



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0112WI-1 for School District of Beloit

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a comprehensive reform vision built on the Common Core Standards that Wisconsin has adopted. With the resources available to the district, the district, parents, community and other stakeholders have a shared vision to overcome the obstacle that may be impeding the growth of their students.</p> <p>The applicant builds its vision around aligning the curriculum to the Common Core and is in the process of "creating standards based formative and summative assessments."</p> <p>The proposal outlines four interrelated projects to bring Personalized Learning Environments to all students which will ultimately lower the achievement gap.</p> <p>The four projects (IGNITE Early Learning Project, EXTEND After School Project, CONNECT Employability Center, and ENGAGE Training Center) are ones that connect "cradle to career." These will help provide personalized student support throughout a student's career in school and will provided services need not only to the students, but to the parent as well. The services will involve and be provided by all stakeholders in the community at large. The projects should help improve academic achievement for all students.</p> <p>An example of the many ways in which the projects will help in the proposal's reform vision is in the EXTEND After School Program. The program will help students access academic support, remediation, and enrichment at all levels, but particularly at the nine highest need schools. The program is supported by the following: 21st Century Community Learning Center funds, SAGE State funds and Beloit School District funds.</p> <p>One of the core educational assurance areas not fully discussed is building data systems. Although Universal Design and Understanding by Design uses data to keep everyone aware of student growth, it was not discussed at length as to how parents and students would keep track of the student's data on a regular basis. Planning time is discussed to allow teachers time to plan. Hackett is discussed to enable teachers to plan for a Reading Assessment Wall to help plan instruction, but again students and parents are not involved. The "I can" statements of learning outcomes in reading indicate that students read their data. The applicant also pointed out that student performance is shared with parents through phone calls and e-mails and conferences. Skyward Family Access for High School is also available on the web. The problem in such poor communities is the availability of internet and e-mail access which was not addressed. The only way in which this is touched upon is through the budget for transportation to the Employment Center where the student will be able to get computer access.</p> <p>An innovative idea in the vision was a recruitment, development and retaining idea for bilingual teachers. The applicant's district is high in Hispanic students. The unique idea is to use RRTD funds to train local staff (teachers and paraprofessionals) to become certified in bilingual education. Afterwards the teachers must teach in the district for at least three years.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal provided raw data on all students in every school in the district. Each school in the district has more than 40% of their population coming from low-income families. As such, the district chose to work with all schools in the district. In addition, 15.2 percent of the entire population of students in the district are high needs students. Because of this large</p> | | |

number of students, the district was convinced that all schools needed to be included.

As all students are participating in the program, all teachers will also be included.

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

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has the autonomy to successfully implement personalized learning environments according to their proposal. The local school boards have jurisdiction over curriculum and instructional design.

According to their statute 118.1, "Each school board should provide curriculum, course requirements and instruction consistent with the goals and expectations established..." The proposal continues to name specific instructional areas which are relevant to the proposal.

Therefore, there seems to be no reason for the district not to be able to be sufficiently autonomous to carry out the proposal. Furthermore, the State Superintendent strongly supports the proposal.

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

10

4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The goals are quite ambitious and may be unachievable for some of the students. The first goal for performance on summative assessments may be unachievable for a majority of the students in reading. Overall the students must raise the percentage scores from 22.1 to 80. This is 57.8 percentage points in five years. This is an average of 11 points a year when last year to this year there was only an increase of 1.7 percentage points. In the same goal there is an unexplained goal from 2015-2016 to the 2016-2017 school year for the Black-not Hispanic population. The proficiency status goes from 65 to 67 percentage points, only 2 points. Nearly all other subgroups were at the 65 percentage point range and went up ten points the next year except the Black-not Hispanic population. Again, there seems to be no explanation.

The second goal for performance on summative assessments may be unachievable for a majority of the students in math. Overall the students must raise the percentage scores from 32.8 to 80. This is 47.2 percentage points in five years. This is an average of 9.44 points a year when last year to this year there was only an increase 5.2 percentage points. The Black-not Hispanic students must raise the percentage scores from 16.9 to 80. This is 63.1 percentage points in five years. This is an average of 12.62 points a year when last year to this year there was only an increase 6.8 percentage points. The Students with Disabilities must raise the percentage scores from 12.2 to 80. This is 67.8 percentage points in five years. This is an average of 13.56 points a year when last year to this year there was only an increase 5.9 percentage points.

The high school graduation rate is not divided out by subgroup, nor is it described.

The college enrollment rate is not divided by subgroup, nor was it described.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal describes a vague record of success over the past four years. To the credit of the applicant there have been successes in the district, but have not extended over the past four years. For example, Todd Elementary School piloted a coaching model with two reading specialists using MAP to measure to gains. The kindergarten class gained 21.2 points which exceeded the NWEA 14 point norm gain. The first graders gained 23.5 points which exceeded the NWEA 16 point gain.

The reading gap between the Students with Disabilities and those without lessened for three years and then in one year the gap went back to where it was three years prior. The same with the gap between Hispanic students and White students, economically disadvantaged and not, black and white, and LEP and not LEP. There was not an explanation given.

The math gap between the subgroups in the district seems to be (for the most part) slowly decreasing.

For four years, one elementary school (Gaston) in the district has won an award for being: Title I, top quartile of state receiving free/reduced lunch, above-average academic performance on the WKCE in reading and math, and met AYP for two or more consecutive years. The elementary also won the Blue Ribbon School Award.

The proposal identifies Merrill Elementary as a Title I focus school. This will give the school additional support but it is unclear how this relates to a clear record of success that demonstrated the applicant's ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms.

The school district's website houses data charts and students and district information that parents can access. Students are aware of the reading outcomes with "I can" statements.

Formative and summative assessments communicate triangulation of data.

Parents are informed by e-mail, phone called and in parent conferences of progress. Students and parents have access to Skyward Family for realtime grades.

The proposal also does not address the persistently lowest performing schools.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal did describe that the school district held open meetings to the public and that the budget was available on the website. The superintendent and executive team hold regular meetings on the budget in open forums and most stakeholders are engaged.

The annual budget presentation is televised and posted on the website.

No salaries for instructional staff or teachers or the actual non-expenditures at the school level were in the proposal. The minimum of the criteria is not met, therefore this is not a high level of transparency.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has the autonomy to successfully implement personalized learning environments according to their proposal. According to their statute 118.1, "Each school board should provide curriculum, course requirements and instruction consistent with the goals and expectations established..." Therefore, there seems to be no reason for the district not to be able to be sufficiently autonomous. Furthermore, the State Superintendent strongly supports the proposal.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided many letters of support for the proposal which included key stakeholder, such as parents, Student body president, business community members, Institutes of Higher Education, community-based organizations, and politicians.

The local teachers union or association signed the application and sent a letter of support. This has occurred, but there is little or no evidence of the amount of meaningful engagement teacher had in the development of the proposal.

The applicant gave insufficient evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal. The applicant stated that the vision and details of the proposal were developed by people from the district and local teacher's union representative president. The proposal was then submitted to the Board of Education for its input and information about the proposal was shared with the PTOs, students groups, early learning programs, business community, community based organizations, and IHEs.

There is no evidence of engaging the stakeholders in meaningful dialogue about the development proposal, how the proposal may be revised, or feedback about any revisions in the process.

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

| | Available | Score |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 14 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's has four separate implementation plans, which work together to make their high-quality plan. Each plan is supposed to have activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. All have the four components of a quality plan. One problem is in the in the timelines. There are two timelines for the EXTEND Program.

The proposal does seek to have students, with the support of parents and educators, understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals in many ways. For example, Through IGNITE, parents will learn to recognize the importance of long-term classroom learning so that parents can promote this understanding in their children.

Another example is the Employability counselor work with students and families to develop a career folder to learning and development goals linked to college- and career- ready standards to understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals. These will be updated quarterly so parents and students can track the individual progress toward the goals.

Bilingual students are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest, for example, because select educators will be trained in dual language instruction providing instruction in a language they can comprehend while learning a blend of English and Spanish.

With the addition of technology in the schools, students have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. Students are able to hear songs from different cultures; see photos and drawings; and experience labs conducted with the technological devices.

From elementary to high school the proposal that there is a data-driven instruction strategy that Beloit teacher will implement that will personalized instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and be college- and career- ready. Keeping the parents informed by various methods (phone, e-mail, parent conference, Skyward Family Access) teachers will triangulate current and targeted data. Students, with teacher and parents, create a learning plan each year that will follow them throughout their career as a student. This plan will help steer the student not only down an academic pathway, but also toward their selected career pathway as well.

The proposal assures that there will be small group instruction, student-led learning investigations, large group instruction, one-on-one instruction, technology facilitated instruction, hands-on instruction, learning projects, etc.

Beloit School District is in the process of aligning their curriculum to the Common Core Standard at all grade levels. On-line course work will be made available presented as credit recovery or as an alternative to dropping out for high risk teens. At this point the proposal does not outline online course as an option for proficiency or as an alternative to courses not taught at the high school level.

The proposal indicated that at least monthly assessments of student progress will be taken with formal and informal feedback given to parent and students. The documentation includes a variety of items which will "be available for students and parents viewing at any time." This statement is vague. The reader does not know if parent or students actually ever see the information.

The proposal indicates that the students have the unique learning plans. The plans "will be updated monthly and available for student and parent use as requested in addition to annual goal-setting meetings with student and families." Lacking is the involvement of students and parents updating the plans with the schools and other stakeholders.

Teachers will undergo training to learn to support high needs students and to help reach their goals that are aligned to the college and career ready standards by using Universal Design for Learning.

The proposal has a comprehensive plan (ENGAGE) to train teachers. Those teachers will train the students how to utilize the technology to access the personal learning devices needed in order to track and manage their learning. Technology

support will also come from the district to help students and parents.

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

20

14

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's has four separate implementation plans, which work together to make their high-quality plan. Each plan is supposed to have activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. The timelines are different on two of the plans.

The applicant's ENGAGE training center is an approach to increasing educator's effectiveness to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students.

All participating educators will eventually be engaged in training. All educators will be in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) at each school to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. For example, the training will be done in a "looping" fashion. Coaches will be trained, so it will be a learn and coach, learn and coach model. The coaches will also lead the PLC. Eventually all teachers will be trained in a myriad of professional development areas that will support student's academic and other needs.

Core State Standards training is to be provided to the all educator to adapt content and instruction to ensure students are college and career ready; so that parents and students alike understand what is expected of them. Understanding by Design training is provided to all teachers so that among other things, teachers design "effective and engaging learning activities." Also, students in grades 6-12 can be placed in the universal curriculum (Springboard) or an intervention system intended to "accelerate learning to meet grade level targets" based on an assessment in ELA.

Although not mentioned in this section, the proposal indicated that at least monthly assessments of student progress will be taken with formal and informal feedback given to parent and students. The documentation includes a variety of items which will "be available for students and parents viewing at any time." This statement is vague. The reader does not know if parent or students actually ever see the information.

The Beloit School District uses the Danielson Model for Effective Teaching where 12-20 walk-throughs a year are performed by the principal; also a summative evaluation each year is performed. Student achievement is not part of the system, but will be added in the next two years. Those teachers who do not meet the standards are given coaching a support. A plan of improvement is put in place for intervention.

All educators in the district will be trained in the Common Core State Standards, Understanding by Design, Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and the 21st Century Learning Framework. The applicant's plan is to use the looping approach to coach all teachers in the PLCs to respond to all student needs and interests. Again, the timelines and persons responsible for all implementation plans are not included.

Lacking in the proposal is a discussion of high quality learning resources, the tools to create resources, and processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources. The PLC is there to share new resources, but again there is no discussion about this area. The reader would have to make assumptions.

Lacking is a discussion about the training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable school leaders and leadership teams to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards. The proposal does state that, "teachers or principals who do not meet the standards are given additional coaching and support in addition to a plan of improvement if they are not meeting growth targets."

The proposal has a unique plan, which is lacking a timeline and persons responsible for hard to staff bilingual teachers. The teacher would be found among the present staff and paraprofessionals and trained at a local college and funded with RTTD funds.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 8 |
| <p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>At a minimum a high-quality plan has key goals, activities and rationale, timeline, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing the activities. The proposal provides the activities, persons responsible and deliverable in the LEA for the particular plan, but not in a cohesive fashion. No timelines were established to support the plans or opportunities provided.</p> <p>The overall organizational structure of the LEA central office governance structure provides support and services to all participating schools in a top down fashion according to the chart. All report to the Superintendent, who supports the proposal. The persons responsible for insuring that the proposal's components are implemented and providing the necessary support to the teachers and students report directly to the Assistant Superintendent who reports directly to the Superintendent.</p> <p>School leadership teams, led by the principal, in participating schools have been informed by the Superintendent that, "You are the captain of your ship." The proposal states that principals have responsibility for hiring staff and completing evaluations, but does not list a myriad of other issues listed in the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal addresses many accelerated and mastery opportunities, but not to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not amount of time spent on a topic.</p> <p>The applicant addresses multiple opportunities to demonstrate standards mastery. Students are assessed with formative assessment and given multiple opportunities to demonstrate make corrections or re-test for proficiency. The teachers have also been train in "Rick Wormeli on grading and assessment and with Marcia Tate on differentiation and brain learning" on multiple comparable ways to demonstrate mastery.</p> <p>The applicant provided many ways in which the district provides learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. Examples of Assistive technology for students with special needs to gain access to the general curriculum were provided, as well as transition services.</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 4 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>At a minimum a high-quality plan has key goals, activities and rationale, timeline, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing the activities. The proposal provides the activities, persons responsible and deliverables in the LEA for the particular plan, but not in a cohesive fashion. No timelines were established to support the plans or opportunities provided.</p> <p>The proposal indicates that that the district has a strong technology infrastructure, but the staff needs a plan is to provide the professional development in order to utilize the equipment and technology resources effectively. The applicant's plan is to provide training and ongoing support to ensure that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders, regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources. Missing in this plan is the stakeholders training and the parent's resources to gain access to the equipment and technology. The budget does not address parent's limited access to technology.</p> <p>Innovative Coaches at each school perform technology training weekly to ensuring that administrator and educators receive technology training. They, in turn, guide instruction and provide personalized learning environments for students. The Assistant Director for Instructional Technology holds training sessions for parent groups in the Skyward Student Management System which has all information about student grades, assessments, attendance, scheduling, discipline and demographics.</p> <p>Skyward is an information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format. It is a web-based system.</p> <p>The proposal ensures that LEAs and schools use is an interoperable data system that goes into the Schools Interoperability Framework or SIF by Pearson.</p> | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 3 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal's continuous improvement plan is not laid out cohesively. The application states that a high quality plan will contain key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. This proposal does not have all of the components in introducing a continuous improvement plan.</p> <p>From the proposal, it is obvious that an external evaluator and data collection specialist will be contracted to help with providing timely and regular feedback and working with the Project Director to monitor, measure and publicly sharing information on the quality of investments. The proposal does not define who is responsible for monitoring, measuring or sharing the information.</p> <p>Data (there is a list, but not who will collect the data) will be collected monthly according to the proposal and submitted to the evaluator. The evaluator will format and analyze the data to uncover trends, strengths, gaps, etc., and give the Quarterly Evaluation Report to the Projects Leadership Committee where any modifications can suggested to the projects activities by anyone on the committee.</p> <p>The report and minutes of the meetings will be made available to the public at schools' Open Houses, district newsletters and mailings, links on the district website, and paper copies at the local school administrative office.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal lacks a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders for continuous improvements. In order to be high-quality the plan must have, at minimum, specific activities to be undertaken and a rational, timelines, deliverable, and parties responsible.</p> <p>The applicant reiterated what was in B2. In this section, for example, the proposal should specify that the Superintendent would meet with the Stakeholders quarterly to discuss adjustments in the budget after receiving the financial reports from the Project Director each quarter. If the budget needs adjusting, then it will be published in the newspaper for transparency sake.</p> <p>However, the proposal does state that the superintendent meets with the different groups and stakeholders. The will keep communication ongoing with the different groups.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The goals are quite ambitious and may be unachievable for some of the students. For example, the goal for performance on the WKCE may be unachievable for Students with Disabilities and Black not Hispanic of the students in math. The Black-not Hispanic students must raise the percentage scores from 50 to 85. This is 35 percentage points in five years. The Students with Disabilities must raise the percentage scores from 40 to 85. This is 45 percentage points in five years. The other subgroups are raising 10 to 20 points in the same amount of time.</p> <p>In grades 4-8 on the WKCE, again the goal for Students with Disabilities may be unachievable also. The Students with Disabilities must raise their percentage scores from 26 to 85. This is 59 point is five year.</p> <p>Another reason one of the goals seems to be unachievable is the performance measure for graduation rate. The ELL and Students with Disabilities are expected to increase at a steady rate and then between SY 2015-16 and SY 2016-17 make no improvement. Then the following year, after the grant period, both subgroups are to jump 15 percentage points to 100 percent graduation rate.</p> <p>On the other hand, the goal for completing the FASFA form for all students by SY 2017-2018 is 50 %. This is a very low expectation when the graduation rate is expected to be 100% in all subgroups by that same year. If the district actually expects that to be the case and approximately 70-90% of the students come from low income families, it would behoove the schools to encourage more students to complete the FASFA forms and make that a more ambitious goals.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A high-quality plan has goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. In evaluating the effectiveness of investments, the applicant has made the external evaluator and the data collection specialist responsible for creating the evaluation and collecting all the documentation. The process was briefly explained in the proposal. The findings would be incorporated into the Quarterly Evaluation Reports and Annual Evaluation Reports.</p> <p>The proposal was not specific as to which activities or investments would be evaluated or if all would be evaluated. The proposal indicated "unique project activities." The proposal should have been more specific.</p> | | |

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables identifies all funds that will support the project including the Race to the Top – District grant; Title I; Title II; Title III; Stateline Community Foundation; Community Partners; CLC; SAGE; and School District of Beloit.</p> <p>The budget tables are reasonable and support the implementation of the rationale of the proposal.</p> <p>Not clear however are the one-time investments versus that that will be ongoing. There are some that are obvious, but some that are not so obvious. For example, in the Educational Center, the \$500,000 technology expenditure was not explained fully. The applicant fail to address how is the technology will be maintained and kept up to date.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A high-quality plan has the key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan</p> <p>For this particular project goal, the applicant chose to list the many projects in the proposal. There was no plan in place. For each of the projects briefly discussed, the applicant listed the funding source to sustain the project or funding source sought. No timelines or persons responsible are listed.</p> <p>The proposal does list funding sources that will help sustain the project in the future, i.e., the District's operating budget, State of Wisconsin SAGE funds, and federal grants.</p> <p>The plan does not include how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use of tis data to inform future investments.</p> <p>Again, the proposal does not bring the sustainability into a cohesive high quality plan to give it credibility.</p> | | |

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 3 |
| <p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>To meet the competitive priority points a coherent and sustainable partnership to support the plan must be explained. The partnerships are explained but are not in a plan that is formed to make the plan coherent or sustainable. The partnerships are individually discussed without bringing together a plan.</p> <p>The desired results have some of the same problems as the proposal in that all of the goals may not be attainable.</p> | | |

The tracking measures that the proposal intends to use were not explained in a way so that the reader was able to recognize how each measure would obtain the desired results for the students in the LEA.

As noted earlier the goals used to target results for the students involved in the proposal may be too ambitious to be fully realized by the students with disabilities and the black-not Hispanic population. Goals to help the English Language Learners are more obtainable in the proposal.

The proposal states that the partner-driven after-school mentoring component will be expanded throughout the district as positive adult role-model mentor volunteers are formed.

The applicant believes that as proof of results are established in the community, expanded services will increase.

Assessment of the needs and assets of participating students will be conducted by the Boys and Girls to be shared with partnering agencies to provide modifications of the defined goals. Other data will be obtained from school assessments and a variety of other data sources within the community.

Quarterly evaluation reports which will highlight student impact of subgroup populations was stated to create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports the individual needs of participating students. Unfortunately individual data needs to be pored over to create a personalized learning environment for the individual student.

Being part of the leadership committee, completing surveys, or encouraging students' parents to communicate with administration is the proposal's engagement of parents and families in both decision-making about solutions to improve results over time and in addressing student, family, and school needs. Direct, open communication or two-way conversation was not discussed.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |

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



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0112WI-2 for School District of Beloit

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A.1. The applicant, a good size school district in the State of Wisconsin, proposes to develop a personalized learning environment by designing and implementing programs and services which will seek to understand the whole child from the standpoint of the principal teacher, utilize assessment tools, and build teacher capacity to meet student needs through

professional development and coaching. Specific programs which will be developed will focus on early learning, afterschool, employment, and training. The applicant provides an explanation for each of the programs and supports each with a description. For example, the early learning project will reach out to parents and provide monthly parenting classes, will establish an early literacy center, increase collaboration between early learning programs and the school district, and involve community in early literacy programs. All programs are aligned closely with the state department of education and the Common Core Standards. Student personalized learning experiences will be implemented through extensive teacher training and classroom instruction. While the program presented is focused and coherent, the applicant does not address key elements of the four core educational assurances. For example, the applicant does not explain how it will seek to specifically turn around the lowest performing schools. It is unclear from the statement if the district has identified any schools that have priority relative to the high needs of the students. All schools and all students will be addressed by all programs being proposed. Also unclear is whether the programs will include a data system that is unique to the programs being proposed. These omissions do not support a comprehensive or unified effort to personalize learning environments for youngsters with unique and specific needs. More precise information is needed to assess how individualized the proposed academic and academic support programs will be.

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

10

7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A.2. The applicant indicates that the project will operate in all 14 schools and will reach all students. The total district enrollment is 6937 students and 447 educators. The applicant reports that 77.4% of the students are from low income families and that 15.2% are high need students. All schools are identified and listed in appropriate tables. In describing its decision to include all students, the applicant fails to explain its overall rationale for not giving priority to certain schools. For example, one of its schools has 96.8% of its students coming from low income families. It is unclear why the applicant did not identify this as a school needing special focus and programming.

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

10

6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A.3. The plan provided by the applicant is focused on intensive training and coaching for all teachers and best practices and research-based strategies that will result in a personalized learning environment for all students. The plan includes activities, the timelines, outcomes, and personnel involved in carrying out the activities. In its supporting narrative, the applicant states it will emphasize the Core State Standards, curriculum based on Understanding by Design, 21st Century Skills, and culturally relevant pedagogy. The information for each of the four project areas is included in a table which includes the required components. While the information included in the plan is generally appropriate, the specificity of the various components is at times lacking. For example, this plan does not have specific measurable objectives or goals. It provides process activities for each of the four components of the overall program such as "Monthly Parenting Classes" without any explanation of the content or purpose. In most cases, the supporting timeline is general (e.g., Month five – ongoing) and indicates that the outcome will simply be that the parents will have new access. Included also are staff members, but no mention of the project director. As a result, the deliverables are somewhat vague and difficult to determine if the proposed services and activities can be translated into meaningful reforms.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A.4. The applicant includes the appropriate tables in which it establishes its vision for improving student learning and performance. In addition to student demographics, the applicant provides goals for improved student outcomes and decreasing achievement gaps. The proficiency rate for all students in reading is projected to be 75.7% as compared to the current baseline of 20.4%. In math, proficiency is projected to be 76.5% in 2016–17 as compared to the current 32.8%. Similar projections are made for all student subgroups in terms of the achievement gap. The applicant projects that the overall graduation rate will be 98% in 2016–17 as compared to the current 84.8%. The college enrollment rate is projected to go from the current 20% to 34% in 2016–17. In general, the projections that support the vision are reasonable and achievable. In some specific cases, however, the applicant may be overly ambitious in stating its goals. The LEA goals for such subgroups as Students with Disabilities seem overly ambitious. For example, the applicant projects very substantial improvement in reading and mathematics for this subgroup. In reading, the applicant proposes that in four years this subgroup will go from a low of 16% (2012-2013) to a high of 75% (2016-2017). In math the group will go from a low of 18.1% (2012-2013) to a high of 73% (2016-2017). These projected gains are very optimistic for this group with special needs and special requirements. The applicant offers a very modest gain in college enrollment rates without explaining the elements of its decision-making in this regard. These inconsistencies make it unclear if the applicant follows a rational decision-making process in setting the objectives.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 8 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>B.1. To demonstrate a record of success, the applicant provides a number of examples of student progress in the school. The applicant reports that in one elementary school, the fourth grade saw a 5.3 point growth in mathematics while the fifth grade gained 10 points. Similar gains were identified in another elementary school in the area of English/Language Arts. In its narrative, the applicant indicates that one of its schools was identified by the Wisconsin Department of Education to be in need of additional training, professional development, and resources. As a result, the school received a variety of support programs to assist it. While the programs were identified, there is no information to indicate that the programs were successful and how they specifically impacted students. Furthermore, there is a general lack of consistency across all schools in terms of any reform efforts. While there are some excellent examples, it is unclear how many of the 14 schools have seen success in a regular consistent fashion over the last four years. More specific information focused on all schools and all students is needed to determine if there is a consistent and pervasive record of improving student achievement, graduation rates, and college enrollment. In particular, the applicant does not provide specific information about its lowest performing schools and how they have improved in the specific subject areas as a result of specific academic or academic support programs. As a result, a four-year record of progress cannot be determined. In terms of transparency, the district reports that it makes information available to all stakeholders. Student data and test scores are shared with students and parents. Students and parents also have access to a 24 hour data reporting system and are able to see test scores immediately. While the district reports these activities, it does not indicate how successful these programs are in actually reaching parents and what the levels of participation are. In general, more specific information on outcomes would strengthen the statement.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>B.2. To enhance transparency, the applicant points out that all board meetings and budget sessions are open to the public. All board policies are posted on its website. The website contains information on how to contact the administrators and others. Much information was recently released for a board referendum. For that effort the board and administrators held many local information sessions to examine programs and finances. The applicant indicates that staff and salary data are submitted to the state which includes them on its website. The district provides paper copies of this information upon request. While the applicant is clearly meeting its responsibility to inform the public, it is also possible that it could enhance these activities with a more interactive process. It is unclear if the applicant has taken any action as a result of feedback that it has received as a result of local information sessions or distribution of the information. It would be helpful if the applicant described a process to deal with feedback and a policy of responding to any inquiries made by any of the stakeholders.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>B.3. The applicant is a local school board which in the State of Wisconsin has local control of schools. The applicant reports that it meets the statutory requirements of being school district and exercises its responsibility to govern. The brief statement does not include a description of how the statutory empowerment results in a personalized learning environment. In its statement, the applicant does not address how this structure will enable it to uniquely implement the four strategies that it has developed. While legally it has the authority to implement the programs and services, it is unclear how it will organize itself and lead the stakeholders toward a successful implementation.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 4 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>B.4. The applicant provides specific examples of support from a number of organizations and groups. Included are alumni groups, Beloit College, Blackhawk Technical College, the Chamber of Commerce, Stateline Boys and Girls Clubs, and parent organizations. In addition to describing their roles in the program, the applicant includes letters in the appendix from</p> | | |

these groups. Included in the appendix is a letter signed by the teacher organization supporting the overall project. While the organizations and groups have provided letters of support, it is unclear what actual involvement each will have in the project. In some cases, there is a record of involvement in school-based programs, but there is little information about what role any one of the groups will play in implementing the activities creating a personalized learning environment. More specific information about what role these organizations will play in decision-making, program development, and other involvement in the project is needed.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

C.1. The applicant is proposing a model that begins with parents upon the birth of their children and carries on through the school years until ready to enter college employment. The early literacy and after-school programs seek to support the students by improving attendance, behavior, grades and motivation to succeed. Using an employability counselor, the applicant works directly with students and families, assisting them in gaining college admissions or entrance to training programs for a desired career. Well-trained teachers enable the students to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, and problem solving. These approaches are based on research developed by the National Association of School Psychologists and reflect the benefits of Positive Behavioral Supports. The applicant cites research showing that the system results in a 90% reduction in problem behavior. This approach is supported with intensive ongoing training for staff which will focus on small group instruction, student led group learning investigation, large group instruction, one on one instruction, and technology facilitated teaching. In class instruction will be supplemented by online, credit bearing high school coursework for high school students. The staff will create unique lesson plans for each student which will allow teachers and parents to provide support and learning opportunities on an individual basis. Regular and ongoing feedback aligned with these lesson plans will be available for students and parents to view at any time. Students will also participate in training with each new technology or resource that is presented in class. While these activities represent important and responsible approaches to change, the overall response does not include the elements of a highly effective plan. The applicant does not identify specific goals nor does it not align the above described activities with goals or deliverables. No timelines are provided. It is unclear what personnel will be involved in the various activities and to what extent these activities focus on specific subject areas. Also unclear is how the technology available to the district will be used. Overall, while the activities are very worthwhile, it is unclear how these activities will ultimately result in a personalized learning environment for each student in the district. More precise information is needed to determine if students will be able to develop critical skills such as goal setting, teamwork, and problem solving as a result of the proposed activities. A more detailed description of the actual sequence of instruction is needed.

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 10 |
|--|-----------|-----------|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

C.2. This aspect of the project focuses on the proposed training center which aims to increase teacher effectiveness and expand the access of students to high-quality educators. Building on a current coaching system, the applicant plans to continue to provide professional development for coaches and support mentoring students for personal learning experiences. Inherent in the process is the selection of teacher leaders who are then trained to become coaches. These coaches then work directly in the schools, assisting both teachers and students. The process is based on the Danielson Model for Effective Teaching. Currently, teachers meet twice weekly for Professional Learning Communities in their buildings and one morning once a month at the district level. The overall process is aligned with the Common Core State Standards, curriculum development, culturally relevant teaching, and the skills, knowledge, and expertise associated with the 21st Century Learning Framework. Students are assessed in grades six through 12 by two or more touch point assessments to determine individual reading levels. Overall, the process provides regular feedback to teachers seeking to personalize their instruction. Less information on training and feedback for administrators is present in the narrative. While the applicant specifically mentions principals doing walkthroughs, there is little information about what training principals will receive and how coaching impacts on them. Also missing is information concerning formal teacher evaluation and how it is part of this overall process. The applicant provides a very broad range of programs, but does not provide specific goals and objectives for each of these activities that could be measured. For example, what are the specific activities which will enable them to raise the effectiveness of teachers and principals. Overall, the applicant provides descriptions of very positive programs but does not organize them effectively into a plan. Missing are specific objectives, a specific set of activities that will result in a personalized learning environment and a means to measure progress of students. The

applicant does not provide a timeline for its various activities nor does it specifically identify key personnel who will carry out these activities. The elements of a highly effective plan are missing. As a result, it is unclear how the applicant will use technology to motivate and deepen learning for all participating students and meet academic needs, thus impacting on graduation rates and college readiness.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

D.1. Applicant indicates that it has added central office staff that will assist them in better administering the project and providing support to the individual schools. The additional staff will report to the assistant superintendent of instructional services. While the principals will remain in charge of the schools, their activities will be supported by a school leadership team which will include teachers from all grade levels and a representative from the parent organization. Based on the information provided and narrative, it is unclear what the school leadership teams will be able to influence. Besides providing feedback, it is unclear if they will be involved in decision-making.

In addition to the regular school programs, students will be able to demonstrate mastery through alternate environments which will allow students to be accelerated. Gifted and talented students will be able to participate in cluster grouping. The applicant will also employ differentiation in the curriculum as well as flexible grouping and advanced placement courses. The applicant also indicates that students have multiple opportunities to attain mastery and make improvements in order to show attainment of a standard. Somewhat unclear is how these programs operate and provide specific opportunities and practice. Included are general descriptions of what is available. The applicant describes learning resources and practices for both students with special needs and English Language Learners. Included are co-teaching processes, assistive technology, transitional services, and instruction that involves the least restrictive environment.

Overall, the response lacks the elements of a highly effective plan. Missing are specific objectives, deliverables, a timeline, and specific personnel who will be involved in the process. As a result, the information lacks focus and organization.

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|---|-----------|----------|

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

D.2. To support the overall program, the training Academy will provide extensive instruction to all District educators in the integration of technology into the classroom. Specifically, teachers and coaches are trained to guide students which will result in improved student achievement and an enhanced commitment to learning. To ensure that all stakeholders are knowledgeable of these programs, the applicant reports that an Innovation Coach will be assigned to each building. Training sessions are also provided for parent groups to understand the student management systems. In addition, the district employs a technology program which allows students to recover credits during the summer and the school year. To ensure that there is an interoperable data system, the district uses the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) to collect and maintain student and staff information. While these activities may impact on individual student achievement, it is unclear what the precise relationship they have with the overall project. Missing are the components of a highly effective plan which includes specific objectives aligned with activities and deliverables. Missing also is a timeline to make some judgments about progress. As a result, it is difficult to determine if the project has an appropriate structure to assist all stakeholders, particularly parents, in using technology and dealing with an open data format.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 7 |

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

E.1. The applicant notes that it will provide a rigorous continuous improvement process which will include regular feedback. The process will include data or indicators on academics, school environment, instructional effectiveness, and professional development. The project director will be assisted by a project leadership committee comprised of administrators and other educators as well as volunteer parents and students. Quarterly evaluation reports will be produced. Summaries of project progress will be included in newsletters and mailings as well as at open houses. Individual stakeholders can request copies of all reports. Overall, the narrative lacks the elements of a high quality plan. The applicant does not provide specific goals, timelines, and deliverables. In particular, it is unclear to what extent the applicant has developed its activities to determine if their investment in professional development, technology, and staff is positive. Information about outcomes for each of these areas is very vague and does not reflect precise measurement.

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

5

2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

E.2. The applicant indicates that it will continue to provide open access to all project activities. It will have regularly scheduled update sessions to discuss the budget, project information, and strategic plan updates. The superintendent's roundtable includes a cross-section of the stakeholders including parents, community members, and businesses. Regular sessions are planned for the parent teacher organizations as well. It is unclear if the applicant will also use web-based communication strategies to enhance transparency. Overall, the statement fails to provide the components of a high quality plan which causes it to lack focus on specific audiences and stakeholders. A plan would enable it to establish specific activities for staff, parents, students, and community members.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

E.3. The applicant provides performance measures concerning teacher and principal effectiveness as well as for students participating in the project. By the end of the project, the applicant proposes that all participating students will have highly effective teachers and principals at the 78% rate. Subsequent tables indicate that the applicant projects proficiency rates in both reading and math for all student subtest groups to be 80%. Some tables have data missing or simply not collected. However, without a high quality plan, the performance measure may have limited value. It is unclear how the applicant developed its projections for the various subgroups. For example, in both math and reading, all subgroups will reach the 80% measure in both reading and math. One of the subgroups, Students with Disabilities, has a baseline of 40% while the other subgroups have baselines which range from 50% to 75%. The projections are somewhat inconsistent and may not be achievable.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

E.4. The applicant indicates that the external evaluator and the actual data will provide a measure of effectiveness of the project. Appropriate data will be collected and reported quarterly and annually by the project. It will include both qualitative and quantitative data sources. However, the information does not include the components of a highly effective plan. Missing are goals, a timeline, deliverables, specific activities, and personnel.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

F.1. The budget document includes an explanation of the funds requested in the grant program as well as monies needed from other sources. For example, the overall cost for coaches is approximately \$29 million, of which \$16 million will come from RTT funds. The remaining \$17 million will come from a match from the school district. The match will include funds from Title I, Title II, and Title III district funds as well as the regular school budget. Other activities have secured funding from partners or local foundations. Overall, the budget request for year one is just over \$3.7 million. The allocations

included in the application reflect reasonable and responsible amounts for personnel, fringe, travel, and other expenses. The applicant indicates that RTT funding will be primarily allocated as a one-time investment. The applicant provides an explanation for each of the expenditures and for each project area. Overall, the allocations reflect investments in development of the teachers and staff which will have a long-term effect on student achievement and progress. In addition, the funds will provide the district with knowledge and talent, reflecting a solid investment in human capital.

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

10

4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

F.2. The applicant provides a listing of key program areas and identifies the sources of funding for each. For example, the training center budget is \$2.7 million. \$1.7 million will come from RTT funds and \$1 million will come from the district operating budget. To continue these projects, the applicant will seek strong partnerships with community businesses and other funding sources. While the applicant identifies a number of potential funding sources, it does not offer a high quality plan which would include objectives, a timeline, expected deliverables, and personnel who are responsible to accomplish the task.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that the project proposal was developed by district staff and shared with the board and other stakeholders in the business and general communities. Various partnerships have been developed by the applicant and are described in this section. Included are partnerships with the local Economic Development Corporation, Beloit College, Blackhawk Technical College, Boys and Girls Club, and other community and health agencies. The partnerships described are active and supportive of the activities described in the proposal.

Also included in the statement are more than 10 population level desired results which focus on educational programs, family and community, and the specific grade levels. The population level desired results reflect a reasonable progression of gains by the project. As a result, all are ambitious and achievable.

All support the overall activities of the project. Using both qualitative and quantitative data, the project staff and external evaluator will assess the progress of the project toward reaching these goals. The data collection specialists will design programs, support the tracking system and generate at least monthly reports. These activities will be reviewed by the Project Leadership Committee. This aspect of the application is very vague and lacks specific information about when this process will occur and what specific data will be collected. It is also unclear how the system will target resources and assist special student populations such as students with disabilities or English Language Learners. Similarly, no information is provided concerning how the model will be scaled to address high need learners over time and then share that information with parents.

The ongoing partnerships provide a number of services for the project. For example, the Boys and Girls Club conduct ongoing assessments using their Youth Risk Behavior Survey to assist the committee in making decisions about the success of the project. Working with the partners, the Committee reviews data and shares a quarterly evaluation report with all stakeholders. The Committee is comprised of parents, family members, students, and others and meets at least on a bi-annual basis. While the applicant provides a number of examples of these activities, it is unclear just how extensive and comprehensive the involvement of the partners is in the project activities.

It is unclear from the statement how the applicant and the partners will address the issue of building staff capacity. While there are a number of incidental activities that are described, there is no comprehensive or organized response to this criteria. The applicant states it will assess needs, identify and inventory them, create a decision-making process, and assess applicant progress, but does not provide any supporting details to explain how these tasks will be accomplished. Much of the responsibility is assigned to the Project Leadership Committee, without providing any specific information concerning the procedures and processes that the committee will follow.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to develop a personalized learning environment by developing and implementing programs and services which will seek to understand the whole child from the standpoint of the principal teacher, will utilize assessment tools, and will build teacher capacity to meet student needs through professional development and coaching. Specific programs which will be developed will focus on early learning, afterschool, employment, and training. The applicant states it will emphasize the Core State Standards, curriculum based on Understanding by Design, 21st Century Skills, and culturally relevant pedagogy. These programs have the potential for raising student achievement levels, building teacher capacity, and improving individual schools.

Building on a current coaching system, the applicant plans to continue to provide professional development for coaches and support mentoring students for personal learning experiences. Inherent in the process is the selection of teacher leaders who are then trained to become coaches. These coaches then work directly in the schools, assisting both teachers and students. To support the overall program, the training Academy will provide extensive instruction to all District educators in the integration of technology into the classroom. Specifically, teachers and coaches are trained to guide students which will result in improved student achievement and an enhanced commitment to learning.

While the applicant has provided a number of potentially successful programs, it has not supported them in some cases with high-quality plans. In discussing its proposed learning program, it is unclear how these activities will ultimately result in a personalized learning environment for each student in the district. More precise information is needed to determine if students will be able to develop critical skills such as goal setting, teamwork, and problem solving as a result of the proposed activities. In describing its approach to teaching and leading, the applicant is unclear about what the precise relationship the proposed activities will have with the overall project. Missing are the components of a high quality plan which includes specific objectives aligned with activities and deliverables. Missing also is a timeline to make some judgments about progress. As a result, it is difficult to determine if the project has an appropriate structure to assist all stakeholders, particularly parents, in using technology and dealing with an open data format.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 109 |
|--------------|------------|------------|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0112WI-3 for School District of Beloit

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant has set forth a significant plan that builds on the its current work in the four core educational assurance

areas. The plans for development include highly ambitious goals such as developing and implementing plans to actively engage all students in settings and achieving high academic and career expectations for themselves. The plan provides strategies that will build on the Five Year Strategic Plan currently in place and provide for increased student achievement. However, the applicant did not specifically address how to they will work specifically with their lowest performing schools.

b. The applicant provides concrete high quality components to implement their model of personalized learning including key activities such as building teacher capacity to meeting student needs by training and coaching and intensive data analysis. These activities described will likely lead to increased student learning and increased equity. The applicant did indicate that student interests would be taken into consideration, through the use of interest surveys.

c. The applicant did adequately describe though their high quality plan what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. In particular, teachers will be offered ongoing teacher trainings and participate in loop coaching and students will be exposed to increased literacy intervention activities.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant provided a high quality plan that describes the process the applicant used to select the school that will participate, including school populations from low income families and high need students.

b. The applicant has provided a high quality plan that will include all schools in the district.

c. The applicant has provided a high quality plan that will includes a description of the total number of participating students, the percentage of students from low income families, high need students and participating educators.

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

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a convincing plan that describes how the reform proposal will be scaled up including intensive training and coaching for all teaches which will likely increase student access to effective teachers. The proposal includes an early learning project that will likely increase learning among preschool learning among low income families. The afterschool program encompassed within the plan will increase community engagements through the mentoring program, which will also likely increase academic outcomes for high school students. However, while the applicant included ambitious activities that will be included as part of the plan, the applicant did not provide explicit objectives for the activities detailed.

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

10

7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant has provided a plan that includes ambitious annual goals for all subgroups, however, it is unclear that the goals are achievable. For example, the applicant has indicated that 7.4% of students with disabilities were proficient in reading in 2011 and by 2017 it is expected that 80% of the students in the subgroup will meet reading proficiency. It is unclear through this plan that such a great academic increase will occur over a 6 year period.

b. The applicant has provided a high quality plan that is likely to result in the ambitious and achievable goals for decreasing the achievement gaps that currently exist. The goals presented are realistic and highly achievable given the current rates of achievement among all subgroups. The applicant is expecting that through the implementation of the plan, the achievement gap will be completely reduced by the end of the grant cycle.

c. The graduation rate goals that the applicant has provided are achievable and ambitious. Given the current rate of 87% high school graduation, the increase to 100% will likely occur as a result of the after school program suggested as part of the plan.

d. The applicant has provided a plan that includes achievable and ambitious college enrollment goals. While the goals are low, they are achievable given the low college enrollment rates that currently exist among the student population.

e. n/a

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 7 |
| (B)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>1a. The applicant has provided clear and convincing evidence of improved student learning outcomes and the closing of academic achievement gaps, among their students over the past four years. Literacy and math rates have increased among all subgroups. However, the applicant did not provide any evidence of increased high school graduation rate and college enrollment rates in the past four years.</p> <p>b. The applicant has not provided any evidence to demonstrate that they have achieved ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest achieving schools. While the applicant identifies the school and identifies that a plan has been developed for the school, the applicant has not provided evidence that reforms have been achieved in the past four years.</p> <p>c. The applicant has provided appropriate evidence that demonstrates that they make student performance data available to students, educator and parents through individual emails, phone calls and 24 internet access to student grades.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| (B)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>a. The applicant provided appropriate evidence that information with respect to actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff are submitted and posted on the state department website, further all of this information available in paper form to any resident of the district who requests it.</p> <p>b/c - The applicant did not provide any description of evidence that they make available data for actual personnel salaries for instructional staff only and for teachers only</p> <p>d. The applicant ambiguously described how they provided transparency for the use of state and local funds. While the applicant provided evidence that the school board holds meetings to discuss budgetary issues including building referendums, the applicant did not fully explain how these budgetary decisions are made clear to those who do not attend these meetings or available in other forms.,</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| (B)(3) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The applicant has provided comprehensive evidence through state statutes that describe that they have sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments described in their proposal. The state statutes specifically indicate the goals of personalized learning environments and will support the plan outcomes.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 8 |
| (B)(4) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>aii. The applicant has indicated in their proposal that their district has a teacher's union is supportive of the plan. However, they provided no evidence of any support for the proposal from any teachers.</p> <p>b. The applicant has provided convincing letters of support form key stakeholders including evidence of engagement from the student body, the state superintendent, the chamber of commerce, the high school parent teacher organization and the headstart programs. The letters provide evidence that these stakeholders were involved in the planning process through various methods including surveys, committee work and ongoing dialogue.</p> | | |

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

ai. The applicant has provided high quality evidence that through their early learning program, mentoring program and training center that students will be understand the connection between their classroom learning and their post school life goals.

ii. The applicant has provided high quality evidence that demonstrates that through the employability and training center students will be provided with opportunities to adequately structure their learning to achieve their goals. The goals will adequately be tracked through the state and local district academic achievement exams.

iii. The applicant has appropriately provided good evidence that through the use of the Understanding by Design framework that teachers will be able to more clearly identify learning goals to deepen student understanding. The applicant has also appropriately identified that students will be involved in job shadowing experiences that will link to their selected employment fields. However, it is unclear whether or not students will participate in classes of specific academic interest.

iv. The applicant has provided insufficient evidence that students will be exposed to diverse cultures and perspectives that motivate student learning . While the applicant did identify that students will have access to iPads, it is not evidenced in the plan how this technology will be used to increase student learning through different perspectives and contexts.

v. The applicant has provided comprehensive high quality evidence that through trained coaches, students will master critical academic content and development skills to develop increased communication and critical thinking skills.

b. i The applicant has provided reasonable high quality evidence that through the creation of individual learning plans revised with each student annually that parents and educators can monitor student growth. These plans will follow the student each year as they continue on through grades in an effort to properly allow them to meet goals in an ongoing fashion. The applicant has provided complete evidence that these goals will ensure that students can graduate in a timely fashion.

ii. The applicant has presented reasonable high quality evidence that through the use of one on one, student led learning, large group instruction and technology facilitated instruction that students will be exposed to a variety of high quality instructional approaches.

iii. The applicant has demonstrated that students will have access to a variety of high quality content including digital learning content through the form of online credit bearing high school coursework and technology centered literacy interventions.

iv. A. The applicant has demonstrated that students will have access to frequently updated individual student data through monthly assessments that will linked to the students' individual learnings plans and goals.

B. The applicant has comprehensively demonstrated through a high quality plan that students will be given personalized learning recommendations based on the students' current knowledge and skills in the form of recommendations for advanced coursework, enrichments and additional online learning opportunities for students as needed and identified by the teachers who are trained to make those determinations based on data.

v. The applicant has detailed that their plan includes high quality strategies to assist high need students to meet college and career ready standards through the individual student learning plan. Additionally the applicant has evidenced that educators will pursue certification in dual language instruction to provide ELL students increased academic opportunities.

c. The applicant has presented good evidence that demonstrates that students and educators will be trained to use technology more efficiently and thoroughly, however, it is unclear if students will be provided training to use other non-technology based resources to manage their learning.

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 13 |
|--|-----------|-----------|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

ai. The applicant has demonstrated through a high quality plan that teachers will be trained to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies through the use of the teacher coaching looping model.

ii. The applicant has provided confusing evidence as to whether or not teachers will be able to adapt content and

instruction to provide opportunities for students to engage in tasks in response to their academic needs. While the applicant has identified that students are placed in varying ability groups, it is unclear whether or not individual student needs will be addressed by teachers in these settings based on student needs.

iii. The applicant has provided appropriate and good evidence that teachers will use the Springboard curriculum to prepare students to take ACT/SAT testing to prepare them for college/career requirements, however, it is unclear how often the teachers will assess students on the skills through use of this curriculum.

iv. The applicant has described a high quality plan that will utilize a comprehensive evaluation process that will improve teacher and principal practice and effectiveness that includes the use of feedback, coaching and reflective practice.

b. i. The applicant has provided sufficient high quality evidence that through the use of touch point assessments teachers will be able to use actionable information that will allow them to identify optimal learning approaches to respond individual student needs. While this high quality approach will be used in language arts, it is unclear how or if such information is available in the other subject areas for teacher use.

ii. The applicant has provided information that details that their plan that will encompass high quality curriculum design that are aligned to the Common Core State Standards and College Board college/career ready standards. However, it is unclear as to whether or not digital resources are aligned with the standards and graduation requirements.

iii. The applicant has provided scant evidence to support that there are processes and tools embedded in the plan to match student needs with specific resources and approaches to improve feedback with respect to the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs.

c.i. The applicant has provided evidence of a high quality plan that will garner information from the district teacher evaluation system that will permit school leaders to take steps to improve teacher effectiveness and school climate. In particular the Training Center described by the applicant provides evidence of a system of teacher evaluation that focuses on increasing teacher capacity to deepen instruction and close the achievement gap.

ii. The applicant has provided an innovative high quality practice through the use of the Training Center of a system whereby teachers will be continuous trained to improve student performance and decrease achievement gaps. In addition, teachers will be observed in groups comprising of administrators and fellow teachers to increase the overall school progress.

d. The applicant has presented a comprehensive high quality teacher training improvement plan that will likely result in more high quality teachers, however, the applicant did not present evidence of the percentage of how many students who will be taught by highly effective teachers and principals.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 12 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant has provided evidence of a comprehensive high quality plan to structure the central office to provide support to participating schools, including the use of curriculum supervisors and minority excellence coordinators who will provide direct support to school leaders and teachers.

b. The applicant has provided convincing high quality evidence in the plan that the district office supports school leadership teams and provides them with sufficient autonomy and flexibility to adapt plans according to the specific needs of the individual participating schools, including autonomous hiring and evaluation systems.

c. The applicant has provided comprehensive high quality evidence that they provide students an opportunity to progress based on mastery and not just time spent on a topic through acceleration scales, cluster grouping, differentiation and flexible grouping.

d. The applicant has provided good evidence that they provide students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards multiple times through the opportunities to take formative assessments several times until the student passes the exam, however, the applicant has provided no evidence that students are provided with opportunities to demonstrate mastery in multiple comparable ways.

e. The applicant has provided high quality evidence that they provide learning resources and instructional practices that meet the needs of all students including special education and ELL learners. The applicant has included sound practices such as assistive technology and co-teaching as part of their plan to assist all students.

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

10

10

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant has provided reasonable high quality evidence to show that participating students, parents and educators will have access to resources through online data access and access to technology to support the implementation of the plan. In addition, parent reports are also available in Spanish for ELL learners and their families.

b. The applicant has provided complete high quality evidence that all stakeholders will have access to technical support through the use of a Innovation Coach who performs technology training weekly. Additionally, technical support for all stakeholders is provided through a web-based help desk system housed at each school.

c. The applicant has appropriately evidenced through a high quality plan that parents and students have access to information technology systems that allow them to use data in other formats. The Student Information System used by the applicant is a comprehensive system that allows parents and students access to academic and demographic data for ongoing analysis.

d. The applicant has presented reasonable high quality evidence to demonstrate that the district's use of Skyward's School Business Suite allows the applicant use of an interoperable data system.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 15 |

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided strong high quality evidence that they will implement a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback toward project goals that is embedded with opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements. The applicant has specified the use of an external evaluator and data collections specialist who will monitor, measure and publicly share information on the quality of the goals as related to professional developed, technology and staff. Timely quarterly evaluation reports will be made available to all stakeholders.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented a comprehensive plan for ongoing communication with all stakeholders that includes project information sharing, strategic plan updates, superintendent roundtables, and community meetings to introduce new projects and to have ongoing dialog to make revisions for program implementation.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant has comprehensively described their rationale for selecting each measure that is clear, in that, all schools will be included in all measures.

b. The applicant has thoroughly evidenced that all data will be divided into subgroup details and be made available through the online management system to effectuate continuous improvement to the plan.

c. The applicant has appropriately specified that data will be collected monthly however, it is unclear how it will review and improve the measures over time.

| | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has presented a high quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of RTTD activities through the use of an external evaluator and data collection specialist. The applicant will closely examine data, budget concerns to assess the impacts of all activities on student success and the longitudinal outcomes of student achievement. This will allow the applicant to make adjustments and revisions during the implementation of the program.</p> | | |

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a. The applicant provides a comprehensive budget that identifies all funds that will support the project, including RTTD, matching funds from Title I, II, and III, the Stateline Community Foundation, and other other community partners.</p> <p>b. The applicant provides evidence of a reasonable and sufficient budget to support the development and implementation of the proposal that will allow for appropriate funding for all project details including details for specific projects including the training center, employability center, and Beloit Promise.</p> <p>c. i The applicant has provided a comprehensive and clear description of all funds that the applicant will use to support the proposal - including total revenue from Community partnership sources, and RTTD funds.</p> <p>ii. The applicant has comprehensively described which funds will be used for one time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs. For example, the applicant has described the costs from the grant that will be used to start the training center, and matching district funds that will be used at the completion of the grant cycle.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has comprehensively described how each new project proposed in the plan will be sustained upon the end of the grant cycle. The applicant has provided complete evidence through letters of support of a plan that includes support from the state and government leaders, and local community partners for fiscal support upon the completion of the grant cycle. The applicant did not provide evidence of how they intend to evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments.</p> | | |

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>1. The applicant has provided very strong evidence of the sustainable partnerships they have formed with community partners in support of the plan. The applicant has provided evidence of support from public and private systems and local colleges.</p> <p>2. The applicant has provided five very strong population level results for students, including that families with newborns will access early literacy programming annually and that students will participate in career and college training and exploration programs.</p> <p>3. a. The applicant did not provide evidence of how they will track selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the LEA.</p> <p>b. The applicant described evidence that supports that they will obtain detailed analysis of evaluation data to drive project modification to promote full attainment of plan goals and objectives. These data will also comprehensively track information for sub groups of children.</p> | | |

- c. The applicant has provided appropriate evidence that demonstrates that the model will be scaled to include no less than 5 high need schools within 2 years of implementation of the plan.
- d. The applicant has provided strong evidence that through their increased strategies such as after school services, community youth service agencies and increased local business involvement that it is likely that results will improve over time.
- 4. The applicant has provided reasonable evidence to show how their partnerships with several service organizations will integrate several educational services. For example, the partnership with Beloit College will offer summer academic programs to students, and the Boys and Girls club will support the behavioral and social growth of students.
- 5. a. The applicant has provided evidence that the partnership with the Boys and Girls Club and the district will build staff capacity by assessing the needs of participating students. The district will use the data provided will be used by the District Leadership Committee to made modifications for students.
- b. The applicant has appropriately demonstrated that the Project Leadership Committee will work with the district to evaluate and provide oversight of the needs of the school and community. This will be done by assessing a variety of data sources including the school report card data, and surveys distributed to youth , parents and community members.
- c. The applicant has appropriately created a decision making process through the Project Leadership Committee. The Committee will meeting quarterly to to evaluate subgroup and project specific data.
- d. The applicant has appropriately included parents, students, and family members as members of the Project Leadership Committee, to empower them in decision making about solutions to improve results for student and school needs.
- e. The applicant has appropriately evidenced that progress will be assessed quarterly to ensure progress in plan implementation.
- 6. The applicant has comprehensively provided annual ambitious and achievable performance measures for the population levels and described results for students. The applicant has provided evidence that shows subgroup performance measures that are also ambitious and achievable.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided comprehensive evidence of how it will build on the core assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to improve learning and teaching through personalization of strategies, tools and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college and career ready standards. Through the use of mentors and individualized student academic plans, the district will accelerate student achievement for all students. Additionally, the district has provided a thorough professional development plan that includes intensive coaching from both administrators and fellow teachers that will likely increase the access of all students to effective educators. All of these procedures in concert will likely result in decreased achievement gaps in the district.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 161 |
|--------------|------------|------------|

