



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0019UT-1 for Salt Lake City School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

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

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

There is evidence provided by the applicant to show the vision of the proposal is representative of the four educational assurances outlined by the Race to the Top District grant notice. The approach includes alignment with the state core education standards and use of strong partners dedicated to improving learning opportunities for youth while enhancing the skills of teachers and other educators. The applicant demonstrates there is a concerted effort to track student achievement. Accountability measures are well presented and include the use of assessments conducted annually to gauge kindergarten readiness, grades 3-11 language arts and mathematics and grades 4-11 science readiness. The use of a data management system has been instrumental in providing student achievement information to stakeholders and will continue to be used to further support the vision presented by the applicant. There is ample information to show there are efforts to accelerate student achievement through the use of various learning opportunities that include hand held tablets to promote individual learning plans, group sessions, interactive whiteboards and classroom instruction. The classroom experience is successfully described by the applicant and includes the use of technology including hand held devices and computers for personalized instruction, parental involvement, extended instructional time, use of the student growth model whereby students, teachers and parents can map student progress and create/adjust individual work plans and classroom coaches will be present to assist teachers. To further show there will be opportunities whereby personalized learning experiences will be provided to deepen student learning, the applicant offers information that includes: the use of the EXPLORE, a curriculum-based assessment program whereby students attending eighth grade can explore career options and select high school coursework to prepare them for college/careers and the PLAN, a program designed to assist tenth graders with educational and career planning opportunities with input from parents, teachers and counselors.

To reward teacher quality, the applicant describes a plan currently in place that includes a 3 year pilot program to provide financial rewards for elementary teachers pursuing math endorsement and achieving student team growth. Elementary teachers will have the benefit of gaining guidance from an academic coach and professional development will be offered to principals. The applicant proposes to provide assistance to low performing schools and the process is clearly outlined and reasonable. For example, each targeted school will increase instructional time for students, increase teacher performance incentives and increase leadership support at the school and district level.

While the applicant provides information regarding the vision more discussion is needed regarding the use of other stakeholders such as parents to help accelerate student achievement to enhance the learning experience and personalized instruction. Further discussion is also needed regarding professional development opportunities for high school teachers to ensure they have opportunities for growth and retaining and rewarding them for their efforts to improve student achievement.

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

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

The applicant provides information regarding the selection of the schools and participants chosen for the project. A list of schools is presented and include elementary, middle schools and one feeder high school which represent the most challenged schools within the area and will affect over 35% of students within the district. The majority of the schools are in high risk areas where a large percentage (75%) of students qualify for free and reduced lunch, perform below proficiency level and have little or no access to quality academic resources. The proposed number of student participants is presented and participating educators are defined; the numbers are aligned with the Race to the Top grant notice. Quality programs will include providing early childhood services by which students and parents will gain the tools needed to prepare them for Kindergarten while students in Grades 1-12 will benefit from personalized language arts, math and science content areas. Additionally, the use of Community Learning Centers as satellite and hub locations will help support the reform initiative by offering families interconnected resources to address their needs within the highly segregated, high poverty target areas.

The Community Learning Centers will address transportation problems and provide an opportunity for parents to be actively engaged in their child(ren) education while providing students access to school coursework and personalized assignments.

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

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

The plan presented to scale up services to support district wide reform in all schools is achievable based upon the goals and activities proposed by the applicant. The creation and use of deliverables such as lesson plans, student learning activities and assessments of core subjects and STEM courses will ensure continual student achievement as the services will progressively build on proven practices proposed by the project. The use of an integrated data system will provide all stakeholders with data including benchmarks and outcomes to determine the effectiveness of the program. The use of a personalized plan specialist to instruct students is appropriate as it will also allow opportunities for teachers to gain additional knowledge and provide a means for professional development. There is sufficient evidence to show replication of the proposed project activities is possible as there will be documentation and distribution of best practices and opportunities to make program adjustments through written summaries of lessons learned. The timelines proposed for each project activity is reasonable. For example, the applicant proposes to collect data, resources and assessments through the district learning management systems throughout the duration of the grant; this will ensure continual monitoring of student achievement and the success of the project.

|  |           |          |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>8</b> |
|--|-----------|----------|

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

The goals to increase student achievement and proficiency levels are based upon the current baseline data present in each school which indicates students are not performing at grade level. The information provided projects an increase of 10% in student achievement over the next four years especially for low income, English learning students and students with disabilities achieving set goals. There is ample evidence presented to show there will be concerted efforts to support the increase of student achievement in STEM courses especially those students performing significantly below grade level. For example, current baseline data indicates Hispanic, African Americans, American Indian groups of youth in grades 4-8 & 9-12 are below grade level in Science and the applicant proposes an increase of 10% over the life of the grant. For those students performing at grade level, there are no projected increases as the applicant proposes to ensure the levels do not drop below state requirements.

The projected graduation and college enrollment rates are achievable based upon the proposed activities to increase achievement throughout the student's duration in school. For example, the applicant proposes to provide Pre-K preparation for students so they have the tools needed before entering school. Once students enter grade school, and high school they will be monitored to ensure they are performing at or above grade level and if not, the student will be provided with additional support. Opportunities for personalized instruction, assessments and extended instruction time will be provided to students. Teachers and educators will receive training and professional development through the use of a coach who will work closely with them to provide guidance. The processes will allow opportunities to decrease the achievement gap and increase the graduation and college enrollment.

The reduction in the achievement gap for Multicultural students is significantly low compared to other populations and the applicant offers no further information to show the reason. For example, the applicant predicts only a 2-3% increase in Math during the life of the grant while there is a predicted increase of 7-13% for other populations.

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

|   | Available | Score     |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| <b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>11</b> |

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

The applicant clearly describes a track record of success related to student learning opportunities and closing the achievement gap especially in the area of preparing youth for kindergarten. The district analyzed 2012 cohort data to ascertain the correlation between participation in early childhood programs and student success. Some of the outcomes indicated that students attending full day programming were performing at 74% proficiency in Language Arts compared to 62% proficiency of students attending half day programming and 70% proficiency in Math for students attending full day programming compared to 59% proficiency in Math for students attending half day programming. The outcomes prompted the district to allocate funding for full day programming pre-K services for youth. This was an appropriate way to address

the needs of all pre-K youth, increase student learning outcomes and close the achievement gap.

The applicant clearly indicates there has been success in student achievement in at least two low achieving schools. Through data analysis, the district was able to track student achievement and outcomes, which indicated that all students attending Edison school have increased their proficiency scores in Language Arts from 49% in 2011 to 67% in 2013. More specifically, low income students' proficiency rates in Language Arts increased from 48% in 2011 to 67% in 2013 and English Learning students proficiency rates increased from 47% in 2011 to 61% in 2013; the results were similar in Northwest, another low performing school. Additionally, a school improvement grant was created to expand course offerings for students and provide additional planning time for teachers.

Overall, the applicant presents ample information to show student data is made available to all stakeholders. For example, teachers and administrators have around the clock access to student performance assessments through a district data warehouse. Additionally, teachers and administrators have consistent access to monitor student progress regularly and they are able to retrieve student data from the previous year. This strategy is reasonable as the information can be used as comparative data to measure student progress between years. The use of a district student academic growth model presented by the applicant is also a logical approach as it allows teachers to use data to set goals based upon student growth and proficiency; the model is also a way to track teacher effectiveness based on student progress.

The applicant only provides three years of information regarding advanced student learning and achievement and equity in learning and teaching, not four as required by the Race to the Top District proposal.

While the applicant provides information to show there have been reform efforts in at least two low achieving schools there is no specific information provided to show district wide efforts for all low achieving schools. Additionally, the applicant does not provide detailed information to show how parents have access to student performance data so they are informed regarding the efforts to improve participation, instruction, and services.

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

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

The applicant has indicated that the district has both non-governmental and governmental information shared with stakeholders regularly. There is consistent dialogue with the School Improvement Planning and School Community Council to promote transparency in planning and discretionary budgeting at school level. The School Improvement Plan details site budgets while the district overall budget and personnel information is located on their website for public review.

The applicant refers the reviewer to the district website for review and does not provide specifics regarding the actual personnel salaries at the school level, instructional staff, teachers or non-personnel levels.

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

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

The applicant provides evidence to show there is autonomy with the LEA's associated with the project. Overall, states require districts to operate according to some state standards, however districts have autonomy to implement programs as there are few state restrictions according to the applicant. For example, the Utah Core standards was created so that each district could implement the states core curriculum at its own pace as long as they meet the deadline of full implementation by the end of school year 2013-2014. Additional state mandates required districts to create and implement a plan for teachers and principals to meet or exceed student achievement standards; districts were able to create their own standards based upon student needs and by aligning their standards with state core standards. This project presented by the applicant is aligned with the core curriculum standards by the state therefore the process of implementation and operations is a successful collaborative effort.

|  |           |           |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>13</b> |
|--|-----------|-----------|

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

Stakeholder support throughout the development of the project is evidenced by the information provided by the applicant. The process included meeting bi-weekly with board members, weekly meetings with general administrators and bi-monthly meetings with parents and other stakeholders. This process was an excellent way to present the proposed project, gain buy-in, allow input from teachers, educators, parents and community members, discuss timelines and gain support from additional partners and stakeholders. The use of a leadership team comprised of educators, parents and community

members was a logical way to keep stakeholders actively involved in the project and its implementation. To gain support from students, focus groups were hosted for students attending grades 6-8. The process was an excellent way to gain input from students regarding learning styles and personalized learning experiences and find out what course of study that might interest them; thus gaining buy-in for the project. Letters of support are presented by the applicant which clearly indicates the level of support partnerships will offer through the implementation of the project. Some support services include mentor/tutoring, health care services and cultural arts activities.

The applicant does not provide in detail how teachers feedback was used in the development of the project.

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

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

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

Ample information to show there will be efforts made to provide quality learning experiences for pre-school youth is presented by the applicant. For example, early childhood services are designed to provide personalized instruction and educators are observed, trained and monitored. Additionally, educators meet with district professionals who provide guidance regarding personalized learning strategies to ensure they have the tools they need to assist students. The holistic approach used for the early childhood program further indicates there are opportunities to develop and nurture student needs.

The applicant further provides evidence to show there are opportunities for students to master core curriculum subjects. For example, a two week writing course is offered at the local university whereby students can master their writing skills. Teachers are also able to attend in order to increase their teaching skills. Reasonable efforts to assist first generation students is evidenced as they have access to the local university to explore history, ethics and literature courses taught by professors; this process allows them to also create relationships with college professionals and enjoy the college experience. 5th-8th graders are able to visit the university three time per year on a Saturday with their parents where they can enjoy hands on classes, athletics and cultural events. This is a good strategy to get students interested in their studies and higher education opportunities.

Early intervention and remedial sessions are clearly described by the applicant such as the use of AVID, a researched based program that accelerates student learning through effective teaching methods and motivational learning tools that are purposely embedded in the regular school day programming. The program is used in elementary, middle and high schools and promotes personalized learning opportunities in language arts, math and science. There is reasonable information provided to show college prep programs are currently available to students district-wide. For example, the Partnership for Accessing College Education (PACE) has a partnership with the community college whereby first-generation college bound students can gain support beginning at the 9th-12th grade levels. More specifically, the support encourages attendance, tutoring, mentoring, and postsecondary counseling. Campus site visits are also made available at the local university and community college which further supports the needs of students. Support services for parents to become educators is evidenced as early childhood educators provide enrichment activities so that parents gain knowledge regarding core curriculum and student achievement; this helps them to become actively involved in their child(ren) education.

Parents become engaged in activities that promote college ready standards through the Empowering Parents course, where they gain knowledge regarding school testing and grading processes. College courses are made available to parents where they are able experience the counseling, FAFSA prep assistance and technology processes students experience. Parents are also invited to volunteer in out of school time and school time hours. There is focus on ensuring a transitional support system is in place so students can move from elementary to middle school to high school to college effectively and with ease. The transitional workshops allow students to connect with teachers and school personnel before they start at another school. The activities currently in place indicate a well-thought out process and indicates that the needs of students are at the forefront of the proposed project.

Currently interactive white boards, document cameras and LCD projectors are made available to students. Schools have computer labs, wireless internet access and some classroom computers are available. There is support for the district as there is a systems information department for schools to use as a learning resource, in addition to professional development opportunities made available. It is noted that one of the targeted schools, Northwest has benefited from a technology grant which increased opportunities for teachers to earn 18 hours of technology endorsements and gain support from a full time technology coach to work with them and students. Although, instructional technology is currently in place it will be enhanced through the Race to the Top District grant as some of the other targeted schools within this proposal

have limited technology at school and at home.

Furthermore, the applicant provides ample information to show there will be innovative opportunities for personalized instruction through the use of technology. The proposal will provide 150 tablet devices to each school and apps of core curriculums will be loaded onto the devices so that students can complete their studies at home without the need for internet service. Teachers will be able to create their own lesson plans by using vendor-supplied digital content to load onto the devices for students to use. Internet services can be made available to homes at a lower cost through a partnership with a local internet provider. Grant funds will be used to make wireless internet available in schools and in the Community Learning Center in the evening so students can use the internet for their school work. Computers will also be purchased in addition to improving the current technology infrastructure in efforts to enhance student learning experience, enhance personalized learning instruction and involve students in deeper learning experiences.

While the applicant presents logical activities for the project the timeline for implementation is not always clear. For example, the applicant proposes to recruit coaches and specialist to train and assist teachers how to implement personalized learning components within 4 months, or before the Professional Development cycles begins. However, the timeline for teachers to implement personalized learning in the classrooms is to 3 months after the grant which means teachers will not have received training before they implement personalized learning strategies in the classroom.

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

**20**

**15**

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

There is evidence to show that stakeholders will be actively engaged with training throughout implementation of the project. The applicant proposes to assess the needs and skills of its current teachers, principals and other educators within the district. Once the professional development needs are assessed a professional development plan will be created within 6 months for implementation.

The plan to adapt content and instruction allowing students to engage various academic interest is clearly outlined and is described by the applicant to show their efforts are viable through the use of a holistic approach. For example, the applicant proposes to link personalized learning skills and competencies through professional development and mapping processes. The mapping process will map personal learning competencies with teacher/leader effectiveness competencies from the beginning of the grant award through the first three months. This is a reasonable approach as it will be allow stakeholders and teachers the opportunity to review successes and need for adjustments to programming before delving further into the project and ensure goals will be met. The applicant proposes to increase staff at each school to support teacher collaboration, regrouping and student mentoring strategies include changing current scheduling practices that will better suit students to increase opportunities for them to learn. There will be strategies to conduct personalized instructional opportunities for parents and partner engagement through orientation, communication materials and events.

To improve teacher and principal effectiveness the applicant provides a comprehensive plan which provides professional development to teachers, leaders and coaches by developing training objectives for each educator after assessing their specific needs. In order to review staff effectiveness for schools, the applicant will utilize baseline data of students and teachers and then develop a plan of action; this approach will further ensure student and educator individual needs will be met. The applicant proposes to recruit coaches and specialist to adequately support the project and hire qualified staff to implement personalized learning in science. Additionally the applicant proposes to increase the expectations of participating educators at the district and site level through the training and orientation process. There is a concerted effort to provide continuous learning opportunities in personalized learning for elementary teachers including training and planning, evaluation systems, professional development and follow-up. There will also be opportunities for peer/cluster learning by which all participating schools who will meet monthly to provide adequate support.

The process to ensure there are mechanisms in place to show educators are subject to evaluation processes is clearly outlined and appropriate for the proposed project. The applicant states that educators have will have access to data, system tools and policies at the district level. Educators will gain feedback regarding performance through documented observations, share promising practices and given opportunities to reflect and provide feedback with teachers and leaders at the school level.

To track student performance to ensure they are progressing at or above grade levels there are appropriate strategies outlined by the applicant. Performance and formative assessment tools will be linked to the state core standards, personalized goals and various teaching strategies which will be made available online. Parent surveys will be conducted to provide satisfaction input regarding personalized learning instruction, success and scale-up. Program observations, educator monitoring and student assessment results will be used to gain better insight to help students learn and reach proficiency. The applicant proposes to develop and implement performance improvement plans for all educators, staff and key stakeholders associated with the project. The applicant proposes to increase the use of technology especially for

targeted schools with limited access. Technology will be gained through procurement processes according to specifications to support rapid implementation of personalized instruction and provide performance feedback. Elementary teachers and educators will be provided orientation and training.

The applicant does not provide any detailed information regarding the process to recruit educators for hard to staff schools or teachers who teach special education or specialty subjects. There is no mention of professional development training for post secondary teachers who will work with the project. The timeline for providing professional training is unclear as trainers will not have been hired to train teachers before they enter the classroom to implement the proposed activities. The applicant does not present a specific timeline or goals for the plan presented.

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

|  | Available | Score     |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>10</b> |

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

In order to fully integrate the personalized learning experience, data management and use, and equity considerations to close achievement gaps, the applicant proposes to collaborate across district departments. The plan is reasonable in that the process will allow the project to gain support and provide resources to help reach the goals intended. In order to accomplish this goal, the applicant developed an advisory team who will help oversee the project and operate under the leadership of the Race to The Top District staff. The use of an advisory team who will develop an implementation plan and project procedures is reasonable as the project will be implemented and assisted by multiple departments. The board will develop the process within 4 weeks of the grant award. The governance team has been identified and some of the key stakeholders include the superintendent, team leader, facilitators, principals and evaluation specialist.

The strategies presented by the applicant describes a focused plan of action to organize LEA central offices and stakeholders. A start-up workshop will be conducted with the advisory team to validate assumptions and activities, clarify principles and develop an implementation plan for the project. The process will occur within 4-6 weeks of grant award and will be overseen by the superintendent, team leader and an external facilitator. The applicant also proposes to create a theory of change and work plan for the Department of Education to implement which will be completed within weeks of the grant award by the team leader, district representatives and sites. The use of a procurement plan will create policies and procedures for personnel, equipment and supplies by which stakeholders will be able to use as guidelines of operations. To provide added support and direction all departments will be made aware of their responsibility through the creation of charts linked to the major activities of the Race to the Top District grant. The Advisory Team will work with the communication department to build a website with Race to the Top District information where project updates will be made accessible to the city and partners.

Further strategies to show the plan to ensure policies and practices will be in place includes reviewing project targets with participating principals and district staff who will be part of the implementation, planning and evaluation process they own the target projections for students per site and project wide. The team leader, evaluation specialist; principals and key staff will be responsible. The applicant proposes to also create a plan for years 2-4 to ensure they meet the requirements of the grant are being met and are linked to goals, objectives, performance measures, key activities, deliverables, responsibility charts and timelines. The applicant proposes to establish mechanisms and timetable for reviews and discussion of project results with principals, teachers, board members and participating partners.

The applicant does not describe how the proposed strategies will give students the opportunity to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. Furthermore, there is no information provided to show how students will have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and ways. There is also no information provided regarding the learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. There are no timelines presented for the activities presented by the applicant.

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

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

The use of a School Improvement Council comprised of school staff, administrators and parent/guardians is an innovative technique the applicant proposes to use to ensure all stakeholders have the tools and resources in and out of school. The council will help to develop academic plans, review budgets and ensure funder accountability data and other information is provided by the principal. They will also develop a list of practices, materials or equipment needed by the school to support its improvement plan. For added support there is a School Community Council who will be responsible for determining site goals and objectives in cooperation with administrators, faculty, staff in alignment with board district and goals. The council will also recommend site-based professional development plans.

There is ample information provided to show there will be access to technology for the purposes of providing additional resources for stakeholders. The use of districts website will provide relevant information regarding curriculum and policies and schools will use the sites to blog information which can be accessed by parents from home, school or community facilities. The Community Learning Centers will be used as satellite hubs to provide technology access for parents and students to review school information and accountability issues. The Community Learning Centers are connected to computers at convenient hours at school sites, partner sites and neighborhood libraries. The applicant provides evidence to show that stakeholders have access to data systems including technical support, student data as needed.

The applicant provides evidence to show there is ample access to an interoperable system through the district data warehouse where parents, teachers, educators and community members can get data on student and classroom growth. Parents and community members can access the system through the Community Learning Centers, local libraries and school-based family resource centers and teachers can access through technology at schools, home, libraries and hand held devices. Furthermore the use of the database system is logical as teachers can use the data to set personal goals for their yearly evaluation based on student proficiency and student growth. The school district is the only one in the state to have a student growth model currently in use for teacher and administrator feedback. The use of this growth model is an excellent way to monitor student progress and allow them to receive detailed reports of student achievement at the end of the school year (based on summative assessments level testing).

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

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

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

The applicant provides information to show there is a continuous improvement plan that will be utilized to support the project. The plan is feasible as the approach includes setting rigorous standards and expectations for students through the project design and implementation process. Through the analysis of program data and assessments both negative and positive factors will be used to determine the positive factors that need to be maintained, compared to the negative factors that need to be changed.

The plan to include educators processes to ensure rigorous continuous improvement is defined and is logical for the project. For example, educators will be involved in the change process by implementing and documenting quality improvement practices and using classroom and school level system techniques through policies and procedures that will help to measure and document continuous improvement. A quality improvement team will be developed utilizing the skills and support from key stakeholders and authority figures who will provide leadership for the program. The team will also be comprised of specialists in early childhood, science education, teaching and leading, evaluation and assessment of student progress and teacher/leader effectiveness to ensure there will be input from stakeholders with various diverse backgrounds.

Timely and regular feedback will adequately support the project through the continuous quality improvement plan (CQI). The plan includes the use of a team that includes district departments, principals, teachers and community members who will gather, monitor and analyze the program data collected. Data driven, information analysis will be used to assess and define process measures for key interventions, regular measurement and review processes. The plan will measure performance against the existing standards for child development, student achievement (proficiency and growth), college and career readiness to analyze gaps. The team will review the final analysis and develop possible solution for improvements. The plan will establish the frequency of analysis needed for project performance measurements and ensure that time and other resources are allocated appropriately to this activity. In put by the Race to the Top District core team and stakeholder representatives will also be sought out to make sure the plan is justified for implementation and use.

|   |          |          |
|---|----------|----------|
| <b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>   | <b>5</b> | <b>5</b> |
| <p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The plans to ensure communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders is defined by the applicant and is appropriate for the proposed project. The plan includes the use of a Project Advisory Committee who will meet with the district superintendent throughout the implementation of the project to gain stakeholder feedback and to evaluate educator effectiveness systems. The Department of External Relations will complete a stakeholder communication plan within three months of the grant award to make all stakeholders aware of the process and ensure everyone can provide input and are informed. The Race to the Top District project director and program specialist will maintain relationships with partners to monitor the quality of project activities and ensure stakeholder needs are addressed. The plan to conduct site visits is defined and includes visiting each site twice during the school year to monitor school progress and provide actionable feedback including recommendation for next steps to advance school turnaround through personalized learning. Committee meetings and superintendent meetings will also be used as a forum to review program results and challenges.</p> |          |          |

|   |          |          |
|---|----------|----------|
| <b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>   | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> |
| <p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant clearly identifies effective performance measures for student groups including all students, pre-K-3, 4-8 and 8-12 grade levels. Overall performance measures indicate that the applicant predicts effective teacher/principal growth to increase by at least 3% each year based upon the project goals and activities to improve educator/teacher quality. The applicant also proposes a 3% increase in student achievement for students each year throughout the duration of the grant. The proposed increase is logical based upon the baseline data presented regarding the students current achievement levels. More specifically the applicant proposes to increase the number of English Language Arts, Math and Science teachers who will provide instruction in core subjects and there will also be an increase in the number of principals to effectively oversee the educational process. The rationale for the performance measures presented are reasonable as they are aligned with the state core standards, state reform initiative and needs of the students to be served by the project. The process to ensure there is timely and formative information tailored to the proposed plan and theory of action regarding implementation success and areas of concern is defined for each project activity. For example, the applicant proposes to use a gap analysis to determine gaps and causes of gaps that are systemic, site based, individual and linked to students or teacher leader performance. The deliverables include monitoring the process and results which will be completed quarterly after month 6 of the project. The persons responsible will be the community based team leader, district departments, teachers, principals and coaches. The activities presented will also allow for regular review and improvement of performance measures throughout the project implementation as there are specific deliverables, timelines, and responsible parties for associated with each activity presented to ensure consistent monitoring of the project's progress. This process will enable the applicant and stakeholders to gauge each measures significance and will allow for project adjustments, if needed.</p> <p>To show students will be on track to become college and career ready for students in the 9-12th grades, the applicant predicts an increase of only 3% over the life of the grant which is minimal considering the number of students to be served by the grant. Some increases the applicant presents in the performance measures do not represent change in the achievement gap. For example, multicultural students will only show an increase of 2% in the performance measures presented by the applicant over the life of the grant.</p> |          |          |

|   |          |          |
|---|----------|----------|
| <b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>  | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> |
| <p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The information the applicant provides relating to and effective continuous improvement plan is logical and detailed. There is an effective evaluation plan currently in place for the early childhood program which includes monitoring, observations and reflections in addition to gaining feedback and stakeholder input and objective measures of child development. The use of data management systems to compare schools who are participants of the project compared to schools who are non-participant will help to determine program progress. The applicant proposes to identify formative and summative evaluation questions critical to the district and stakeholders to gain input regarding project improvement. The questions will help to measure program impact, output and activity/process levels from participating educators district staff, board and community stakeholder levels. Student achievement in participating schools will be measured and a scale up process will be institutionalization throughout the district with support for district officials. The plan will be linked to project targets, results and indicators identified through the key questions identified. Additional assessment methods include data gathering and analysis, linkages to educator effectiveness systems, surveys, student and stakeholder data collection and internal/external dissemination of findings. Implementation and engagement of continuous improvement processes will include the use of</p> |          |          |

indicators, measures, data collection analysis and the plan will also be used to adjust internal processes for better alignment with national evaluation plans. Data collection and analysis will occur quarterly to view project reporting and dialogue with stakeholders including board, local/state government, participating and non-participating sites to gain additional insight. The evaluation process will be the responsibility of the team leader, evaluation specialist and key stakeholders.

The applicant does not describe the process for evaluating the technology to be used by the project. There are no specific activities presented.

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

|  | Available | Score    |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>   | <b>10</b> | <b>8</b> |
| <p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Applicant presents a budget which clearly defines all funds and expenditures related to the project including external support from district, state, local and projected foundations who will support the project. The expenditures are logical based upon the projected services to be provided and number of schools to be served. The applicant proposes to serve 9 elementary schools, 3 middle schools and 1 feeder high school. An individual budget is included for each year of the project and the budget is detailed. For example, in showing the personnel costs the budget lists each position that will be paid with project funds, the percent of their time personnel will devote to the project and their overall yearly salary and fringe benefits. Similarly, specific categories and items such as training stipends and supplies includes the yearly cost of the expense and contractual cost are all reasonable.</p> <p>The applicant does not define if district, state, local or foundation funds identified are one time investments or ongoing to support the project.</p> |           |          |
| <b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>  | <b>10</b> | <b>8</b> |
| <p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant presents a reasonable plan to sustain the project that includes the potential to gain support from the Capital City Education campaign. The campaign provides long term funding from businesses, individual donors, industry leaders and community-based organizations who fund college, career and civic readiness attainment. There is also indication of some district and local foundation support. Training programs specific to early childhood education will be made available to educators and it is expected that experienced teachers will share the expertise with new incoming teachers regarding personalized instruction to support students; this is a logical approach to sustaining programs. The applicant also proposes to seek additional partnerships and grants to further sustain the project after funding has ended.</p> <p>The sustainability lacks specificity regarding actual funds which will be made available to support the project after the grant is over.</p>  |           |          |

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

|  | Available | Score    |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>   | <b>10</b> | <b>9</b> |
| <p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant clearly provides evidence to show partnerships are in place and their commitment through letters of support. The school district, city, local university, targeted schools and community learning centers and parents are all partners who will support the needs of students and increase teacher quality through professional development opportunities. Additionally, the school district, mayors office and local University of Utah formed a cultivation alliance to create a culture of college, career and civic readiness throughout the city. Through the alliance a comprehensive model and framework was developed with input from various groups of stakeholders, parents and community members could share their ideas. The partnerships are solid and will provide the support needed to successfully serve the targeted population.</p> |           |          |

The plan to ensure there is an integration of services is evidenced and is reasonable for the proposed project. For example, the University of Neighborhood Partners works within the targeted neighborhoods where 10 of the 11 participating elementary schools and the middle schools are located. The partners have been credited with leveraging existing resources to achieve more and creating a process of communication/culture to increase capacity building amongst institutions and individuals who don't interact with one another. Additionally, partners have created a shared space to develop specific joint actions focused on structural and social change. The neighborhood partners are guided by a diverse group of resident leaders who are associated with education, health care careers, parenting and the roles of family members. The School Improvement Council and School Community Council will also monitor the plan and services to ensure alignment with project goals and student achievement.

The linkages and partnerships between LEA's is present and it is clear there are supports in place that will monitor program progress. For example, the Bureau of Economic and Business Research links students achievement data, demographics, housing, economic and health data to district levels to ensure holistic services are provided to students. Healthcare services are hosted at three school-based clinics and at the community learning center sites in addition to mental health services provided at 7 elementary schools and 1 middle school there is also support from the universities' school of nursing. The health providers share information with teachers and school administrators that are compliant with all legal guidelines. This process helps educators to better serve the needs of students. Partners and stakeholders will use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students. Private sector partners are actively involved through the Capital City Education partnerships funds which supports educational and civic projects such as the one proposed by the applicant.

The methods to track data is defined and is detailed by the applicant to show there is a achievable plan in place. The plan includes the use of baseline data and academic indicators will be tracked through the district's instructional data management system which collects routine assessment data. Personalized learning interventions and information will be made available at all school sites and community centers. Out of school time student achievement and parent participation will be tracked and findings integrated in the districts out of school time power school system for assessment.

The scale up plan presented by the applicant is a sound plan that will help to accomplish the goals through several stages presented. Stage 1. was to implemented through the implementation partial services offered at satellite sites and a Family Resource Center was created. Stage 2. included the development of an operating framework which was a collaborative effort by educators and stakeholders and the use of evaluation of baseline data for 2012. Through the Stage 3. process a logic model for the community learning center utilizing documented experiences from the hub satellite sites, baseline evaluation and collaboration with stakeholders was created. Stage 4. Clearly describes the sustainability plan was a collaborative effort by the district, mayor, community leaders, businesses and other stakeholders committed to leveraging resources. The applicant proposes to incorporate systems developed through the Race to the Top District funding to continue to support their efforts. Stages 5 will implement systemic approaches to align providers, stakeholders, district departments and schools who are responsible for providing various services such as after school programs, health services, school improvement/turnaround support and more. Stage 6. is reasonable as it will provide methods for continuous improvement and expansion through the use baseline study, student assessment data and demographics. School leadership teams, district leaders and other stakeholders will meet quarterly to discuss continuous improvements of service and results.

Performance measures presented by the applicant are ambitious and achievable. Some of the measures outlined include continuous review of current out of school time programs against the states core standards, measuring training and technology assistance to out of school time partners in the core areas of science, math and literacy and plan activities to fill the gaps and ensure core alignment. The applicant provides measures for adult workshops to promote the learning experience at home including a overview of individualized teaching/learning methods and hands on practices with out of school time core based activities.

The applicant does not present any specific details regarding the process to ensure there will be performance measures specific to the needs of English learners.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

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

#### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided information to show there will be concerted efforts to provide personalized learning opportunities to improve learning and teaching strategies throughout the targeted schools presented for this project. There

is progress already noted at the district levels whereby support for students before they enter school is provided through a full day program where students gain the knowledge they need to prepare for kindergarten. Student progress is tracked and assessed and parents are actively involved in the learning process to ensure student readiness. The applicant proposes to use a holistic approach for the proposed Race to the Top District grant to target low performing elementary, middle and one high school in efforts to assist students with achieving academic, social and personal goals. Professional development to improve teacher quality for educators will be implemented through onsite coaches, support at the district level and continual opportunities to gain feedback through observations, reflection, data analysis of student achievement and assessments. To promote personalized learning activities the applicant proposes to improve technology access and by doing so students will have access to hand held devices they can use to complete personalized assignments from their teachers. Teachers will have the capability to load assignments onto the devices so that students can use them with or without internet access. Parents will have the opportunity to become actively engaged in the educational process as volunteers and through school community site visits. Parents will also have access to student achievement data, school records and educators to provide student support and gain knowledge relating to the needs and concerns of their child(ren). Various community learning centers will be located in the targeted areas, in addition to local libraries where students and parents can have access to assignments and other pertinent student records if there is no internet in the home for school use. The community learning centers and school improvement committees will work together to make sure all stakeholder input is included related to student achievement, needed resources, teacher quality and project activities. Student achievement will be measured regularly to ensure student progress is being made and to make any personalized program adjustments are needed so that they will become college and career ready.

|              |            |            |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Total</b> | <b>210</b> | <b>176</b> |
|--------------|------------|------------|



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0019UT-2 for Salt Lake City School District

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

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

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

- a) The vision outlined in response to this criteria builds on work in the four core assurance areas.
  - Adoption of the Common Core State Standards and a robust system of formative and summative assessments meets the criteria.
  - Including a vision to transition to a more robust real time availability of data using a startup grant from the State Office of Education is justified since the current use of near real time customized reports is likely not adequate to provide timely information to all stakeholders in order to inform instruction. Allowing parent and student access with the new system is appropriate.
  - The applicant demonstrates a vision of recruiting and retaining effective teachers and principals with a competitive salary schedule and job embedded professional development. Academic coaching for teachers and an ambitious partnership with The University of Virginia Darden School Partnership for Leaders in Education to help build the internal capacity necessary to support and sustain effective school turnarounds is a commendable approach. The district has made a start on a system of rewards using a merit pay pilot and a teacher recognition program.
  - The district demonstrates a vision for turning around low achieving schools building on the leadership program mentioned above and a focus and support for these schools. It builds on work done through in pilot schools using student assessment data to intervene in curriculum and teaching strategies and building a system of student intervention and extension. The million dollar technology grant has allowed one pilot school to create a personalized learning environment, a sound first step in the work toward making the vision a reality

b) The vision includes a description of assessments administered to gauge student academic interests. The Salt Lake Way strategies include providing opportunities for students to pursue areas of interest but details about the opportunities envisioned are missing.

c) The vision described in the Salt Lake Way describes classrooms with a strong technology component to individualize instruction. Teachers use interactive whiteboards in engaging students in lesson presentation. Using tablet devices or computers with students allowing them to practice skills, research topics, watch video lessons or use other instructional programs reinforces the teaching and is a sound way to ensure retention of content. A plan to use tablets to support parents in helping students at home is an ambitious undertaking but an important commitment to making learning opportunities available to students outside the school day.

The strong vision described, with one exception, justifies a score in the middle of the high range.

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

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

The applicant meets this selection criteria with a thorough explanation of the process used to identify schools to participate in the reform proposal, a list of schools that will participate and a table with numbers required to meet the criteria. The selection of schools provides the most disadvantaged students in the metropolitan area a continuous pathway to career and college and support to families. The identified schools are in a feeder pattern to the district's most diverse high school and serve large proportions of low-income, minority students as well as refugees and immigrant families. Additionally, some schools in this cluster are current or emerging Community Learning Center (CLC) sites. The challenges presented in the selected schools justify their inclusion in this application for a RTTD grant.

This results in the highest score available.

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

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

The applicant has provided a plan including goals, activities, rationale for activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for overall implementation. A graphic describes the theory of change. Though the plan includes adequate goals, activities, rationale for activities and parties responsible for overall implementation, more detail is needed on the deliverables and timelines for each to provide a clear picture of the tasks required to be accomplished and a time frame for each. Providing information on parties responsible for each task would complete the plan.

A narrative description of the plan for scaling up is provided and goals are included in the plan. Sources of funding for scaling up with “continuing district support” after the grant ends is provided in the budget section of the application. Funds will become available in 2014 that were leveraged by the Downtown Redevelopment Agency. Additional funds are anticipated through a citywide plan called A Capital City Education from a National League of Cities and Lumina Foundation seed grant. Assets are available through the Salt Lake Education Foundation (SLEF), a district 501(c)(3) nonprofit. Additionally schools will be expected to commit site based funds to sustain the project post grant. Extensive resources appear to be available to meet the criteria.

This selection criteria earns a score of 7 in the high portion of the middle range due to lack of detail as outlined above.

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

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

The vision and goals for the district are ambitious yet achievable and if implemented appropriately are likely to result in improvements in performance as noted below. Comprehensive data tables are included with narrative to clearly explain how targets were determined.

a & b) Performance on summative assessments in the schools chosen for the RTTD grant compare unfavorably with district-wide scores. Data tables show achievement gaps between subgroups. A focus on enhancing early childhood education, providing personalized learning environments and enhancing technology using grant funds seems to be a feasible approach to improvement. Having CLC sites on many campuses will be an important component of the plan. The district capability of linking students and teachers and retrieving data on results is important. Teachers are given these data in order to reflect on their progress. The district is able to differentiate teacher support and retrieve results from classrooms included in the RTTD grant.

c & d) Graduation rate targets and college enrollment rate targets are provided district-wide. The targets are reasonable and take into account the improvements that should result from the interventions mentioned above to improve student performance. These interventions are designed to increase graduation rates, college and career readiness. The Glendale/Mt. View CLC site appropriately provides a College Lounge with counseling, assistance with college applications and other tasks associated with making a transition to higher education including access to technology support.

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

|  | Available | Score     |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>  | <b>15</b> | <b>8</b>  |
| <p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a &amp; b) Though the applicant has provided data demonstrating some upward trends in advancing student learning, four years of data is not provided. Data provided shows inconsistent performance.</p> <p>c) The district has made student performance data available to educators. With the purchase of the Illuminate system linked to the student information system the district has the ability to create dashboards with customized data. Teachers and administrators are using them and the plan provides for student achievement dashboards to be made available to educators, parents and students in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction and services. Access and training will be provided. This is a sound approach toward personalization.</p> <p>This selection criteria is scored at the mid point of the middle range due to missing historical data on advancing student learning and inconsistent performance from data provided..</p> |           |           |
| <b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>  | <b>5</b>  | <b>2</b>  |
| <p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides information on availability of personnel expenditures in the district budget published on its web site and on the Utah's Right to Know site. However evidence is not provided to indicate whether these expenditures are categorized as required by this selection criteria. The district views non-personnel expenditures at the school level in School Improvement Plan reports which are made available on individual school web sites after School Board approval.</p> <p>This criteria is scored at the low end of the middle range due to a lack of evidence on categories of data needed to meet this selection criteria.</p>   |           |           |
| <b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>   | <b>10</b> | <b>10</b> |
| <p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The district response to this selection criteria demonstrates evidence of State legislature oversight over reading deficits with a "Reading Bill" mandating that parents/guardians of every child who is not reading on grade level must be informed of this and a plan put in place to enable the child to achieve grade-level reading. However, the narrative indicates a level of flexibility and freedom to innovate in order to improve student outcomes through personalized learning as outlined in this application. There is no mention of statutory or other requirements to limit district autonomy.</p>   |           |           |
| <b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>   | <b>15</b> | <b>8</b>  |
| <p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a)All stakeholders mentioned in this selection criteria were included in discussions of the application and provided opportunities for feedback. Bimonthly meetings of the chairs of the all Schools Community Councils, meetings of active leadership teams of the Community Learning Center sites consisting of parents, teachers, administrators, partners and community members, 6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> grade focus groups of students and a briefing and brainstorming with all participating principals and teachers were mentioned as venues for the discussion. According to the narrative the decision and rationale for reapplying for this grant was discussed, however, there is no mention of the manner in which feedback was used to revise the proposal.</p> <p>i &amp; ii) No evidence is provided to indicate either direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in</p>  |           |           |

participating schools or evidence that at least 70% of teachers from participating schools support the proposal.

b) Strong letters of support from a number of community organizations are included. In addition to support for the proposal these letters confirm contributions to district efforts in a variety of ways. Some of these are listed below.

- The Salt Lake City Mayor commits to supporting the project with a continuing education partnership agreement, public resources and technical assistance.
- The City Council joins the mayor in a partnership with the district,
- The University of Utah Neighborhood Partners, present in more than a dozen district schools, engages university faculty, parents, students, district teachers, school administrators, and community leaders to work together to improve education, healthcare, financial stability, cultural identity and communication.
- the English Skills Learning Center trained volunteers teach students with limited literacy skills and provide free ESL instruction to adults. Additionally, Empowering Parents classes are held at some elementary and middle schools. PEER I(Parents Engaged in Everyday Reading) lessons are offered to encourage parents to read at least 20 minutes per day to their children.
- Big Brothers Big Sisters provides mentoring relationships to students.
- Utah Partners for Health supplies a health mobile clinic offering medical and eye care and a portal connecting families to low cost health centers and other resources.
- The Utah Education Network provides online and in-person professional development to educators on educational technology.

This criteria is scored in the middle of the mid range due to incomplete information on the manner in which feedback was used to revise the proposal.

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

|                                    | Available | Score     |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>16</b> |

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

The plan provided includes key goals, activities and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities. Though the plan is credible and of high quality overall, a greater level of specificity is needed in describing deliverables and the parties responsible for each task as well as the timeline for each task.

a)

(i)The plan calls for beginning with students in early childhood programs to begin setting goals, acting to achieve them and recognizing their own accomplishments. The Early Childhood Development Dept. has begun exploring technology approaches to allow students to work cooperatively in groups and track individual and group accomplishments. The district has a focus on investing in strengthening early childhood and building on assets and skills in all domains. There is no mention of how this focus and tracking will be carried forward to the secondary level.

(ii) The implementation of district interim assessments in language arts, math and science to provide feedback on ongoing learning is a key component for students to track their progress toward academic goals. Administrators and teachers have a customized data dashboard through the Illuminate system with customized data they have selected available on login. An important activity described under the district goal regarding high quality, rigorous assessments to guide personalized learning is to make real time data available to students and parents directly with a student achievement dashboard.

(iii) The application describes an approach allowing students to explore areas of interest through the use of technology. Students will practice skills, communicate and collaborate with experts and peers, and find other approaches through the use of computers. Since computer access at home is limited in the project schools a feasible approach is to provide 150 tablets per school for students to take home. Appropriately, to overcome a lack of Internet access in homes, the district will expand wireless Internet access in the schools to make computer labs and wireless access available to students and their families in the evening.

(iv)Through a partnership with the University of Utah students are exposed to a diverse university environment and opportunities for learning from university faculty. A program for struggling writers and a program for first generation

th th

at-risk 10 and 11 graders exploring history, ethics and literature are two of the offerings available. Connecting U Days three times per year at the university afford 5<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> grade students and their parents opportunities to experience the university culture through hands on classes as well as cultural events.

(v) The AVID program, now available in high school and middle school with plans to expand to elementary schools participating in the grant, is nationally recognized at developing skills and attitudes for success in post-secondary education for students who may be underrepresented in college preparatory courses. This is one way the district provides support to students in mastering critical content and developing the skills and traits for success.

b)

(i) A critical part of the district plan is expanding access to preschool for children in the identified feeder pattern so that they enter kindergarten ready to learn. The district holistic approach to personalizing instruction from kindergarten and beyond focusing on each child's development is appropriate. The district Community Learning Centers (CLC) are important parts of the plan, focusing on meeting needs of families so they may support their student's work in school and engage in their own learning. The student achievement dashboard will allow students and parents to monitor their personal progress toward meeting academic goals.

(ii) Using interim assessments teachers are able to monitor student progress and meet in professional learning communities (PLCs) to prepare personal learning plans for their students and plan interventions, groupings and strategies to meet the identified needs. Technology rich classrooms are designed to provide student learning support through use of devices loaded with apps that support the core curriculum, including many apps that do not require Internet access.

(iii) The plan includes the acquisition of a learning management system (LMS) available for teachers to create their own lessons by using vendor-supplied digital content and Internet content along with their own ideas. The LMS will archive lessons that are available district-wide for teachers and students to use.

(iv)

A) The plan has a comprehensive approach to making data available to educators as well as students and parents. With the addition of a student achievement dashboard and interim assessments as well as summative measures, a system will be put in place to give the feedback necessary to determine progress toward mastery.

B) The educator PLC created personalized student plans based on data will provide the recommendations needed to plan the appropriate instructional approaches, select effective content and provide the support needed to progress toward mastery of standards and graduation requirements.

(v) High-needs students will benefit from the approaches mentioned above. Additionally, the CLCs will provide support to students and their families with social, emotional and academic needs as well as access to technology support. Results of assessments will be used to coordinate extended after-school and summer school programs. Other data such as attendance, suspensions, English proficiency and disabilities will be used to coordinate special services that are available through district providers and the CLCs.

(c) The plan calls for multiple training opportunities and documentation for parents and for training opportunities for students which will allow them to track and manage their learning. Detail is missing on the contents of the training to clearly specify whether the training will be comprehensive and available to all students at times they are able to attend or whether it will be online or face-to-face.

The score for this section is at the low end of the high range due to lack of specificity of information on plan deliverables and student training.

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

**20**

**18**

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

The plan provided includes key goals, activities and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities. Though the plan is credible and of high quality overall, a greater level of specificity is needed in describing deliverables and the parties responsible for each task as well as the timeline for each task.

a)

i)The plan includes activities to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments. Implementation begins with conducting an RTT-D orientation program with all participating educators at district and site levels within the first thirty days of the grant award. Appropriately, a needs/skills assessment will be conducted among current teachers, principals and coaches in order to define professional development needs by category of educator to develop generic and personalized professional development. There is a plan to conduct personalized learning professional development for elementary teachers following needs assessment and development of training plans and materials within the first six months and at intervals thereafter. Any mention of conducting this type of training with secondary teachers is lacking. If the district intends to provide personalized learning training to all teachers in participating schools, including secondary schools, then information should be included in the plan. If there is no plan to do that it is unrealistic to expect that secondary teachers will effectively implement personalized learning environments without appropriate professional development.

ii)The plan provides for analysis of student assessment results along with educator monitoring and program observations by personalized learning specialists at quarterly intervals. The result will be personalized student and educator learning plans, a strong component of the plan. Instructional leaders will observe and support implementation, providing development feedback. They will document observation results and create plans for documenting and sharing promising practices and developing new skills and approaches. Technology equipment purchase soon after the grant award and training on use will allow students to access videos, engage in project-based learning and enhance learning through engaging content aligned to standards and their identified academic needs.

iii) Measurement of student progress mentioned above in (C)(2)(a)(ii) will be enabled by the plan to design and implement interim formative assessments per grade and the availability of real time data. Formative assessment tools linked to Utah State Core Standards and personalization goals and strategies will be made available on line. The district currently has the ability to link students to teachers and access data on teacher effectiveness. The plan provides for a review of staffing and teacher effectiveness at each school with a goal of ensuring access by all students to effective/highly effective science teaching.

iv)The plan provides for developing and implementing performance improvement plans for the program and/or staff. As part of the emerging educator evaluation process linked to personalization of learning for all, performance improvement plans will be completed for all participating educators. Goal setting will be in place by the end of Year 1 and annually thereafter.

b)

i)The plan includes a feasible approach for assuring educators have access to and know how to use the technology tools and the data system to access personalized student information through the student achievement dashboard . It is designed to provide rapid-time access to student performance for educators, parents and students. Work to complete this dashboard is due to begin immediately through grant funding. Appropriately, user access, related user training and documentation will be provided.

ii)The plan calls for the purchase of a learning management system where teachers will create lessons using vendor-supplied digital content, Internet content and their own ideas. Creation of lesson plans and student learning activities for personalized learning, a range of assessments for language arts, mathematics, and science in grades k-12 will be ongoing throughout the grant and beyond. The LMS and the Illuminate data management system provide the vehicles for sharing these assets.

iii) A robust assessment component of the plan provides a thorough process for continuous feedback. This includes interim assessments given at 6-8 week intervals, teacher created common short cycle formative assessments created in their professional learning communities and given approximately every two weeks, and a district purchased commercial assessment bank available in Illuminate that models the state summative assessment.

c)

i) Already in place for the past three years, teachers have received an effectiveness rating for each subject area they taught, with four categories of effectiveness (highly effective, effective, marginal, and ineffective). The linkage of student data with teachers has made this possible. A sound process for improvement, teachers are able to reflect on their practice and these data will be used by leadership teams to differentiate support for teachers. The plan provides within the first six months of award a teacher observation tool which will be developed and adapted. Technology appropriate observation, feedback and reflection tools will be provided. An appropriate performance measure outlined in the plan is the use of regular feedback from students and parents to assess and improve school climate.

ii)The plan specifies an analysis of student assessment results. Using combined data and understanding what helps close achievement gaps will allow more effective personalized student and educator learning plans. Within one month of completion of a professional development needs assessment the plan calls for the creation of professional development objectives for teachers, leaders and coaches adapted to new skills needed for personalized learning environments.

d)The plan details a review of staffing for teacher effectiveness in schools participating in the grant. After creating a baseline for the measure they plan to develop a plan to increase the number of students taught by effective or highly effective teachers as well as ensure access by all students to effective or highly effective science teachers. They plan to limit transfers out of these schools for the grant period. There is no mention of the criteria for developing the plan.

The score for this criteria is at the midpoint of the high range due to lack of detail in the description of deliverables, roles of parties responsible and timelines and for missing information on personalization training for secondary teachers.

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

|  | Available | Score    |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>7</b> |

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

The applicant has a plan for project implementation with goals, activities to be undertaken and rational for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities. However, a sufficient level of detail, tasks involved to accomplish activities and information on persons responsible for each task is not provided.

a)The plan includes an extensive process for leadership in supporting the project in a systematic way. The Superintendent will appoint a cross functional advisory team upon grant award under the leadership of the appointed RTTD team leader. The determination to appoint a team with a sufficient level of authority to effect action within key departments is a sound approach to assure success. Responsibility charts for departments and individuals linked to major activities of the project completed within 90 days is an important step involving the Superintendent, the RTTD team leader and department directors.

b)School leadership teams in the district already have a great deal of autonomy through the shared governance process in which the board of education has agreed to delegate selected decisions to sites. The School Community Councils (SCCs) and the School Improvement Councils (SICs)in these school appear to have sufficient flexibility over the factors necessary to assure project success including developing plans to meet the school's most critical academic needs and overseeing School Land Trust Program monies and federal, state and local private grants. The SICs determine the school day with input from the SCCs and Superintendent approval. The fact that these councils are already in place and experienced in site based decision making within parameters of the school board is a strong factor in achieving success in personalization to meet student needs.

c & d)There is no solid evidence in the plan of flexibility to give students credit based on mastery rather than the amount of time spent on a topic and no discussion of this practice. The application mentions Out of School Time (OST) at the CLCs with a plan of engaging program partners in connecting OST activities to the Utah Core Curriculum standards. Specifying that OST providers can also support personalized approaches to student mastery through OST activities is the only mention of mastery related to this criteria. There is insufficient information in the application to determine whether this constitutes flexibility to give students credit based on mastery rather than the amount of time spent on a topic

e)The application does not directly address the adaptability and accessibility of learning resources for all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.

The score for this criteria is at the mid level of the middle range due to lack of detail on aspects of the plan, missing information on mastery credit and no information on adaptability and accessibility of learning resources for all students.

|   |           |          |
|---|-----------|----------|
| <b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>   | <b>10</b> | <b>9</b> |
| <p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a) The plan describes a district that recognizes the issues present in the student/family population included in the grant application with access to content, tools and other learning resources both in and out of school. The plan describes websites and blogs with relevant information for students and parents. Connections are available through school or community facilities, including CLCs, libraries and school-based family resource centers. The CLCs include parent access to computers for learning and student tracking. The plan for implementation with grant funding will include providing access to learning devices and programs for students in participating schools, and will require the completion of a robust plan for managing on- and offsite use of the devices and related accountability issues. These are strong components of the infrastructure plan for personalized learning.</p> <p>b) The plan describes mechanisms that ensure parents and other stakeholders have access to information and technical support. Educators have access to individual support, online support and to some degree peer support. Currently technical support from the Information Systems department and a range of professional development opportunities provided by three district educational technology specialists are available. Support for students and their families from the CLCs, the SICs and the SCCs assure they have the technical support they need to contribute to student achievement.</p> <p>c) The Illuminate data system purchased by the district and expanded through grant funding appears to meet the definition of an open data format system and will provide data dashboards for educators, students and parents as well as current data on teacher effectiveness linked to students they teach.</p> <p>d) According to the applicant the existing data system has been linking student and teacher information for several years. State assessments, district assessments, enrollment data are also available. Improvements to the system currently underway are providing additional functionality and integrating more types of data such as a linkage between district student information and the data dashboards for school improvement data. Integrating data between the CLCs and after school programs and the district student information/dashboards is also planned. The data system is described as integrated but appears to meet the definition of interoperable. There is no mention of budget data being included in the system.</p> <p>The score for this response to the selection criteria is at the mid point of the high range due to having practices, policies and rules that meet the requirements of the criteria except for missing information on budget data in the interoperable data system.</p> |           |          |

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

|   | Available | Score     |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| <b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>  | <b>15</b> | <b>15</b> |
| <p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The district proposes a plan centered on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process. The plan includes goals, activities and associated rationale, the timeline, and the deliverables. The strength of the CQI process is the broad-based focus on improving services whether improving elements of the plan or improving processes producing results for students. Making sure the right things are done, in the right way and at the right time goes beyond accountability and on to a focus on improvement, an important part of a successful project. The inclusion of a table including CQI Elements and Status/RTTD action needed gives needed detail to the plan.</p> <p>Regarding quality of investments by RTTD the plan addresses monitoring through the establishment of a quality improvement committee. The committee will measure performance and develop solutions. They will publish results of their assessment of plan results through multiple channels of communication. Having the CQI committee led through the Superintendent's office is an effective way to assure functionality of the CQI process across district departments. The plan to use the CQI process and a committee to manage the process provides a feasible approach to improve and communicate results of the project to meet the criteria of this section.</p> <p>The score for this criteria is at the highest level due to a high quality plan and process for continuous improvement.</p> |           |           |
| <b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>   | <b>5</b>  | <b>5</b>  |

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

The plan for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders is of high quality due to the attention paid to feedback in as well as communication out to stakeholders. The plan uses systems and communication staff already in place along with district and RTTD leadership to communicate RTTD progress. An innovative method of making sure that communication is 2-way and that feedback is captured, shared and addressed is through the creation of a table/form provided in the application to track the steps in that process. The Department of External Relations, where the Communications Office is housed, will complete a stakeholder communication plan within the first three months after the grant award, a focused approach to ensuring that the information flow and ongoing dialog is well managed. The plan is credible and of high quality and describes goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible. The overall credibility of the plan is effectively described in the narrative.

The score for this criteria is at the highest point of the high range due to the inclusion of a high quality plan to meet the criteria.

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

**5**

**4**

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

The plan provides overall ambitious yet achievable performance measures through the RTTD grant. The targets should yield significant improvement based on the monitoring and intervention described in the application such as the strong professional learning component and support to improve educator effectiveness. The plan exceeds the criteria for number of performance measures required. The use of the IDMS and data warehouse to capture parent and student feedback for improving student achievement is a strong component. However, there are some inconsistent areas.

- A performance measure for academic growth in grades K-3 is missing.
- Performance measure (Grades 9-12 – b) is missing targets for SPED Grade 12. It appears the last row of the table may not have printed correctly.
- Performance measure (Grades 9-12 – d, e -row b) Health or social-emotional leading indicator is not explained fully. It is not clear what is being measured.

The score for this criteria is at the low point of the high range due to missing information.

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

**5**

**4**

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

The plan for evaluating the effectiveness of RTTD funded activities is of high quality and includes the required components. A greater level of detail is needed to evaluate activities and associated tasks, as well as timelines for each task and person responsible. The plan cites technology to support learning, teaching and measurement as one of the two primary types of investments proposed in the application. However, there is no detailed description of the evaluation of effectiveness of technology investments.

The plan cites Guskey's framework for evaluation of professional development and includes the framework. The strength of the evaluation is in the comprehensive process with follow-up at the school and classroom level to determine impact.

The district plans to hire or contract an evaluation specialist to help with identifying the evaluation questions critical to the district, developing a plan that responds to the questions, communicating the plan, and periodically reviewing the evaluation system and plan. This is an appropriate step in assuring that the grant is being administered appropriately to achieve the goals laid out in the plan. The use of an outside evaluator is a strength and will lend credibility to the evaluation process.

The score for this criteria is at the low point of the high range due to a need for more detail.

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

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
|  |           |       |

|  |           |          |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>   | <b>10</b> | <b>8</b> |
| <p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a) The budget tables provided in (F) (1) of the application categorize funding for the project as “Total Grant Funds Requested” and “Funds from other sources used to support the project “ or just “Funds from other sources.” No information is provided on the provider(s) of the funds in the “Funds from other sources” category except for those funds requested from the RTTD grant and in the budget item for “Fees collected from students able to pay the costs.” Missing information on sources of funding is not responsive to the selection criteria.</p> <p>b) The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal because it is directly aligned to the major initiatives outlined in the plan to appropriately support the request for grant funding. Especially important is the request for sufficient funding to allow a high level of professional development and support throughout the project.</p> <p>c)</p> <p>i) There is no identification in the budget tables in section (F) (1) of the funding sources except for those funds requested from the RTTD grant and in the budget item for “Fees collected from students able to pay the costs.” The budget items in the tables are clearly described in sufficient detail to understand how funds will be expended.</p> <p>ii) One time expenditures such as wireless access points are clearly delineated in the column for the year they are to be purchased with blank cells for other years of the grant. The table is organized so it is very clear which expenses are ongoing. Salaries, for instance, are placed in all cells of a row for years of the grant. Some items, such as computers, are purchased over more than one year and that is clearly evident.</p> <p>The score for this criteria is in the low end of the high range due to the overall quality of the budget and the missing information on sources of other funding.</p> |           |          |

|  |           |          |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>  | <b>10</b> | <b>7</b> |
| <p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The narrative describes the sustainability of the project’s goals in a clear and convincing manner. The initiatives described to assure sustainability, especially “A Capital City Education” and the resources generated there through an alliance with the mayor, the University of Utah and the district to assure sustainability of the gains made during the grant funding time frame are strong components of a continuation plan. A portion of the budget supplied for sustainability depends on a shifting of funds aligned to a shift in district priorities to an investment in early education and personalized learning. Supporting the sustainability plan is the fact that schools in the district have access to significant funds that can be expended at the local level. In this environment the district can shift most responsibility for personalized learning to the schools, freeing these district funds for allocation to other areas.</p> <p>Though the sustainability plan seems feasible with worthy goals, the application does not provide clear detail on activities, rationale for activities, the timeline except that the plan covers the required three years after the grant ends, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities.</p> <p>The score for this criteria is at the high point of the midrange due to a feasible plan but missing information on required elements of a high quality plan.</p> |           |          |

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

|  | Available | Score    |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>   | <b>10</b> | <b>9</b> |
| <p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>1) The applicant has described coherent and sustainable partnerships with clarity throughout the application and in this section. Strong partnerships have already been formed with community-based organizations including a cultivation alliance between the district, the city and the University of Utah. Healthcare partnerships, including physical and mental health providers, are already in place and functioning through the CLCs which are the physical spaces or hubs of most of the activities proposed to meet this priority and would be expanded with grant funding. Private sector partnerships are also in place. Increasing the coordination of these partnerships and evaluating the services available for maximum effectiveness</p> |           |          |

are strong components of the proposal.

2) The applicant provides a table clearly demonstrating the population-level desired results. The results included meet the criteria for student educational results and family and community supports. The desired results support the applicants broader application in the areas of early childhood education, college and career readiness, and personalized learning strategies involving parent understanding, awareness of curriculum goals and use of OST. The criteria for this section is met with an appropriate number of desired results, desired results indentified by type (educational or family/community), and desired results that match areas addressed in the broader application (see above).

3)

a) Information is provided in the narrative explaining how the selected academic indicators would be tracked using the district's Instructional Data Management System. Data on use of OST has already been linked to academic achievement in the district's student information system. The plan includes the use of survey data to track non-academic indicators.

b) The proposal provides for the district's Evaluation and Assessment unit to provide data profiles that would include measures of total need in the population served and in sub-populations in clusters of needs in order that they may be targeted for interventions. Data such as attendance, suspensions, English proficiency, giftedness, or disability will be used to coordinate special services that are available through district providers and the CLCs. This is a feasible approach to meet the criteria.

c) The proposal cites information on the theory of change process in the district that could be the strategy to be implemented in order to scale the model beyond the participating students to students district-wide with identified needs. However, it is not clear whether this criteria has been met.

d) Improving results over time will be measured using the continuous quality improvement process discussed in Section E of the application. Creating a dashboard for the CLC coordinators, allowing them to access data on the outcomes of their efforts and improve results is a sound step toward meeting this criteria.

4) The proposal meets this criteria with a feasible plan to expand the CLCs to satellite sites at all elementary schools and Family Resource Centers (FRCs) at all middle and high school sites. Services described in this criteria are in existence currently and would be expanded to new sites or use a referral process back to the existing sites. The strength of the plan is in the scaling up of the effective CLC/FRC programs to all schools participating in the RTTD grant.

5)

a) The proposal describes an activity that would provide CLCs staff the ability to access datasets to monitor and evaluate student achievement. The staff would receive orientation and real time access to the data. This activity in addition to the dashboard mentioned in (3) (d) above meets the requirement of this criteria.

b) The Instructional Data Management System will be the tool for meeting this criteria. Supports are in place to assure that data can be accessed effectively and that appropriate users have access and understand how to use the system to identify the needs and assets of the school and community.

c) The proposal cites an activity for development of district-wide theory of change and aligned structures, policies and procedures to create the infrastructure needed to meet this criteria. Additionally, the CLC Coordinator, site teams and partners as well as curriculum specialists are responsible for the expansion of the CLCs and the assessment and documentation of the current status of OST programs.

d) The proposal discusses site-based CLC leadership committees as the vehicle for engaging parents and families. However, the narrative suggests these committees are in a state of flux and may not be functioning as intended at all sites. The district and site coordinators are working to refocus these committees to meet the requirements of this criteria.

e) The district's continuous improvement process as well as the participation of the district as a pilot for an ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of programs located in centers such as the CLCs and FRCs is expected to inform the work in the future which meets this criteria.

6) The performance measures identified in the proposal are ambitious yet achievable except for the performance measure for Student and families access to health and mental health services. Targets remain the same for all four years of the grant. This measure does not meet the criteria for an ambitious performance measure. There is no explanation in the narrative of reasons for the static targets.

The score for this section is in the middle of the high range due to overall effective partnerships and strategies, but a lack of clarity for evaluating some criteria.

## Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

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

### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The district has addressed the core educational assurance areas in the application for the RTTD grant for the most needy students. Many strategies outlined in this application are already being implemented in the district and are part of a comprehensive plan to increase effective practices. Adding a comprehensive early childhood program including the expansion of Pre-K, a strong focus of the application, should give students a strong foundation to keep them on track toward college and careers. Data systems already in place and proposed to be expanded offer a comprehensive approach to all stakeholders, with dashboards currently in place and others in development. Dashboards available to students and parents will provide a portal to personalization, a tool for understanding and support of student progress toward college and careers. Performance measures and targets are well designed to track and improve student achievement and access to effective educators. This includes decreasing achievement gaps across student groups and increasing graduation rates. The application has a strong professional learning component with access to experts, coaches and professional learning communities to increase educator effectiveness. Expansion of the CLCs to offer more support to students and families outside of school with academic and non-academic needs along with the ability to track OST linked to student academic data is an important component of the application.

|              |            |            |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Total</b> | <b>210</b> | <b>166</b> |
|--------------|------------|------------|



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0019UT-3 for Salt Lake City School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

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

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

While the proposal is comprehensive in scope, there is a lack of focus with regard to the overall vision. The proposed plan includes a number of components, each of which has the capacity to add value and improve schools for the district. However, the proposal does not provide a persuasive explanation of how the different components fit together to form a coherent vision. This is especially true in the discussion of personalized learning. The applicant includes a robust discussion of how the proposal addresses the four core assurance areas, but does very little identify clearly articulated goals or to explain how the chosen supports and interventions will deepen student learning or increase equity. The discussion of professional development and leadership supports obtained through the University of Virginia PLE program and the extensive plan for implementation of rigorous standards and program of assessments is well developed. By comparison, the presentation of the plan for ensuring appropriate and system wide use of the data that will be generated by the various assessments needs to be developed more fully and tied to the other components of the proposal, including how the personalization of learning will be facilitated.

|  |           |          |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>6</b> |
|--|-----------|----------|

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

The applicant proposes to serve all students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 who attend schools that feed into and include East High, one of the schools with the highest number of students eligible to receive free or reduced lunch. The applicant appropriately identifies all of the participating schools within the district and contrasts those schools with those that will not be participating. The charts do not include percentages and instead focuses on raw counts of students and educators. It would have been informative to understand the proportion of students included on certain metrics. In addition, there does not appear to be information available with regard to student race or ethnicity or national origin, which would have been helpful to support applicant's claims regarding the growing number of immigrant students with unique educational needs. The data presented also raises a question as to why East High, but not West High, was selected. West High appears to have a larger number of high need and low poverty students than East High. In addition, West High appears to be closer geographically to the participating feeder schools. Finally, while the applicant includes relatively detailed information regarding the identity of participating schools, it does not explain the process by which those schools were chosen or why certain schools (West High in particular), were excluded.

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

**10**

**6**

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

The plan applicant presents falls short of the requirements for a high quality plan in that the key goals established for the improvement of student outcomes and the activities described do not appear to be sufficiently aligned to bring about the desired change. The applicant's theory of change with regard to early childhood and family and community supports as pathways to college and career readiness is supported by a plan to take actions directly related to the development of programs and resources that will ensure that students are prepared for kindergarten and that will establish more avenues for the district to provide families and community members with the supports necessary to help students achieve. However, the discussion of personalized learning lacks the necessary detail with regard to the goals, theory of change and the actual activities that the applicant will undertake to achieve its goals. Although the applicant makes various references to personalized learning, it is unclear from the presentation precisely how personalized learning will be achieved at the school level. There are references to the use of technology in early childhood, but the proposal would have benefited from a more complete description of how the district will use technology to personalize learning for those students. Thus, the proposal does not provide enough information on how the applicant will create personalized learning opportunities and this leaves the reader unable to evaluate whether those activities will support the goal of using personalized learning to improve student achievement. The plans to scale up the proposal to reach all students in the district seems reasonable and includes clear deliverables and timelines.

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

**10**

**6**

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

The applicant sets goals for proficiency in language arts, math and science that are relatively ambitious and appear to be achievable given the proposed dedication of additional resources to participating students. In addition, the efforts to close the achievement gap by at least 50% for each subgroup over the course of the grant period is laudable and reasonable. However, the applicant applies the same formula to establish targets for growth and proficiency regardless of the level at which subgroups of students are currently performing. The modest target of 2% growth for each subgroup year over year, regardless of whether student subgroups are currently performing at acceptable levels suggests that the achievement gap will not be closed entirely or even substantially narrowed in certain areas and for particular subgroups. Consistently, performance targets for American Indian, African-American and ELL students lag behind those of other students in part due to the lack of differentiation in goals for growth. Thus, this raises concerns about the applicant's commitment to close the achievement gap. In addition, although the challenges with regard to high school student performance are readily apparent from the data provided, the growth and proficiency goals appear to be less ambitious for all students and subgroups in high school.

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

|   | Available | Score    |
|---|-----------|----------|
| <b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>6</b> |

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

The applicant has invested resources in early childhood programming and in limited turnaround strategies that appear to have led to some improved academic outcomes. However, the evidence applicant has provided does not support the

conclusion that the LEA has a consistent record of success on a broad scale. The applicant references its investments in early childhood programs, including a parent engagement program and full day kindergarten. It appears that traditionally underserved students who participate in the full day kindergarten are outperforming their peers. This does provide support for goal of using investments in early childhood programming to help close the achievement gap. Yet, the information provided does not contain a full description of the full day kindergarten program, its reach and population so that the causal connection between full day kindergarten and improved performance can be verified. Additionally, although the general research cited supports the applicant's proposal to continue investments in early childhood programming, the proposal does not include detailed information about the LEA's role in providing actual early childhood instruction beyond the PAT program that would enable the reader to draw a causal connection between the applicant's reform efforts and improved performance of students who participated in early childhood programs.

In addition, the applicant cites the performance of only two schools as evidence that its reform efforts beyond early childhood have resulted in improved academic achievement at the LEAs lowest performing schools. Although the narrative in applicant's proposal suggests that these schools have experienced significant gains in language arts and math, the data provided as evidence does not uniformly support that conclusion. The performance of two schools referenced has improved, but not consistently over the last three years. The only consistent, upward trend in academic performance is found at the elementary school in language arts proficiency. The middle school arguably has not seen any marked improvement and in some cases, performance among certain subgroups has declined in recent years. Moreover, the applicant does not make any reference to reform efforts or successes in high school achievement.

The applicant provides ample evidence to support the conclusion that it has established a practice of provided student data to educators in ways that drive and help improve instruction. The applicant utilizes a student growth model for teacher and administrator feedback and as part of the model teachers receive detailed reports with achievement data at the student and classroom level. In addition, teacher evaluation includes effectiveness ratings for each subject area taught and performance incentives are tied to student achievement. Although the applicant makes clear that it shares data with educators to drive instruction, outside of the discussion of early childhood parental engagement efforts, the proposal does not include any substantive discussion of how data is shared with parents and how that has impacted outcomes.

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

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

The applicant has developed a relatively transparent process that enables stakeholders to access overall school improvement plans. The school improvement plans include site specific budget information relating to discretionary spending. Moreover, the detailed budget information on district wide expenditures is available but it does not appear that the applicant makes site specific detailed budgets available to the public. The proposal would be enhanced if the applicant could demonstrate a willingness to be more transparent and to provide data on school level expenditures as well as information on personnel salaries and benefits costs. In addition, the applicant does not appear to take any measures beyond making the information accessible via the LEA or school websites to ensure that interested parents and other stakeholders know and understand the LEA's plans for school improvement and how spending is tied to the LEA's overall plans.

|  |           |          |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>8</b> |
|--|-----------|----------|

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

The applicant provides sufficient support for its conclusion that the state in which the LEA operates will allow the applicant the necessary autonomy to implement its proposal. The applicant specifically notes that there are few restrictions on autonomy and refers to two specific examples. First, the applicant references the Utah Core initiative which called for core curriculum standards, but gave districts the authority to determine how and at what pace they would introduce those standards, so long as the standards were implemented by the deadline. Similarly, the applicant points to the state's teaching and leadership standards as evidence of the state's willingness to defer to the LEA when it comes to implementation of standards and similar policies. Additionally, the applicant relies on one example to illustrate how the proposed focus on personalized learning intervention is aligned with statewide priorities. The applicant describes legislation that specifically requires that a plan be put in place for any child who is not reading on grade level to enable the child to achieve grade-level reading parents/guardians. It also reports that in response to the legislation, the LEA has devised a plan to provide additional resources and more direct instruction from teachers to help students identified as needing additional help in reading.

|  |           |           |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>13</b> |
|--|-----------|-----------|

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

The applicant details a comprehensive process of stakeholder engagement around its reform efforts generally and in particular, the applicant's decision to apply for a RTT-D award and to advance initiatives that involve personalized

learning. The applicant leveraged existing stakeholder groups via the Capital City Education initiative and Community Learning Centers to reach various constituencies and discuss the LEA's priorities and obtain feedback. To date, through meetings held at the CLCs and from focus group sessions, it appears that various stakeholders have been meaningfully engaged in discussions about what services are needed for students and how the LEA should respond to those needs. In addition, the applicant obtained feedback from the Salt Lake Teachers' Association and received the Association's support of the proposal. Finally, the proposal has been reviewed by the Office of the Governor, the Utah State Office of Education and the Mayor of Salt Lake City and has received support from a number of community partners and other stakeholders. The proposal includes numerous letters of support from various constituencies, but lacks a high quality plan for ensuring that stakeholders continue to be engaged throughout the contract period. The applicant does not specify clear goals or deliverables that will facilitate ongoing stakeholder engagement and support of the initiatives it is proposing to implement.

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

|   | Available | Score     |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| <b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>  | <b>20</b> | <b>15</b> |
| <b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>  |           |           |
| <p>The applicant's plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing student learning experiences to ensure that students graduate ready for college and career is relatively sound. The applicant's proposal includes some general goals, specific activities, a timeline for implementation of a number of activities and has assigned responsibility for many of the project activities. In addition, the applicant presents a comprehensive set of initiatives and programs that are designed to ensure that participating students in grades pre-K – 12 improve their academic achievement. The proposal appears to include a number of the components necessary to provide students with personalized learning environments. The applicant has made a significant investment in a powerful technology solution that suggests it will be able to collect and maintain critical, student level data and share it with educators and others who will be working to support participating students. The data management system the LEA purchased will enable applicant to keep track of students who are highly mobile, gives teachers ready access to that data and makes it possible for them to establish unique dashboards so that they can readily see the data that means the most to them. The applicant's investment in the data management system serves as evidence that the applicant will have the capacity to generate the type of individualized student data that will be necessary to create meaningful, personalized learning plans for students and give them the capacity to set and meet individual goals. The applicant's plan to hire and deploy data specialists at participating schools to facilitate effective use of the system by teachers, students and parents, also evidences a thoughtful approach to the work.</p> <p>In some areas, however, particularly with regard to the specific plan for creating personalized learning, the applicant's plans lack clarity as to how the various components will work together. The proposal narrative does not contain any substantive discussion to make clear that each student will have individual learning goals that are tied to their future success and academic interests or a personalized learning plan. Nor is there a discussion of how such a plan will be generated. In some cases, the lack of detail in the plan with regard to the timeline for implementation raises questions about the applicant's ability to fully implement certain activities that will rely on implementation of other activities. As an example, the applicant indicates that teachers will be able to use a Learning Management System (LMS) to "<i>support the development and delivery of personalized learning curriculum.</i>" Under the plan, teachers will be expected to begin analyzing student performance data, sharing instructional strategies, and developing personalized learning plans for students within three months of the grant award. However, the LMS will not be in place until a year after the grant award.</p> <p>The discussion of college and career readiness indicates that participating students may have access to a number of programs and resources to aid them with preparation for college and provide them with necessary skills like goal setting and critical thinking, particularly with the applicant's planned expansion of AVID. It appears that some students will have access to programs that give them exposure to diverse cultures and culturally relevant learning, but not necessarily all participating students. In addition, the plan with regard to college and career readiness is not sufficiently coherent to demonstrate how the proposal will ensure that each student is college and career ready. Most of the programs stem from partnerships of varying types and duration, which may make it difficult to manage in a way that ensures all students are served. In addition, there does not appear to be any significant discussion of college and career readiness standards beyond the implementation of Common Core standards and new assessments.</p> |           |           |
| <b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>  | <b>20</b> | <b>10</b> |
| <b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>  |           |           |
| <p>The applicant has not set forth a high quality plan demonstrating it has devised an approach to teaching and leading that</p>  |           |           |

will increase educators capacity to provide all students with personalized learning. The proposal includes a wide array of activities that ultimately are aimed at enabling teachers and leaders to offer personalized learning instruction to participating students. In addition, the applicant has made some of the critical investments to ensure that individual student data is created, tracked and accessible to teachers and leaders. However, the plan for implementing the various strategies it has described needs further development to enable effective implementation. The applicant's plan establishes a general goal of building capacity to implement personalized learning, but the activities, timeline and deliverables that follow are insufficient to promote that goal. The plan for preparing teachers and leaders is not aligned with the general goal of building capacity to create personalized learning environments or the plan for learning in that many of the activities that applicant will need to conduct to ensure that teachers and leaders are ready to deliver the personalized instruction will not be completed before the personalized learning is scheduled to take place. This calls the overall credibility of the plan into question. As examples:

- Applicant plans to develop professional development objectives for teachers and coaches within one month of receiving the grant award. However, under the plan, the criteria for selection of coaches and specialists would not be established until three months post-award.
- Applicant plans to ask teachers to prepare personalized learning plans for students within three months post-award, however, the professional development to prepare teachers to “conduct personalized learning” will not be designed and deliverable until six months post-award.
- The professional development for use of personalized learning technologies is scheduled to take place “prior to installation at sites; after delivery,” but it is unclear when delivery is expected to take place.

The applicant has developed an ambitious plan to create personalized learning opportunities for students, but it does not appear that the groundwork that needs to be accomplished prior to receipt of an award has been done. It does not seem feasible to conduct many of the tasks described in the proposal to support teaching and leading within the timeframe provided and in a way that will facilitate fulfillment of the applicant's goals. Therefore, the applicant's approach may not enable educators to effectively implement personalized learning environments and strategies that meet student's academic needs or to readily adapt content and instruction. Teachers may be provided the tools to frequently measure student progress, but the misalignment of activities in the plan makes it unclear whether teachers will be prepared to use the data in ways that will inform the acceleration of student progress and improvement of teaching.

Similarly, the applicant has set forth plans and activities generally designed to ensure that educators have access to tools and data and resources to give them actionable information on students and identify high-quality learning resources for them to use and match those resources with student needs, but it is unclear from the plan whether educators will receive the professional development and technological resources in a manner that will fully equip them to utilize these strategies for personalizing learning. In addition, the applicant has a solid plan for evaluating educators and using that information to improve educator effectiveness and increase the number of highly effective teachers who reach participating students, but could have provided more specifics on how educators would be trained in strategies to close the achievement gap or serve students with special needs.

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

|  | Available | Score    |
|--|-----------|----------|
| <b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>6</b> |

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

Although the applicant has formulated a plan to support project implementation and has described the district level infrastructure that will be utilized, the plan cannot be considered a high-quality plan. The applicant has not identified any key goals to support project implementation, only activities, with accompanying deliverables, timelines and responsible parties. Many of the activities and deliverables are insufficiently developed. The applicant indicates that it will establish an Advisory Team to serve as the lead entity within the LEA to manage implementation of the plans described in its proposal. However, the team has not yet been formed and the applicant has not formulated a specific plan for the composition of the team. Instead, the applicant proposes that the Superintendent will appoint members and that the team will include representatives from departments necessary for implementation of the proposal. Many of the activities described in the proposal could have and likely should have taken place prior to the submission of a proposal (i.e., appointment of the Advisory Team, preparation of responsibility charts and detailed implementation and provisional plans, finalizing the theory of change and development of a procurement plan). The lack of specific detail about the Advisory Team or its composition suggests that the applicant has not invested the time to prepare for implementation of its proposal and hit the ground running upon award of a grant.

In addition, the applicant suggests that schools will have the necessary autonomy and flexibility to make adjustments at the school level, but it does not include any discussion of the regulatory and policy environment that will allow the reader to evaluate whether there are any barriers to the establishment of personalized learning at participating schools or whether students will be able to demonstrate progress and be promoted based on mastery rather than other traditional means. The proposal is also silent as to how the applicant will address the needs of providing access and information to students and families who speak another language or need special technological assistance to participate in personalized learning instruction, including those students with special needs.

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

**10**

**6**

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

The applicant points to a number of distinct groups and entities that will be in place to provide support for implementation at the school level and provide parents and other stakeholders access to the resources that will be necessary for implementation. However, the proposal does not include a discussion of how these various groups – the Advisory Team at the LEA, the School Improvement Councils, the School Community Councils, the CLCs and Early Childhood programming centers – will work together to ensure effective implementation. While it appears that the different groups will enable participation by parents, teachers and other stakeholders, the proposal does not include a robust discussion of how precisely how decision making authority will be allocated amongst the different stakeholders.

The CLCs and involvement of parents in the Early Childhood programs will be leveraged to ensure that parents have access to programming and information about the plan. The proposal indicates that the applicant will ensure access to technology for all students beyond the CLCs by increasing wi-fi access at schools and through provision of internet access through electronic tablets. However, the proposal would have been improved by a more comprehensive discussion of how the applicant intends to provide technical support for the various technology that will be used by parents, students and teachers both in and out of schools at the CLCs and during extended day hours. Moreover, the applicant does not make clear that the schools and LEA will use an open data format or interoperable data systems that will enable more seamless entry and use of individual student data.

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

|  | Available | Score     |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>12</b> |

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

The applicant demonstrates an understanding of the importance of having a continuous improvement process that will ensure quality implementation at the classroom, school and LEA level. The description of the process that will take place for teachers and at schools suggests that steps will be taken to ensure that standards are identified and a structure is put in place to enable the applicant to measure the progress that is being made and make adjustments to the plan as necessary. The decision to make the Superintendent accountable for the continuous improvement process is a sound one that will likely facilitate effective implementation. In one instance, the proposal suggests that the continuous improvement team will include both content specialists and stakeholders in the continuous improvement process. That information is not consistently presented throughout the response as the chart accompanying the narrative suggests that the Superintendent will appoint only a team of experts. A team that includes stakeholders as well as experts would be more comprehensive in scope and would have the added benefit of engaging parents and community members in a substantive way.

The plan that the applicant describes to implement its continuing improvement process cannot be consider high quality because it lacks details sufficient to demonstrate that the timeline and resources available consistently will work together for effective implementation. Although the basic elements of a plan are present, with goals, activities, deliverables and a timeline, the proposal fails to provide key information that will be necessary to ensure the plan is feasible. The applicant does not explain how the tasks of performance standards will be created and communicated or who will design and implement the gap analysis that will be used to identify root causes of achievement and performance gaps or how consensus will be built on solutions to be pursued or how the applicant will prioritize addressing gaps. The applicant's plan for continuous improvement suggests that certain threshold decisions have not been made and initial planning has not been done. (i.e., the frequency of analysis needed to conduct necessary performance analyses that will support the continuous improvement process has not been determined, selection criteria for the Quality Improvement Committee).

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

**5**

**3**

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

Although the applicant has devised a plan for ongoing communication and engagement, it lacks some of the elements of a high quality plan, including key goals and a specific level of details that would enable determination of whether the plan can be successfully implemented. The applicant's plan for continuous improvement appears to include regular communication with teachers and leaders throughout the LEA. The proposal includes plans to generate quarterly announcements and updates about improvements being made that will be distributed to stakeholders and published on the LEA website as well. The proposal does not address how the various school level teams (the School Community Council and School Improvement Council or the Advisory Team) will be engaged throughout the life of the grant. The applicant points to a Project Advisory Committee, but it is unclear whether the Advisory Committee is the same as the Advisory Team and if not, how the Committee's role is distinct from the Team's pivotal role. In addition, the development of a stakeholder communication plan should enable the applicant to engage stakeholders in a meaningful way. At this stage, however, the applicant has not included in the proposal a fully developed plan that offers any real evidence that the applicant has thought through how it will meaningfully engage stakeholders in the improvement process. Instead, the majority of the activities described contemplate convening some set of unnamed stakeholders in order to develop a plan to reach some generalized goal within a certain timeline.

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

**5**

**3**

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

The proposal includes the requisite number of performance measures and the measures implicate a range of performance standards, including those that address academic achievement and proficiency, attendance and drop out rates, on-track rates, participation in out of school and support programs, and levels of communication and feedback from stakeholders. For most measures, the applicant proposes modest and incremental increases, such as the expected two point increase in the number of participating students who are taught in language arts, math and science by a highly effective teacher, and expected three point increase each year in the number of effective teachers and principals serving those students in language arts, math and science. The expected increase remains the same for all and for all subgroups. This incremental approach does not seem likely to affect gaps in the number of effective teachers serving students within the subgroups that have a greater need for those teachers. In addition, in some instances, the use of raw numbers rather than percentages for some of the performance measures makes it difficult to evaluate how rigorous the measures truly are.

The applicant does not include a detailed discussion of how the measures selected will lead to information that is tailored to its proposed plan or theory of action and does not explicitly explain how it chose the different performance measures that are included. Finally, it appears as though some of the measures with regard to growth in early elementary grades are missing performance targets as are targets for special education students in certain grades. The proposal would be improved by a discussion of those targets or an explanation as to how those students will see improved performance despite the absence of specific performance targets.

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

**5**

**4**

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

The applicant's plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its investments focuses heavily on measurements of educator effectiveness and assessments of professional development. The plan is strong with regard to evaluating those investments. It also contains all the requisite elements in that it has key goals, specific activities to be undertaken that are aligned with the goals and a timeline that facilitates achievement of the specified goals. In addition there are deliverables and responsible parties identified. The applicant intends to rely on its existing systems to evaluate its investments in educators (specialists, coaches and teachers). The current system includes the use of standards and rubrics, classroom observation, student outcome measures, and stakeholder feedback to measure educator effectiveness. The applicant will also continue to document increases in the number of students who are taught and led by effective and highly effective educators and will implement a recognized tool for evaluating professional development and training to monitor the effectiveness of its investment in training. When viewed in combination with the rest of the proposal, the plan for evaluating these investments appears to be sound.

However, the focus on educator effectiveness and professional development leaves out any real discussion of how the applicant will determine whether the technologies utilized are effective. The proposal would be enhanced by the inclusion of a more detailed plan overall, as well as some discussion of how it will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the chosen data management system, learning management system and various computer and tablet technology it plans to purchase.

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

|   | Available | Score    |
|---|-----------|----------|
| <b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>  | <b>10</b> | <b>7</b> |
| <p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has identified all of the different funds that appear to be needed to support the expenditures referenced in the proposal. The budget for each aspect of the proposal appears to be reasonable given the specific activities contemplated under the applicant's plan. In addition, the applicant's budget reflects a thoughtful approach to the investments it proposes to make in that each proposed expenditure is sufficiently described. A significant number of the costs appear to be ongoing operational costs rather than one-time investments, which raise questions about feasibility of fully funding every component of the proposal. The narrative in other parts of the proposal seemed to suggest that certain partnerships and programs were already established and funded with other sources (i.e., the University of Virginia PLE project), but the budget makes clear that is not the case. Also, the narrative of the proposal makes reference to certain positions that do not appear in the budget (i.e., Personalized learning specialists)</p>  |           |          |
| <b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>   | <b>10</b> | <b>8</b> |
| <p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's plan for sustaining the project goals is high-quality in that the applicant has articulately clear goals and the activities it intends to undertake to ensure that it can continue the work that will be started with the support of an RTT-D grant award. The applicant intends to secure those resources locally and from privately raised resources. About \$8.7 million of the funds required to implement the applicant's proposal comes from other sources. This is a relatively large proportion of the \$18.4 million that the applicant has requested to support its proposal and assuming that the applicant can sustain the outside funding it currently has, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the applicant could raise additional funds to sustain its proposal beyond the grant period. The plan to sustain investments made from the award of a RTT-D grant is sound and appears to be well-developed. The Capital City Education project has access to viable sources of funding and it appears to be supported by strong partners who are committed to seeing it implemented fully. The LEA's foundation also appears to be a viable source of funding to sustain the project.</p> |           |          |

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

|   | Available | Score    |
|---|-----------|----------|
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>  | <b>10</b> | <b>9</b> |
| <p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's plan to expand the use of CLCs so that participating students and their families can utilize the various supports available at the centers and access technology students need to support personalized learning is a critical part of the overall proposal and appears to be high-quality. The development of the CLCs appear to be one of the most sustainable parts of the applicant's plan due to its connection with the Capital City Education project and support that program has throughout the community. Development and expansion of the CLCs will necessarily involve reliance on the strong partnerships that the applicant has already developed with the City, foundations, local universities, the University Neighborhood Partners and the National League of Cities. The cultivation model appended to the proposal serves as evidence of the strong commitment among these partners to the community centers. The various partnerships described suggest that the applicant will be able to provide students with academic support services as well as those that address students' social, emotional and health needs. This will help staff at the participating schools address the different needs students have and enable those students to remove the barriers that exist for them to reach their academic goals.</p> <p>Each of the population level desired results that the applicant has identified are aligned with the priorities in its proposal and will support its goal creating personalized learning for students and preparing them to graduate career and college ready. In addition, the proposed performance measures for the proposed population level are ambitious, yet achievable. The target increases are incremental, but will result in real progress by the end of the contract term.</p> <p>The proposal would be strengthened by a more definitive plan to utilize the neighborhood data that will be collected and maintained by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research, as well as some more concrete detail on how the plan for tracking student data from other sources will be accomplished.</p> |           |          |

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

|   | Available | Score      |
|---|-----------|------------|
| <b>Absolute Priority 1</b>  |           | <b>Met</b> |
| <p><b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Although the proposal description of the vision does not clearly articulate the full scope and degree to which the applicant intends to create personalized learning environments for students, when the proposal is viewed in its entirety, it becomes evident that the applicant seeks to take a comprehensive approach to personalized learning that will reach students throughout their education, from pre-school to high school graduation. The use of individual student data to identify student needs, gaps in performance among students, teachers and school leaders make clear that the applicant has the capacity to begin development of a system of personalized learning for students. Although the plans could be more developed in terms of how the applicant will move from plan to implementation, the proposal overall demonstrates the applicant has meet Absolute Priority 1.</p> |           |            |
| <b>Total</b>  | 210       | 137        |