it needs to do in order to meet its goals and has created a plan broken down by key initiatives to outline the funding that will be needed in which to support it. However, there are a seemingly high number of resources being used for staffing, which could prevent serious problems in sustainability once the grant period has passed.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section receives a low score, as the applicant mentions several programs they hope to sustain, such as expanding early childhood education and enhancing teacher effectiveness but does not provide details for how they will make it possible, or how these are sustainable practices. The district seems committed to a focus on high quality teaching through embedded professional development and instructional support, but does not explain how it will be funded. The applicant also states a commitment to searching for additional funding streams, but that alone does not promise a sustainable practice. The applicant recognizes different areas that would be at-risk once the funding is gone, but does not provide a plan for how they would hope to alleviate any difficulties. The applicant also does not address any support from state or local government leaders, nor do they provide an estimated budget for the three years after the grant.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant lists numerous partnerships, and explains that the partnerships will be used to enhance capacity and focus learning, but does not provide specific examples or a plan of how each partnership will be used to meet the identified goals. There is also no explanation of how partnerships will be supported and sustained, or the specific role the partners will take in the school aside from general statements that they will support students with no details of how many students, how students are identified, or how progress is monitored. There is no discussion of how partners would work with the goals or what kind of decision-making process would be put in place to monitor the effectiveness of partnerships. There is also no explanation of how parents, families and students would be engaged in said decision making processes.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant meets the Absolute Priority. They have outlined numerous personalization strategies, such as personalized learning plans, and career pathways, as well as job-embedded PD for teachers to ensure they have the capacity to create personalized environments. Rigorous coursework through AP, IB and dual enrollment programs, as well as partnerships with colleges and universities show a focus on establishing college and career ready standards.

Total	210	113
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0145DE-2 for Red Clay Consolidated School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Red Clay Consolidated School District proposal provides a comprehensive vision for increasing student achievement that ensures students are the college and career ready, overcoming barriers that impact student achievement and future economic prosperity. The focus will be on the 11,711 students in Pre-K through 12th grade, 815 educators and all administrators. 65% of the students will be involved that includes 87% of the Economically Disadvantaged students. The four core educational assurances are included in the districts 2012 Strategic Plan. The belief behind the reforms is that changes in student outcomes are predicated on changes in the instructional practices. Teachers need timely access to student data to drive instruction and can use the i-Tracker Pro and the Delaware Data Dashboard and Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS) to analyze and provide appropriate and effective interventions to meet the personalized the learning environment for each student. The Red Clay Collaborative Learning Community supports teacher level Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that is focused on continuous school improvement and student achievement. Red Clay will institute a 1:1 initiative (supported by research) that support and enhance the unique learning environment for each individual students, however, they did not discuss how this program would raise the achievement level of students. The district will provide a personalized 21st Century Learning Environment for students and 21st Century professional development and Teaching and Learning to support the implementation of the project. The vision could have been stated explicitly without having to review the proposal to understand and determine the focus of the school district. It is better to state that this is the vision in a couple of sentences or two than to try and identify the vision in the response to this item. While the district describes their vision for reform it did not describes the classroom experience for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

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

10

6

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a broad description on how the buildings were selected for participation in the program. It lacked specificity and was unclear on the criteria used to select the schools. They indicated that the School Success Teams, which included the low performing schools, initially selected the schools. All high schools were selected in order to provide continued support for the staff and students. A list of schools is included in the narrative. The proposal did not mention the criteria used to identify the students that will participate in the proposal. The total number of participating students (11,711 students in Pre-K through 12th grade) was included in the proposal. The narrative also discussed the change and refinement in the proposal based on the mapping process. The proposal is organized into four projects: 1. Highly effective educators; 2. Personalization of learning; 3. Parent and community engagement; and 4 Implementation and evaluation. Each phase is explained in detail with good supporting documentation.

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

10

4

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The plan for Red Clay Consolidated Schools is briefly described in the narrative and includes a Personalized Learning Environment supports real-life, in-depth learning experiences and ensures students are College and Career Ready. There are general comments about providing 21st Century Learning Environment, which necessitates 21st Century Professional Development and 21st Century Teaching and Learning. The discussion focuses on the analyzing data, developing interventions, identifying resources, recommending learning progressions for students, tracking student progress, and adjusting these steps as necessary. The plan described in the narrative is very broad and provides minimal explanation on how it will be scaled up in the district. While the diagrams in the appendices provide a graphic of the process, the content provides minimal steps in expanding the high quality plan to all of the schools in the district and how they will operate under the model of 21st Century Learning Environment. The narrative indicated that the schools "had made the transition" but it was not discussed or presented what transitions the schools had made. There was no mention of the logic model and the narrative did not include any comments on how this will be scaled up to the rest of the district.

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

10

6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal indicated that the students will be college and career ready when the schools implement the Personalized Learning Plan and Personalized Learning Platform and there is a partnership with teachers, parents and students. The narrative indicated that the use of Academic Deans as instructional leaders, Literacy Coaches to provide ongoing professional development and a rigorous secondary program will help increase student achievement and prepare students for college and careers. It was unclear, what the relationship will be between the principal and Academic Dean. While the

district is committed to raising scores, the narrative provides minimal support to explain and support these efforts. The chart describes the Strategic Implementation and Continuous Improvement structure while the narrative provides little if any comments to explain the chart and present the process for improving achievement. There was no connection between adding staff and supporting the improved performance in the various areas of student outcomes and college and career preparation. The applicant does not provide explanations on a number of the charts including (A)(4)(c) Graduation Rates, (A)(4)(c) College enrollment, and others and does not summarize the results and indicate or explain how the numbers were derived at for each of the school years.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The Red Clay School District describes the efforts of the State of Delaware to allocate resources from the RTTT funds to increase student success as part of the states effort to distribute the funding. The key elements that have been part of this effort included collaborative goal setting, establishing non-negotiable goals for achievement and instruction, creating school board alignment with support for district goals, monitoring achievement and instructional goals, and allocating resources to support the goals for achievement and instruction. The narrative indicated that Red Clay increased students meeting or exceeding grade level by 14% in reading and 10 % in math over a two-year period. The narrative described the increase in many subgroups since 2010 school year. The district use ARRA funds to fund 9 Title 1 Instructional Literacy Coaches and Instructional Support Team leaders. Data was used to support the increase in student achievement since 2010 such as a 4% increase in graduation rates. The Partnership Zone was described in the proposal and it included three schools buildings from the district, as did the Focus Schools, which included three school buildings. The district developed a District Turnaround Office (DTO) in 2011 to take charge of the 6 buildings to ensure results. There are 7 strategies of the DTO to improve the school buildings and these include to improve conditions in which the schools operate; foster a sense of urgency for turnaround; increase leadership capacity in all Partnership Zone schools, promote 21st Century skills in the Partnership Zone and a couple of others. Partnership Zone Council was created to support the DTO and ensured that the schools have resources, targeted support from multiple district offices, autonomy and flexibility needed to turnaround and transparency. dditional support and details on the different strategies that were success ful in increasing student ahchievement would have improved the narrative.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The Red Clay School District makes reports publicly available and established the Community Financial Review Committee to review, monitor, disseminate and guide the school board on matters related to finance. The website provides the financial information on the district as well. The district lacks ome transparency by not using other stratgeis for providing the information such as school newsletter and other public outlets.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The proposal includes a description of the autonomy and support to create and implement innovative and unique programs and strategies to support and improve student achievement. Examples provided in the narrative include the use of i-Tracker Pro, data informed cycle of inquiry and monitoring instructional practices, hiring Academic Deans who monitor instruction, lead Professional Learning Communities in the building and other responsibilities related to the curriculum and instruction, College and career ready standards, and implementing a personalized learning system (Achieve 3000). This section primarily describes programs that the district has implemented or plans to adopt once the funding has been received. There is one item that is included in this section, which deals with the autonomy of the district with no supporting data..</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	11
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:		

The proposal included a list of stakeholders that demonstrate the steps that were implemented to show how the community, staff, Red Clay Education Association and leadership was involved in the development of this proposal. Input into the proposal was requested from the teachers, administrators, Delaware Department of Education, Red Clay Parent Advisory Council, elected legislators, the Governor and Lieutenant Governors of Delaware and others. The narrative was unclear on whether there was a presentation or meeting to these groups or if they actually had input on the content and strategies of the proposal. In the appendix there is a lengthy letter from the Deputy Secretary of Education, Delaware Department of Education suggesting changes and/or modifications to the proposal. There is a response to each of the items by the Deputy Superintendent from the Red Clay School District outlining the modifications made to the proposal. It appears as if some of the concerns and responses were incorporated into the grant while others were included in the response to the issues identified by the Delaware Department of Education. The grant includes a number of letters of support. There was no mention of students support and what kind of input the parents had in the development of the proposal. It was also unclear if the staff had input prior to the development of the proposal or was the proposal already developed and some of the ideas were added after meeting with various groups.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant described the four major components of the comprehensive plan for learning which will provide students with many options and select one of the plans based on interests.. The four areas are: 1. Providing rigorous, high level programming such as STEM, IB and Advanced Placement Programs; 2. Improve and expand Career and Technical education offerings district wide and develop partnerships with universities; 3. Embrace student support systems to assist students challenging themselves with upper level coursework; and 4 Professional developments for teachers to support the implementation of personalized learning environments. The district also provides a variety of themed schools such as Conrad School of Science, a magnet school serving grades 6-12, with an emphasis on biotechnology, John Dickinson High School, an International Baccalaureate and Stem Program, Thomas McKean High School, an emphasis on Career and Technical education and others. Blended Learning is an approach that has been adopted by the Red Clay School District to challenge, engage and provide alternatives to students. This allows students to participate in classes at different high schools from their home school building via two-way communications. The results have been very positive with success rates on the most recent AP exams were 71.9% compares with an overall Delaware pass rate of 58.4% and a national pass rate of 60.9%. The district is planning to implement the Career Pathways, which will help students reach a career goal. The district is also working with local universities and has established a partnership with the community college allow high school students to participate in the construction and renovation program. There is a dual enrollment program to earn college credit in a joint partnership with Delaware Technical Community College. There is the implementation of a Personalized Learning Environment and an extended day program that will support students daily with their academics. The extended day program will provide mentoring, field trips, guest speakers and community service and support for parents to engage their children's education. Measures for success were included in the proposal for this program. The narrative discussed the use of mastery learning, which will allow students to progress at their rate of learning. There are many proposals and ideas recommended in the proposal, some of which have been implemented and others that will be provided through this proposal. It was difficult to determine how all of these various programs fit together to support and enhance the learning of each student. There was minimal mention of parental involvement and support for these various programs.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The narrative described the district's approach to achieve all of the goals of the proposal, which included the hiring of teacher leaders in each of the school buildings. The professional development will driven by student learning needs as determined by analyzing data, best practices and effective practices. The district will use the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to build a collaborative culture of High Performing Teams and focus on results. Teachers will receive training on variety or programs described in the proposal but it does not indicate which ones and how this will be determined. The narrative did not describe or present a process for selecting staff to participate in any of the programs. It was difficult to determine how the staff will be selected to receive training in an IB program, Advanced Placement Program or any of the other ones mentioned in the proposal. The grant did not state how the professional development program</p>		

will be implemented in the schools and district and how this will help student succeed in the classroom. It was mentioned that the training will be conducted during the summer months but no process for selecting staff, when and where it will be held and the content of the training. There was no mention on how the principals will be trained in the new project.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	7
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative describes the five goals that are defined in the strategic plan. The focus is on the student and continuous improvement through a variety of strategies and feedback. The district involved various stakeholders in the development of the strategic plan and has established a systematic reporting system for the implementation of the plan. The district uses a multi-layer system for problem solving and decision-making. There is a Superintendent's Council and they meet monthly to hear proposal, dialogue and make recommendation on district practices. The Curriculum and Instruction Department uses a Council and Cabinet Structure. Teacher membership is included on the various councils but the selection process is vague and unclear. School buildings have a Building Leadership Team that meets monthly to discuss building needs and request for additional support. The narrative did not discuss mastery of standards and students progressing and earning credit. It was confusing how the different teams work together in a school building such as the PLC and BLT and the relationship between these two groups. It was difficult to determine how the Curriculum and Instruction Department operates its decision making process and how the decisions are presented at the Superintendent's Council and who makes the final decision.</p> <p>The narrative mentioned that the focus will be on improving Mathematics and Reading scores but the emphasis will be on increasing the achievement level of the students with disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELL). The district wide team will focus on supporting an inclusive culture transformation, accountability for the SWD subgroup and the implementation of effective instructional strategies.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the narrative did not provide a direct response to this item, the proposal did address the access that parents will have to student data through their website and the use of a student information system that will be available to appropriate staff and parents; technical support will be provided to staff but it did not include any mention for parents; no comments were made on allowing the export of data to other electronic systems and there was the indication that systems should work with each other. The budget did present the issue with the infrastructure and the need to upgrade the wireless network by including additional access points and increasing the bandwidth. There was no mention on the schools use of interoperable data systems.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Red Clay School District clearly indicates that it will build on continuous improvement by working closely with the Delaware Department of Education in using the approved educator evaluation system, the Delaware Performance Appraisal System II. The district identified and will also use PD 360 to provide targeted PD within each building based on needs and feedback. The proposal did not identify effective and appropriate PD for teachers in order to improve their skills in the classroom to increase student achievement. The use of teacher observations by a certified evaluator is another critical step in the process to improve teacher effectiveness in the classroom. The combination of evaluations and feedback appears to be sufficient in identifying staff that need improvement and in designing a program for improvement. It is difficult to determine whether the PD 360, the only program selected for teacher PD, addresses all of the issues with staff. Providing more than one PD program for staff should have been included in supporting teachers to become more effective. The project did not describe any mid course corrections and/or changes that would alter the project direction if goals were not being met. Continuous improvement means that it is ongoing and not a month-to-month plan.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district will share and provide information about the project through a variety of communication vehicles. The proposal included the use district newsletters, blogs and messages in the Superintendent's e-newsletters. Reports will be presented to the Board of education on the progress of the strategic plan which will be available to the public through the district's website. A variety of other publications will be made available to the stakeholders on the progress and accountability measures of the proposal. The information is primarily disseminated through internal documents published for the public consumption but there is no effective means for receiving in out and feedback on the information presented to the public.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Red Clay District will use a series of performance measures to document improvement. A process will be designed to monitoring educators performance and principal performance against targets established in the 2012-13. The narrative included charts to identify their performance measures. Clear metrics were identified to measure the success of the plan. These are listed in chart form and are very detailed and specific. On-going evidence and supporting progress reports will be presented to demonstrate achievement of goals and efforts to increase performance levels with students. The proposal provides clear details, charts on the evaluation component. The findings will be presented to the appropriate leadership teams, community groups and others interested in the results. Red Clay will establish a shared accountability system and a data driven approach to evaluate the outcomes. Feedback will be used to modify the strategies and interventions.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district included a chart to describe their evaluation plan. Each step of the process was identified and the chart included the timeline, deliverables and owner. The chart provides the steps but lacks specific such as when will the survey be conducted and who will receive the survey was not included in the chart. Other specific items relating to the deliverables are not included as well.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal describes the budget expenditures for the four projects that are listed as 1. Highly Effective Educators, 2. Personalization of Learning, 3 Extended Learning and 4 Implementation and Evaluation for Continuous Improvement. There is an overall budget and one for each of the four projects with an explanation for the items. A rationale for the staff is included and it is well defined and written in a clear manner. Their responsibilities and outcomes are described in the appendix. The budget is reasonable and appears to be cost-effective. It supports the goals of the project and is well organized. The costs including the project personnel appear to be very high and expends 66% of the funds. The proposal did not include the three-year budget after the project is completed.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative describes how the district will engage in a process of continuous improvement. The narrative includes and identifies the risks the district has undertaken to make this project a success. The risks include predicting the impact of the proposal on the schools but they may not be appropriate since some of the otucomes are unpredicatbel; there is much work involved in the implementation of the grant and staff may stay or leave the district; and it is difficult to predict what</p>		

the funding level will be once the grant has been completed. This is a very direct approach to what may happen to some of the goals in the proposal. In listing the risks, the district is anticipating issues that may or may not arise and no one can predict future outcomes. It would be more effective to plan for the sustainability then be concerned about risks that may occur. The narrative addressed each one of these risks and how the district would solve the issue related to each item. Most importantly, the district indicated that it will engage in a process of systematically reviewing all activities in this plan and then will determine what brings the most value to students and allocate resources to these programs/strategies/steps. It is difficult to determine how the district will sustain the Academic Deans and other staff hired in the district and supported by grant funds.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The narrative includes a description of the community partnerships established by the district and how it will strengthen and support these efforts. A number of partnerships support student and families along the educational continuum such as the Parents as Teachers Program, The Delaware Stars Program and a number of other programs. There is an extensive list of partnerships included in the proposal. The proposal describes a number of successful partnerships developed with the schools and the community agencies for helping students with social issues. The partnerships are focused on educating staff, parents and families to build capacity within the district and support students academically socially and emotionally. The proposal described the number of partnerships developed by the district but does not provide much details on how this will be assessed and analyzed for effectiveness. The narrative indicated that changes will be made from the feedback received but there is no process established for implementing this approach in a systematic way..

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrated the willingness to employ the latest technologies and provide a personalized learning environment for the students. The blended learning approach will utilize two-way communications to allow students to enroll in courses at different schools in the district. The project involves parents, educators, teachers and the community to create and implement programs that will support the goals of this project. The project provides comments to meet the core educational assurances that will enhance the teaching and learning through the different strategies described in the narrative.

Total	210	129
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0145DE-4 for Red Clay Consolidated School District

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>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant provided a vision that is built on the four core educational assurance areas, which have been embedded in the district's 2012 Strategic Plan. Further details regarding how the assurance areas were being supported were provided, including a convincing and credible depiction of the classroom experience for students involving flexible small group and whole-class activities, as well as personalized learning activities. Additional information concerning accelerated achievement using a 1:1 computing initiative grounded in research, and plans for sustainable strategic reform through the Red Clay Collaborative Learning Community, further supported the long-term vision for this proposal.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The proposal included broad statements around twenty-first century learning environments, but did not provide sufficient detail to fully describe how the district is working to achieve these environments.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant described the School Success Teams' process for selecting schools based on longitudinal data, demonstrating a collaborative approach towards proposal development. It included all secondary schools, allowing for the district to focus on the proposal's implementation as a major district reform strategy as opposed to compartmentalized implementation. District-wide implementation will also support sharing of information and strategies between school leaders. The district listed schools identified for participation in the proposal, and clearly presented participating students in subgroups as well as the total number of participating students.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The proposal did not give enough detail to describe the criteria that the School Success Teams used in selecting schools. It did not identify criteria for selecting students to participate in the proposal. The lack of information regarding these processes suggests a deficiency in transparent communication that could limit the impact of the applicant's proposal.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant presented its logic model as applied to the proposal. The 'Schema for Solving Educational Problems' described a cycle of inquiry model based on data and collaborative accountability, including family and community members. The theory of change was depicted visually supporting a clear understanding of how key personnel would improve academic achievement for the district's students. It further delineated the implementation of the proposal through a detailed implementation plan, which related activities to the core educational assurance areas. Activities during all four years of the project implementation were detailed, including plans for evaluation, community partnerships and future sustainability.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Information regarding the 'cycle of inquiry' was given describing how it would be applied for an individual student, but was not given in terms of how it would be applied for the entire proposal, in order to support meaningful reform. The applicant does not describe how the cycle of inquiry process will support its ability to reach the goal of improving student learning outcomes for all students.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

Strengths:

The applicant provided ambitious and appropriate goals for the total population as well as specific subgroups, including students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students. Goals were included for math, reading, graduation rates and college enrollment rates. Additionally, specific goals were set to reduce gaps in reading and math proficiency. For each goal area, yearly targets for specific subgroups were differentiated in order to support a greater likelihood of attainment. This resulted in different post-grant goals for each subgroup. Some subgroups, such as economically disadvantaged students, begin with lower baseline rates, but targets reflect a faster rate of growth compared to other subgroups. This approach to the development of yearly goals resulted in thoughtful and attainable, yet still ambitious, subgroup goals. The post-grant goals, if achieved, would result in increased proficiency for all subgroups and decreased achievement gaps.

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	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant described gains in reading and math proficiency as a result of a redesign plan from 2009, participation in the state Race to the Top program beginning in 2010, and participation in the new state testing program beginning in the 2010-11 school year. Scores increased significantly over the past three years since the beginning of the new testing program. Specific student subpopulations, including English Language Learners, increased proficiency levels during this time, as well.

The district highlighted several recognitions it received as a result of its current reform processes, and highlights increased graduation rates and college readiness indicators, such as SAT and Advanced Placement score increases.

Six schools were identified as either persistently low performing or focus schools. The district described its supports for those schools, and the resulting increases in AYP. The district described differentiated support for these schools, as well as a commitment to ensure success through the development of the District Turnaround Office in 2011. Additionally, the applicant's commitment to supporting its lowest performing schools was strengthened by the public accountability system it devised through the Partnership Zone Council.

The applicant articulated several data systems to support communication around student performance data. These data systems support both educator instructional decisions and school-family communication. Support structures are in place, including Professional Learning Communities and Building Leadership Teams, to further analyze performance data and determine next steps for both individual students and student groups.

Weaknesses:

The district did not provide information on a clear record of success for closing the achievement gaps. Data tables provided regarding subgroup proficiency over time do not indicate success in this area.

Information regarding the record of success in improving high school graduation rates was not complete, and data tables provided in the application do not clearly identify success in this area.

No information was given around previous successes with college enrollment rates. Data tables provided in the application do not support success in this area.

Additionally, data and goal setting were not described in relationship to previous successes.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The Community Financial Review Committee provides a high level of public transparency regarding financial transactions for the applicant. This committee is charged with various activities to monitor, verify and communicate financial information with district and school board personnel. Documentation regarding financial expenditures, including current and allocated expenses, is provided both electronically and in print at school offices.

Weaknesses:

The district provides information regarding district salary allocation and district average salaries. Communication regarding actual school level salaries and non-personnel expenditures was not explicitly described.

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

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that it has sufficient autonomy to personalize learning environments for its students. Examples provided by the applicant include policies regarding standards-based instruction and Response to Intervention regulations. This autonomy has resulted in a number of current initiatives supporting personalized learning environments, including Student Success Plans. The applicant provides a variety of examples as to how it has been recognized by the state for innovation, including academic deans and the data-informed cycle of inquiry.

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

15

14

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant consistently describes stakeholder involvement in the creation of the proposal, as well as describing ongoing stakeholder partnerships during the entire four-year implementation period. Family and community member involvement was described in the 'Schema for Solving Educational Problems', Partnership Zone Council, and the Extended Day Program, amongst other program components.

The applicant's proposal was developed using subcommittees which included representation from all stakeholder groups, including representation from the collective bargaining unit. Letters were included from key community stakeholders, including the governor, mayor, and secretary of the state department of education.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant included a letter of support from the state parent-teacher association, it did not include evidence or letters of support from parents of students in the school district.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- The applicant described personalized learning plans for elementary students, middle grade students and high school students. These plans would be developed by and accessible to students and parents. Although personalized plans for high school students are fairly common, student success plans for middle grade students are an encouraging strategy to connect to college- and career-ready standards. Additionally, the use of individualized plans for elementary students (Personalized Learning Plans) demonstrates the applicant's commitment to personalize learning at all grade levels.
- The plan identified a variety of college- and career-ready standards and strategies, including the International Baccalaureate (IB) standards and CTE pathway standards. These widely recognized standards are considered to be rigorous in preparing students to achieve postsecondary aspirations.
- Strategies for deep learning experiences including specialized schools and blended learning/distance learning programs. Although the idea behind the Real-Time, Fully Participatory Distance Learning has been in existence for some time, schools have continued to struggle with effective implementation of such a program. The applicant described a thoughtful approach to the roll-out of this program, including increasing the accessibility of this program to greater number of students.
- Student data would be frequently updated and available to educators through the Teacher Access Center. Students and families would access data through the Home Access Center.
- Elementary students would receive standards-based progress reports, which would be reviewed by Professional Learning Communities in order to make future learning recommendations using the Personalized Learning Platform

software

Weaknesses:

- The only accommodation mentioned for high-needs students was the extended day program. This appears to be a one-size-fits-all approach, which is contradictory to the personalized approach frequently referred to in the proposal.
- The proposal includes numerous strategies and programs to positively impact student achievement, but does not present a comprehensive plan as to how these strategies and programs would work together.
- The process for how students would be guided into the various programs and strategies lacked detail.
- Family involvement was minimally mentioned

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are mentioned as a major strategy to support effective instruction, which result in all educators participating in the continuous improvement cycle to ensure instructional strategies that positively impact student achievement.
- The Delaware educator evaluation system supports highly effective instructional strategies through the identification of educator strengths and weaknesses. When weaknesses are identified, the Delaware Performance Appraisal System develops training plans to support educator growth.
- Professional Development topics include widely respected best practices, such as AVID, the ASCA National Model, and Advanced Placement.
- Interview strategies are being reviewed to promote hiring of high quality educators.

Weaknesses:

- Principal development and support was not mentioned.
- The proposal mentioned job-embedded professional development, but did not specify what this would look like or provide additional details.
- Although the proposal presented well-developed activities and strategies, it did not present a coordinated plan detailing how all the activities and strategies would work together and interact to personalize learning for all students.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	9

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- The proposal mentioned several committees at the district level that provide a variety of stakeholder voices, including the Superintendent's Council and regular stakeholder meetings with the Directors of School Operations and Curriculum and Instruction.
- The Building Leadership Teams appear to have significant autonomy in that they set standards and expectations for the schools, as well as support Professional Learning Communities.
- The applicant describes a plan for inclusive instruction using the Response to Intervention (RtI) model, particularly for Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners.

Weaknesses:

- Although committees involving stakeholder voice were mentioned, it was not clear how these committees actually impact district strategies or plans.
- The plan did not address how RtI is implemented and monitored for effectiveness.
- The applicant did not address mastery-based progress.
- The applicant did not address multiple ways to demonstrate mastery.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan mentions Home Access Centers and Technology Support, but did not mention how students, parents, educators and other stakeholders would have access to necessary resources. The plan did not address how all participants would have technology support. It did not address whether or not participants would be able to export information or whether the data systems would be interoperable.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- The applicant described a highly developed process to monitor, evaluate and improve educator effectiveness through the use of the Delaware Performance Appraisal System and technology-based professional development tools. This process focuses on student outcomes as the basis to support professional growth of its educators. The technology-based tools allow training to be individualized and more widely-accessible compared to in-person trainings.
- The applicant described a plan to develop a continuous improvement plan, should the grant be awarded. Various components of the continuous improvement plan were described, including the use of data to determine if a strategy is or is not working, and the ability to modify strategies should the data demonstrate a need. The feedback system was described, as well as the frequency of continuous improvement monitoring.

Weaknesses:

- Using only one professional development resource (PD360) does not ensure that all educators have all needed resources and support.
- The applicant does not provide specific details for the overall continuous improvement plan. Although components of the plan were mentioned, it appears that the applicant has not completed defining the specifics that would enable the plan to be put in place, including individuals responsible to ensure that the proposal is monitored for improvement.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- The plan describes numerous ways in which the district will provide information to stakeholders and the general public. These strategies include posting information on the website and making hard copies available, representing the applicant's intent to distribute information to stakeholders.

Weaknesses:

- The plan does not provide opportunities for stakeholders, including teachers, students, families and community members, to give feedback or partner with the district. Two-way communication was lacking, resulting in the appearance that no mechanisms exist for stakeholders to become meaningfully involved in the reform proposal.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Performance measures were included for academic performance in reading and math; college- and career-readiness indicators, including FAFSA submissions, SAT scores and CTE completion; and to decrease the achievement gaps between subgroups.

- Targets appear to be ambitious and achievable, including differentiated measures for each subgroup.
- A timeline for review of progress towards performance measures was included.

Weaknesses:

- Performance measures were not included for graduation rates or dropout rates, which represent critical outcome data for schools and districts.
- Rationale for performance measures were not included.
- No description was given regarding how the district would improve the measures over time if found to be insufficient, resulting in the appearance of a lack of progress monitoring towards achievement of the performance measures.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant described the process that would be followed to develop a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of activities. Components of a high quality plan were described, including goals, general processes, timeline for implementation, deliverables and people responsible.

Weaknesses:

The plan did not provide details specific to the applicant's proposal. Although the plan included components of a high quality plan, it appears that the applicant has not completed defining specifics that would allow the plan to be implemented.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- The applicant identified funds to be used to support this proposal, including local funds and other sources.
- The budget starts with lower amounts during the first year, in order for the district to ramp up implementation.
- One-time funds and on-going funds were both described, leading to greater clarity in the disbursement of funds.
- The budget addressed sustainability of some components of the proposal by identifying possible sources to explore as future funding sources, as well as using non-grant funding sources to support the project implementation, such as Literacy Coaches.

Weaknesses:

- The budget is heavily weighted towards staffing and personnel. This leads to great difficulties with sustainability.
- Newer positions appear to have the similar roles and responsibilities to existing positions. For example, Academic Deans appear to have the same role and responsibilities as Principals.

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

10

6

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- The plan discussed Continuous Improvement Plans, including scaling up or down investments due to review of relevant information and data.
- Plans for sustainability were included. The proposal describes how the grant program would provide foundational support for future refinement of a standards-based educational program. It mentions that current federal, state and local resources are in the process of being re-purposed to support the proposal, for example, use of IDEA allocations to support professional development.
- Risks for the project were discussed, including how the district would adapt should the risks come to fruition. This approach of attempting to predict and address possible pitfalls is innovative and leads to a five-point approach to

improve the chances of success for this project.

Weaknesses:

- Very few specific strategies were mentioned to ensure funding for positions. It was mentioned that the Academic Dean positions would be sustainable through attrition and a change in school operations, but the proposal does not give any additional detail describing where the attrition would come from or what the school operations changes would look like.
- There was no mention of an estimated budget for the three years following the grant program.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- Numerous existing partnerships were described. These partnerships include organizations that address supports for children from birth through high school, including education on parenting skills, physical and mental health support, and academic support, including literacy, tutoring and credit recovery.
- The Community of Interested Persons forum was described as a way to share information about district priorities. This forum has been in place for three years, demonstrating an established process to focus efforts of both the district and community partners.
- Population-level desired results were included around academic proficiency, suspension rates, attendance rates and dropout rates.

Weaknesses:

- Although existing partnerships offer support for families, population-level desired results were not included for family and community supports as defined in the application. The identified population-level desired result for families stated 'improve parents' perceptions of their capacity to support their students' achievement', which does not give enough detail to understand how the parent perceptions would reflect improved family and community supports as defined.
- No processes were described for partners to track indicators, use the data to target resources, or scale the model beyond participating students.
- No processes were described to monitor effectiveness of the partnerships.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant described a proposal that involves significant reform in instructional strategies through the use of professional learning communities, as well as strategies to personalize learning from elementary through high school. These strategies represent a fundamental shift in the district's approach to teaching and learning, resulting in more individualized learning opportunities and programming. The Personalized Learning Plans (PLPs) at the elementary level are particularly noteworthy and innovative. Tools described throughout the proposal further support the effective implementation of the proposal, supporting students in the mastery of college- and career-ready standards, including International Baccalaureate and Career Technical Education standards. The proposal identified goals that were intentionally and thoughtfully crafted to provide ambitious and attainable targets that would raise achievement levels for all students and decrease achievement gaps. Targets were differentiated for each subgroup to further ensure ambitious yet attainable goals. A variety of strategies to deepen learning were provided, focusing on numerous opportunities at the secondary level.

Total	210	143
-------	-----	-----