



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0114PA-1 for School District of Philadelphia

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicants reform vision is aligned to the districts vision and integrates the four educational assurance areas of RttT. The applicant offers a clear and credible focus on efforts to improve literacy in grades K-3. Seven strategies are detailed to deepen student learning and address student achievement. Inclusive activities addressed equity for special needs and ELL Students. Detailed descriptions of the classroom experiences for both teachers and students participating in the personalized learning environment were included.</p> <p>No weaknesses noted</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths-</p> <p>The applicant detailed a process to select schools for participation in each cohort that randomly selected schools to allow for sufficient capacity during implementation. Due to the literacy need in the district, all K-3 schools will participate. Schools will be divided into two cohorts to better facilitate implementation and to allow for meaningful comparisons. A detailed list of the participating schools was provided. The total student numbers were included with the demographic information requested in the notice was provided.</p> <p>Weaknesses-</p> <p>It is unclear if the random approach to school selection will ensure that the students with the highest needs are served early in the grant. The justification for a random assignment of schools was not clearly addressed.</p> | | |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths: A high quality plan is presented with a logic model that describes a three dementional approach to improving student achievement in literacy for K-3 students. A plan to scale up is clearly articulated through the plan to address literacy needs as a strategy to better prepare students for challenging secondary programs to ensure students have the ability to reach college and career readiness goals.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Due to the grade levels selected it is not clear how the applicant will meet any graduation rate or college enrollment indicators required in the grant.</p> | | |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 3 |
| <p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths: The applicant provided ambitious and achievable goals aligned to the waiver granted in their state. They propose to raise literacy achievement in K-3 as a foundation for increased academic performance for upper grades as students matriculate. This approach addresses proficiency status and growth, decreasing achievement gaps, and ultimately increasing graduation and college enrollment. The goals proposed narrow achievement gaps.</p> | | |

Weakness: Goals were provided for the first year of the grant for forth, fifth, and 7th grade students. It is unclear what the division is doing to accomplish these goals since they are similar to the third grade goals. Some post grant goals for narrowing achievement gaps are not ambitious and are expected to remain over 40%. The applicant did not provide goals and information for all subjects and at all grade levels tested.

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 10 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The district had five years of growth, then a leadership change when a decline was seen. Graduation rates are up 4% over the prior year. Low performing schools are closing and high performing schools are offering more seats. A number of indicators demonstrated positive achievement initiatives in the district. The literacy initiative seems to be a strong and continuing initiative that has already demonstrated growth in 12 schools. The use of data has been a focus of the district to improve school culture in a system wide approach. The district has offered workshops, tutorials, demonstrations and outreach.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>It is unclear how this data informs and improves participation, instruction, and services. The user experience appears to be online only. It is unclear if all stakeholders have conductivity and can access this data. The record of success is unclear.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The district publishes and has the ability to share both system and school level budgets. The budgets included detailed personnel costs. The public budgets are detailed and transparent.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The applicant expressed that transparency in its processes, practices and investments was important, however much of the information was released on-line and in district documents. It is unclear how the public is made aware of the availability of information.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant provides state policies that demonstrate autonomy under legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements for personalizing learning for students at the high school level. Conditions support targeted literacy interventions and plans.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The application details a plan for Elementary levels. Regulatory requirements did not sufficiently address conditions and autonomy for the elementary level students included in the proposal. The applicant detailed the standard and the literacy plan in place but did not detail how these practices demonstrated successful conditions and autonomy to implement a personalized learning environment.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 15 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> | | |

The district held focus groups and visioning sessions during the formation of the grant. The applicant detailed how students, parents, teachers and principals were engaged in the program development. Plans were accelerated from three years to two based on educator excitement. Refresher sessions were added based on teacher feedback. A proposal website was created to allow feedback from parents and community members. Evidence that all stakeholders influence the plan was detailed. The applicant shared an early draft of the application with the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers and made several rounds of revisions based on the feedback. Impressive letters of support were included.

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

| | Available | Score |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 17 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) Strengths:

The applicant details a plan that includes the support of parents and educators that collaborates with the Harvard Strategic Data Project that demonstrated that students who read on grade level by the third grade have a higher possibility of graduating and going to college. Parents will be involved in identifying and measuring progress toward student literacy goals and students will gain an understanding of how to set goals with teachers and parents. The district will collaborate with the Free Library to ensure students and families receive the same message regarding literacy.

To deepen learning, students will produce text and receive: leveled texts, increased resources that reflect cultural diversity in the libraries, program research based word recognition programs, integrate media, and digital devices including reading apps to build skills and inclusion for all students including special needs and ELL students. The plan will assist all students to master critical content and skills to support their educational careers with strong collaboration between schools, parents and students.

Students will build communication skills with digital devices and learn the importance of setting goals/reaching goals.

a) Weaknesses:

It would have strengthened the application to provide further details regarding how high need students and their parents would be engaged and served through this project.

b) Strengths:

A personalized data profile will be created a map for eh student that will be used as a pathway for each individual student. Students will receive appropriate materials and teachers and students will adjust as students advance. A mixed method approach will be used that incorporates digital devices as engagement and assessment tools. Data will be used to allow teachers to adjust their techniques to meet students learning styles

A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments will be incorporated in this comprehensive plan. Both leveled and advanced, research based materials will support the project. High quality digital content will be included. The needs of diverse learners will be considered during the purchase process.

Ongoing and regular feedback will include individual student data collected through layered assessments: individual progress data, social and behavior data, and quarterly progress. Students will know whether they are on track and where additional support is needed. A web based system will be used for students to access, review and track their progress.

Learning playlists will be developed for each student. These playlists will be individualized to address the needs of students including ELL students and students with special needs. Technology will be used to further support ELL and Special Education students both socially and academically.

b) Weaknesses:

It would have strengthened the application to address the needs of students in poverty and to further connect college and career ready standards into the development of individual student maps and paths. For example, poverty is high in this district. It is unclear if parents and students will have the conductivity necessary to access some of the web based progress tools from home.

c) Strengths:

Support will be available during the introduction of the Mobile Devices and the division has experience with deploying technology for the use of students.

c) Weaknesses:

It is unclear what ongoing support will be offered, how technology devices will be maintained, and if the devices will need conductivity outside of the school buildings (or be available outside of the school buildings).

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

20

17

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a/b) Strengths:

Six core-training modules will support educators in personalizing the learning environment. These modules will be comprehensive and include on-line learning, onsite support, and constant feedback. These modules address the needs of high need students, literacy, personalizing instruction, socio-emotional needs, assessments, digital learning and working with parents. Both technology and instructional coaches will also provide support. Specific, well-qualified staff members were identified to assist with implementation and sufficient key staff will be engaged in this project. New staff will ensure support is feasible.

Training will be anchored within the Comprehensive Literacy Framework and the project will be phased in. Student devices will not be introduced until teachers have been trained. A detailed timeline was included for each phase with key goals, activities, methods of delivery, audience, objectives/deliverables, and responsible parties (a key component of a high quality plan).

All participating educators and school leaders will be trained and have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress. In addition, teachers will have access to evaluation data and principal feedback, as well as additional professional development resources aligned to the project from the Danielson Framework for Teaching.

a) Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

c) Strengths:

The school district has the professional development and technology structure to support this project. The district has adopted the Danielson Framework for Teaching. This system includes an observation tool that allows PD to be differentiated to target support for teachers and an on-line evaluation system.

The training, systems, and practices are in place to continuously improve student progress. Professional development days will be established, as well as quarterly face-to-face meetings, and symposia afterschool, in the summer, and on weekends.

c) Weaknesses:

The proposal did not include sufficient information regarding college and career readiness as a component of the training and teacher evaluation plan as part of the process for continual improvement.

d) Strengths:

The applicant has a plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from highly qualified teachers and principals. An education evaluation system is in place and a cadre of Consulting Teachers supports new teachers. Instructional coaches are also available.

d) Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address how high quality teachers and principals were provided in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education). It would have also strengthened the application to provide further details regarding the principal evaluation plan.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 10 |
| (D)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The district has made policy changes and the strategic Delivery Unit will work closely with the leadership staff to ensure support from the central office to implement the project. The district will offer the flexibility for the personalized learning model. Other schools in the division have already adopted a more personalized approach. Schools have control over bell schedules, staffing, and budgets (within formulas). Additional support is available for high need students and additional resources are available for low performing schools.</p> <p>The district has strong policies and a history supportive of graduating students based on content mastery rather than seat time. In addition virtual opportunities are available for all students.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>The policies described mostly related to high school students.</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| (D)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The district has a history of providing the infrastructure needed to all stakeholders. A variety of grants and programs are already in place through other initiatives for the entire school community.</p> <p>Technical support is in place for digital resources. The district has identified conductivity issues and the city of Philadelphia has partnered with a variety of city and community agencies and organizations to close the digital divide.</p> <p>Through partnerships with Pearson and their online Schoolnet Program, data systems operate in a ecosystem environment allowing data customized for parents, students, teachers and administrators.</p> <p>Data programs are arranged in a framework for interoperability between legacy and newer systems in the district.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>It is unclear how students will have conductivity outside of the school building.</p> | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

Strengths:

A high-quality plan to implement rigorous continuous improvement processes is in place. Continuous improvement will be achieved through program design strategies, in-class data use, program evaluation, and monitoring of the action plan. The plan involves multiple levels of feedback from Directors, teachers, parents, District leaders and other stakeholders. A strong system for monitoring, measuring, and publically sharing information is described. Data briefs will be distributes as well as quarterly reports, and annual reports.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

An Early Literacy Project Steering Committey will be established and will meet weekly to monitor progress. All stakeholders will be invited and a website will be developed. Multiple avenues to engage parents will be implemented. Family events will be hosted at participating schools to provide parents with local, personalized experiences.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

Fourteen detailed and ambitious yet achievable performance measures were presented. Rationals, measurements, and how the applicant will review and improve the measurements over time were specified. The charts defined subgroup and the number and percentage of participating students. Age-appropriate measures for growth were described. Continuous improvement was a strong focus in the performance measure descriptors.

Highly effective teachers and principal evaluation systems are being implemented state wide. Measurements are developed to address college and career readiness indicators. Socio- emotional development indicators are detailed.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The district has an Office of Research and Evaluation that designed a rigorous and sound evaluation plan. A logic model was provided to support the plan. Five overarching questions guide the evaluation. The schools will be randomly assigned to two cohorts. The comprehensive plan includes inputs/resources, activities, outputs, and both short and long term outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant identifies all funds that will support the project. The budget detailed is both reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal, and a clear rationale for investments and priorities, including was evident. Assumptions provided detail and the budget directly aligned to the high quality plan.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The source of the other contributions in the budget was not detailed.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The plan addressed how the applicant will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget, and include an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds. A plan is in place for the district to fund key staff starting in the final two years of the grant. The district is also committed to funding critical instructional materials. The professional development provided will be sustainable.</p> <p>Pennsylvania has a focus on teacher effectiveness and the Mayor's Office of Education has goals aligned with the grant. Mayors office has offered financial and other support.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>It was unclear how technology devices would be funded in a sustainable manner. The plan lacked support from State and local government leaders, financial support, and a description of how the applicant will 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 | 10 |
| <p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant detailed a strong partnership with the City of Philadelphia and the Penn Child Research Center. The Penn Research Center brings a decade of resources to address social, emotional, and behavioral needs of students. The partnership strategies are aligned with the district Key Anchor of Improving academic outcomes. The description provided with coherent and sustainable. Both of the partnerships contribute to the goals of the grant. The city has built an integrated data system to address the needs of vulnerable children and will continue to provide services to deepen the existing relationship. The Free Library will collaborate on literacy goals and provide a Wi-Fi area for parents and students.</p> <p>Nine population-level desired results for students in the LEA were provided that align with and support the applicant’s broader Race to the Top – District proposal.</p> <p>Tracking tools, including Schoolnet, were detailed to assess the population-level results. Multiple strategies were detailed to use the data to target resources and improve results.</p> <p>A three-pronged strategy will be used to scale up the model to ensure results improve over time. The partnerships will fully integrate early childhood education classrooms in elementary schools. The district and city have already seen success</p> | | |

using the integrated data system model.

The integration of education and social services will provide students and families with easily accessible supports and interventions.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |
| Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>Throughout the application, the School District of Philadelphia, described a evidence based plan to personalize the learning and increase college and career readiness through a literacy program targeting K-3 students. The applicants plan was focused but comprehensive. All stakeholders will be involved and multiple partnerships were described. Technology based strategies support individualized goals and assessments. The professional develop described is comprehensive and the district policies strongly support the project. The applicant offered convincing plan that has the support of their learning community.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 171 |
|--------------|------------|------------|



Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0114PA-2 for School District of Philadelphia

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>Vision is described in detail through the Superintendent's Action Plan v 1.0 and the accompanying Comprehensive Literacy Framework which clearly defines the goals of the district (1. Improve academic outcomes; 2. Financial stability and sustainability). The Comprehensive Literacy Framework provides explicit descriptions of actions expected and steps in the process of quality literacy instruction in the Kindergarten through Grade Three band. Through a detailed and focused approach on early childhood literacy and a defined goal of having students reading at or above grade level upon completion of grade three, the district acknowledges that the transference of achievement will matriculate through the grade bands with the students as they progress through the upper grades. A limited description of data systems and data usage is described. The district has implemented a comprehensive system to evaluate teachers and support new teachers through a peer mentor and review system. A brief description of turning around low performing schools is provided though it references primarily high schools and high school programs.</p> <p>The details of the Comprehensive Literacy Framework outline instructional practices that create learning environments tailored to meet the needs and interests of the students at their present level while working to accelerate their learning to</p> | | |

that of high levels. The process of working with students at their present level while preserving the same standards for all students is describe as a means to accelerate learning and increase the percentage of students performing at or above grade level (or scoring advanced or proficient on state assessments). The district describes that process of building a strong foundation of literacy in order to increase the success of students in subsequent years of education.

The Comprehensive Literacy Framework describes in detail what literacy instruction should look like for both students and teachers. Each component of the instructional model is described to tell explicitly what students do and gain from the experience as well as what teachers do during each phase of instruction. Descriptions also describe the opportunities to tailor instruction based on student needs (for example, reading level and/or text difficulty), student interests (selection of texts titles, nonfiction/fiction), and variety of instructional learning tasks (descriptions of center activities as they correlate to literacy instruction).

This section score in the high range because it details a very focused, clear and credible approach to early literacy instruction aligned to current standards. However, limited information is provided regarding two of the four core assurance areas (turning around low performing schools and use of data). Though a brief summation is provided the information seems only vaguely related to the primary goal of the district (to increase early childhood literacy rate).

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has submitted a clear and comprehensive plan to include all schools servicing grades Kindergarten through Grade 3. The applicant clearly identifies the schools participating through the inclusion of all schools serving grades kindergarten through grade three. The total student participation is estimated to be approximately 52,722. Of the participating students, 76% are high-need, 71% are from low-income families. The number of educators (1757) were included in the plan. The schools were defined by their school number and percentages provided for all specified categories of the application as evidenced in the data table provided. The applicant defines a phased in approach by including one half of schools in year one, assessing progress and approach, adjusting as needed, and phasing in the second half of schools in a second cohort.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant proposes to build a stable and strong foundation in literacy by focusing its efforts on early childhood literacy in grades kindergarten through three. It is anticipated the results of developing students who leave grade three reading at or above grade level will translate in to success in later grades and preparedness for college and/or career. The overall goal to improve student achievement is supported by the initiative of the applicant to produce students who are reading and ready to learn when they leave the formative years of early elementary. The plan targets the research based instructional methods for quality reading instruction in early childhood with an emphasis on the five areas of reading instruction.

Additionally, plans outline how to target the instruction to meet the individual needs of the students--(English Language Learners, students with Individualized Education Plans, literacy deficits, etc.). Strong correlations of students reading on grade level at the conclusion of grade three and their success in high school are presented and supported with documented research.

Overall, this scores in the high range. While research does support the need for early childhood literacy and its impact in later years, the applicant does not describe how it will capitalize on the increased literacy capacity of students in later years and maintain and/or continue to progress the literacy of the students. It is not clear the responsible parties and deliverables of the plan.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Data indicates that the applicant proposes to increase student performance on state assessments in later years due to the fact the primary grades are not assessed. Assessment measures do not begin until grade three at the state level. Since the focus of this application is on primary grades (Kindergarten through grade 3) there are explicit data points until grade three but are expected rather as the students involved matriculate through the grades. Applicant does propose significant increase in students performing proficient or advanced on state assessments in reading. Data projections suggest the achievement gaps will be closed by 50 percent over the course of five years. Graduation rates are projected for increase though not to the point of the defined goal of 85%. College enrollment rates are projected to increase though it is noted there are factors (finances, familial obligations, etc.) impacting college enrollment. Goals established exceed the state standard for academic growth for the categories of summative assessments for Reading PSSA and graduation rates,

overall and for subgroups.

With a focus on the primary grades, it will be some time before results of the proposal are seen in the higher grades (high school). It is valid that increasing the success, particularly in literacy, of students in the primary grades, the results would translate into greater success in subsequent grades.

While data is provided and goals are set, the graduation rate is still lacking in ambition and does not narrow in on the specified goal. Enrollment rates are indicated with very minimal increases. There is no data presented to demonstrate math performance on summative assessments.

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>The district demonstrates a moderate track record of success though longitudinal data is lacking. There has been an increase in the graduation rate (4%) which exceeds the trends in the area but still does not reach the stated goal of 85%. There is no disaggregate data to identify that gaps between groups are being closed in any of the subject areas. It is evidenced the district is making strides to turn around low achieving schools through the closure and consolidation of schools while expanding seats in high performing schools as well as its reduction of persistently dangerous schools over the course of four years. It is not evident how it is noted the district did experience an increase in effective reading instruction though the data only covers the time period of one year.</p> <p>The district utilizes an Instructional Management System (IMS) to provide a comprehensive data platform that assimilates numerous data for parents, teachers and students. Data includes assessments, attendance, grades, as well as instructional resources. Data and resources are provided to parents, students and teachers. Training is provided to all parties on the use and implementation of the IMS.</p> <p>Overall this scores in the medium range. While there does exist some points of improvement and success, data is not reflective of a clear track record of success nor is it longitudinal in its presentation. Though some data is presented, the data is for very short period of times which do not attest to an established momentum of success.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| (B)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The district has in place a comprehensive system and reporting method for denoting all financial reports with a true transparency for the public. Salaries of all employees (instructional, teachers, and support staff) are reported by school level and district level. Expenditures for purchases as well as their purpose are also provided. Reports are provided on-line for access and are presented in a public forum to the School Reform Commission. Examples of reports were provided as supporting evidence of the level of transparency provided. Sample reports provided evidence the transparency of personnel salaries by categories as well as expenditures. Overall the applicant demonstrated a high level of transparency.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| (B)(3) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The district clearly demonstrates its authority to implement the early childhood literacy goals expressed within the application. Goals contained within the application are aligned with state adopted Common Core Standards as well as with the district comprehensive literacy plan. There exists no regulatory requirements that would prohibit the successful implementation of the goals of this application. Excerpts of PA State Board Policy were provided which provide the district with the ability to implement the comprehensive scope of the literacy based plan in Kindergarten through grade 3. State Board Policy specifically denotes that school entities should develop learning plans that will assist the student in acquiring the knowledge and skills to perform at a proficient level.</p> <p>Applicant effectively addresses all criteria related to this section and the highest score is being awarded.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 11 |
| (B)(4) Reviewer Comments: | | |

The district has sought and received the support of numerous agencies for the goals of this application. The goals of the application were developed through a consortium of teacher, administrators, and district personnel. Revisions were made to the plan to scale up the implementation based on feedback from this group. Upon completion of the initial draft, the goals were presented to the local teacher's association/union which suggestions for revision and feedback which was applied. It is noted that an early draft of the plan was presented to the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers but there is no evidence that PFT supports the proposal. Parents of students and students also provided input into the plan by providing ideas on the integration and use of technology. Additionally, officials from numerous agencies, high education institutions, government positions, parent organizations, and school administrators provided letters of support for the initiatives suggested within the grant application.

This scores within the medium range. Though there is reference of support of teachers in the development of the plan, it is not evident.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 17 |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district clearly and comprehensively outlines how they plan to build upon the information of an ongoing study (Harvard Strategic Data Project) to assist students in understanding the importance of literacy and reading on grade level by the end of grade 3. Furthermore, the teachers will aid students in outlining how this literacy will assist them with later years of education. The following are ways by which the applicant plans to create personalized learning environments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers and students will set annual and quarterly goals based data gathered from instructional practices and assessments. • These instructional practices, centered around a student driven reading instructional model, will allow students choice in the selection texts, activities based upon their needs, and digital resources. • Data from digital resources will generate individualized playlists and targeted activities through technology applications. • It is proposed that these resources and approaches to literacy instruction will accelerate the learning of high need students while at the same time providing a diverse content of instruction to all students. • By providing digital tools which will collect data as students utilize applications, teachers will be able to analyze the generated data profile and make instructional decisions based on needs and towards the mastery of state standards. • This data will also allow students to interact with instructional materials, resources, and texts which are meeting their specific individualized needs. • Teachers will use the data to develop the instructional plan of what each student needs within the context of the entire class. Data will assist students and teachers in continuing ongoing feedback. <p>The data collected will be inclusive of screeners and probes, response to interventions and instruction, as well as diagnostic reading assessments. Students will also be able to monitor and track their progression through the data. As progress is made by a student, learning playlists for digital media/technology will be generated. Because learning playlists will be generated according to each individual student's needs, it is likely that high need students (particularly ELL and students with IEP's) will accelerate in their learning due to the highly individualized tasks.</p> <p>The district has an established plan to integrate technology and digital media through the use of technology integration specialists. Once the procedural routines of the literacy instructional model are established, the technology integration specialist will work with the classroom teacher to introduce the digital media and technology through small group rotations within the classroom.</p> <p>Overall this scores in the high range. It is evident there is a high quality plan to implement the goals of the application with a focus on early childhood literacy and the use of technology and digital media within a phased in approach. However, there is lacking a clear explanation of how technology and digital media will be used within the context of literacy instruction. There is also a weak description of how data collected through the digital devices will be explained and/or presented to parents and students.</p> | | |
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 10 |

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

District clearly identifies six comprehensive training modules for educators to participate in to implement fully the goals of this application. Modules include:

1. literacy practices,
2. using data,
3. student social and emotional needs,
4. assessments,
5. digital learning, and
6. working with parents.

The district has identified key people for key positions to coordinate the professional development and monitor implementation through a phase in process over the course of two years. The plan clearly denotes the deliverables and timeline for each phase of the implementation and training module.

The district has already invested in training teachers and administrators on the evaluation and observation system recently adopted by the state and being implemented presently within the district. Additionally, the district has allotted professional development days to implement the training pre-requisite in the advancement of the goals of this grant to support the implementation and training of its staff.

The district has also implemented multiple measures to increase and maintain the capacity of highly effective teachers. These measures include establishment of an Office of Teacher Effectiveness to recruit, train, and retain quality professionals; development of consulting teachers cadre to aid in the intervention and support of new and struggling teachers; establishment of instructional coaches to assist with implementation of practices; development of teacher coaches to aid novice teachers; and professional development of administrators on how to support teacher improvement through observations.

It is not clear how the identified training will aid teachers selecting processes or specific tools to match student needs and resources. Nor is it evident the depth of these trainings. The trainings are identified in name only and provided only with the content of a timeline deliverable. Specific details and how the training addresses each of the areas outline are lacking. Additionally, the trainings do not provide details on the impact of creating individualized instruction for all students.

The overall plan does not address how the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals will be increased. It is also undocumented how educator effectiveness has been evaluated prior to this year in order to demonstrate a means by which to create an effective learning environment.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 5 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district has detailed some plans and practices to ensure project implementation. The district established the position of Strategy Delivery Unit Director to serve as a connecting piece from the central office to the local schools so as to create vertical and horizontal communication in the implementation of the districts three priority goals. Schools have been provided areas over which they maintain autonomy and control which includes bell schedules, flexibility in staffing within state and federal mandates, and budgetary decisions. High schools have also had the ability to implement specialized learning models to meet the needs of their students (i.e. Creative and Performing Arts, Science Leadership Academy, etc.).

The district provides additional staffing, consulting support, and budgetary funds to high need students such as ELL and students with IEPs. Additionally, the district established a Newcomer Learner Center for new immigrant and multi-lingual students. The district is presently working to revise its graduation policy and provide students credit for mastery rather than seat time. Several new school models are being implemented through continuing partnerships and grants earned by the district at the high school level.

While the described practices do address the needs within the district, most all pertain to the high school setting and not the elementary schools identified as participating schools. It is only proposed that the district will consider revising its promotion policy and marking guidelines but only upon the completion of the high school graduation policy. It is not specified if the promotion policy and marking guidelines is applicable to the participating schools or not. Overall this scores in the low range.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district acknowledges that many classrooms are enhanced with technology for use by students and teachers, however updating the technology has been difficult. The district has established a technology help desk which can be accessed via phone, fax, or email to assist with issues. The district is working in partnership with several agencies to increase the access to internet for its students and parents outside of the school setting. The district has adopted and uses an open data system (SchoolNet) which allows administrators, teachers, students and parents access to data. The district has also invested in a comprehensive operational data store to house and manage the multiple data systems creating an interoperable system of both older operating systems and newer platforms.</p> <p>It is not evident how parents and students have access to resources and tools outside of the school setting. It is also not evident how individuals other than employees of the district receive technology assistance and support for the personalized learning described. There is not a clear description of how information can be exported in an open data format.</p> | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 14 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Within the scope of achievement, the district describes a clear and quality plan to use in-class data to monitor student success in order to continuously improve. These monitoring points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Diagnostic Reading Assessment • Problems in the Classroom Engagement Scale • Annually students will participate in the state assessments and measures will be taken at the conclusion of grade 3 and grade 4. <p>The district plans to implement the goals of this proposal through a phase in model utilizing two cohorts which will provide opportunity for revisions and adjustments to be made between the two cohorts.</p> <p>The district describes a specific plan to utilize its Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE) to monitor implementation. ORE will provide quarterly and annual reports on progress and recommended changes toward the achievement of the defined goals. Reports will be provided to district leadership and posted electronically for public review.</p> <p>Overall this criteria scored in the high range though a more thorough description of the public sharing of information on the quality of investments would have strengthened this criteria.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 4 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Plans are outlined to establish a steering committee which will meet weekly to monitor implementation. Additionally, plans include the publishing of a quarterly digital journal and quarterly parent workshops. Information will be provided to parents through orientation sessions and on the quarterly report cards. Parents will also have access to information and resources digitally through the online portal. Communication seems to be predominantly only between the district and its students' parents; other stakeholders are not addressed except for invitation to steering committee meetings.</p> <p>Overall this scores in the high range as the criteria for a high quality plan are adequately addressed.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 4 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district clearly identifies thirteen indicators by which to monitor the implementation of the goals as outlined. The district outlines how it will utilize measures through its state summative assessments, DRA's, attendance rates, and PCES (currently in place) to track implementation and its success or lack thereof. The Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE)</p> | | |

will maintain the data and monitor the criteria to gauge success and progress towards set goals. The ORE will also determined additional measures to utilize should the identified measure prove to be insufficient. Specific performance measures and targets are outlined within tables as "To Be Determined" though targets identified are described within the narrative.

Overall this scores in the high range as all criteria are adequately addressed.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 Applicant describes a high quality plan with multiple measures for evaluation of effectiveness based on the key goals of proposal. Included are deliverables and activities such as teacher training post-tests, Parent/Guardian Surveys, structured interviews, structured observations, usage data for digital/technological devices, document review, teacher feedback surveys, principal surveys, and school records. Coordinating the volume of data falls primarily to the Office of Research and Evaluation. Most measures have an identified timeframe and measurable data point. However, usage data does not have an established benchmark other than to increase frequency of use.
 Overall this scores in the high range as all components of a high quality plan are adequately addressed for this criteria.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 5 |

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 Application clearly identifies the appropriation of monies within the defined categories as they support the goals of the application which is reasonable and sufficient. Applicationspecifies that costs that continue beyond the time frame of the grant will be incurred by the district upon conclusion of grant. As the grant is written with a singular focus on early childhood literacy, the budget narrative and tables are presented as a single unit to align with the single goal. Activities and projects which require a one time fee and those which require ongoing investment are clearly identified. While it is specified that costs for the additional personnel required to implement the goals of the application as well as licensing fees for technology will be incurred by the district, there is not a plan identified to maintain the technology identified within the plan. Additionally, a line item of various contributions and funds from other sources is noted with no explanation as to source of contributions or their purpose. Overall the remaining budgets are adequate and sufficient to address the goals to support this proposal.
 This criteria scores in the medium range because not all funds are clearly identified which will be used to support the project and strategies for long-term sustainability is not fully addressed.

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
|---|-----------|----------|

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant describes a plan by which it will assume the cost for personnel hired for the implementation of the grant and will also assume the costs of licensing for technology in order to sustain the goals of the proposal. What is lacking is a clear description of how this plan will continue beyond the life of the grant. While there are speculations that the instructional practices gained from professional development at the onset of the grant will continue, there is no clear explanation as to how these will be supported and/or maintained. There is also no explanation as to how a review of past investments will be used to support future decisions. It is also undocumented how the ongoing maintenance of the digital tools will be supported.
 This scores in the medium range because not all components of a high quality plan are fully addressed. While there is vague description of a timeline and activities to take place, there are not explicit goals, identified responsible parties, or an overall credibility to the described plan.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

| | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes clearly in detail a number of relationships with agencies outside of the typical education arena with which it has partnered in order to improve the quality of education provided to its students. Included in these partnerships are focused goals to create integrated data systems across agencies (Behavioral Services, Human Services, etc.). The plan includes specific data that will be used to track indicators as evidenced through the use of SchoolNet, the District's Management System, and the Problems in Classroom Engagement Scale (PCES). The plan also includes a means of using present successful programs to scale up to higher grades which will address high needs students. An example provided was the EPIC program used in Pre-Kindergarten which will expand to Kindergarten. EPIC and PCES will be used to increase skill development for the high needs students. The plan also clearly describes how the district plans to capitalize on the established endeavors to increase parent engagement particularly at the early childhood level through the FAST program and Free Library of Philadelphia. Also included are partnerships with the Department of Human Services and KEI to ingrate systems to clearly identify the needs of the students and community to develop actionable plans. These partnerships will also provide professional development and resources to the staff of the participating schools. The district clearly outlines how it will scale up training on the Response to Intervention (RtI) professional development to expand its understanding as one of shared collaborative decision making process to identify the supports to best meet the needs of the students. Explicit plans are detailed to improve communication with parents and make resources targeted for their child available to parents. The district will continue to use the established checkpoints for the goals of the plan as checkpoints for this criteria as well as the Office of Research and Evaluation. Measures identified are identical to measures for the goal of this proposal. These measures are clearly ambitious yet achievable.</p> <p>This criteria is awarded the highest score because all criteria were effectively addressed.</p> | | |

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |
| <p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides sufficient evidence that Absolute Priority 1 is met.</p> <p>The applicant clearly focuses on the target of foundation of literacy in the early childhood grades. It is evident that through a comprehensive literacy plan, the district had detailed how instruction will be personalized based upon the individual student's needs. Instruction will be provided with a variety of content and delivery models. Included within the delivery model is the use of technology to engage the student but also to provide data to the teacher and parent to monitor progress and inform decision making. By creating a tailored instructional piece for individual students, it is proposed that learning will be accelerated for all students particularly those identified has high need. By establishing the foundation of literacy and having students reading on or above grade level by grade 3, students will be on track for college and career readiness.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 149 |
|--------------|------------|------------|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0114PA-3 for School District of Philadelphia

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>School District of Philadelphia's (SDP) reform vision, which includes providing intensive literacy support aligned with Common Core Standards in K-3 by implementing a comprehensive literacy framework and bring innovative instructional practices into all K-3 classrooms in the district, incorporates the four core educational assurance areas to support comprehensive education reform: (1) adopting standards aligned with ambitious indicators to challenge students to read complex texts, write arguments, think critically, and problem solve; (2) implementing comprehensive web-based integrated data systems that brings together data sources to assist in making educational decisions; (3) ongoing professional development, support system for new teachers, teacher, principal/administrator, and superintendent evaluation systems in place or planned implementation dates established, and personalized digital learning; and (4) improving lowest-achieving schools with action plans to improve academic outcomes for students.</p> <p>Applicant articulates a clear and credible approach to reach their goals by providing an exhaustive description of their Comprehensive Literacy Framework where student achievement will be accelerated with deeper learning in early grades. Personalized student support will be accomplished with expanded collections to provide more choices, word recognition programs to address language deficits, utilizing digital tools, and administering frequent formative assessments and progress monitoring.</p> <p>A detailed comprehensive framework in the classroom was provided in a table which describes what students will experience and how teachers will individualize instruction to personalize learning for students during literacy blocks in school schedules.</p> <p>Overall, SDP's reform vision is thorough and comprehensive which is reflected in the high score.</p> | | |

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

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>SDP's approach to implementing its reform proposal is to include all schools in the district with grades K-3. Justification is provided for how they selected the eligible participating schools with a global perspective indicating their goals and activities will positively affect each student. Dividing the students into 2 cohorts and staggering implementation will allow sufficient capacity and time to refine the process based on evidence and evaluation. This is a logical and practical approach which will likely result in successful implementation.</p> <p>Applicant has provided a detailed list of the schools that will participate in grant activities. The number of participating educators is documented on the provided tables but is not discussed in the narrative.</p> <p>SDP has provided the total number of participating students, identified the percentage of the participating students that are from low-income families, participating students who are high-need and referenced the number of participating educators that will be trained. There is sufficient evidence based on the definition as to how low-income and high-need were identified.</p> <p>The high score for this area reflects the overall approach to implementation and the comprehensive definitions of identifying participating students and educators.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
|--|-----------|----------|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>SDP has provided a far-reaching high-quality plan to reform schools in their district with an extending vision to extend the program an additional three years beyond the allotted four year grant period. The district-wide plan provided as an appendix includes key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, a timeline, deliverables, and identifies the parties responsible for implementing the activities. Applicant has chosen to focus on an anchor goal of the district-wide plan to improve academic outcomes for students in all schools for this proposal by concentrating on grades K-3 in literacy and reading. While the applicant provides evidence to support the district-wide Action Plan, there is not sufficient evidence to support the proposal of how focusing on reading and literacy activities for all students in grades K-3 will result in district-wide improvement.</p> <p>Evidence of key goals include increasing the number of students scoring proficient or advanced on assessments incrementally over the next four years; activities and rationale are to purchase curriculum, digital devices, and provide effective personalized instruction with research to support the effectiveness of the activities; timeline indicates a phased in</p> | | |
|---|--|--|

approach utilizing two cohort groups but there's no justification on how/when activities will be implemented over the grant period; and deliverables will be measured through data and evaluation of the program with adjustments being made as needed. Applicant does not provide sufficient documentation of who the responsible parties will be to carry out the activities within the specified timelines for this proposal.

Scale up is accomplished through the participating students being grouped into two cohorts with a staggered implementation plan. Participating students are defined as all students in grades K-3. There is no evidence indicating that the literacy reforms will be expanded to other grade levels within the district. However, applicant does provide evidence to support focusing on literacy in early grades will impact students achievement levels as they progress through middle and high school.

Applicant's theory of change will improve student learning outcomes for all students by implementing a comprehensive literacy model with personalized instruction, effective educators and administrators, and appropriate and timely assessments to identify and address student needs. Evaluation processes are included in the plan to continually analyze the effectiveness of the plan and make adjustments as needed. Student learning outcomes in reading will be improved by receiving differentiated and personalized instruction, having access to a variety of instructional methods and tools, and being taught by effective well trained teachers.

A middle range score is given in this area based on the applicant not providing supporting evidence of a high-quality plan for the focus on reading and literacy for this proposal.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

SDP 's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance due to their exhaustive analysis of student achievement data in reading and literacy. Their vision to improve reading levels for students in grades K-3 is ambitious with multiple activities and goals yet achievable due to steady, incremental increases annually. Applicant's proposal identified reading scores by subgroups and clearly shows the discrepancy between the subgroups of Asian and white students and compares the scores with the state scores. The proposal has set a goal to address performance gaps between all student subgroups by 50% by year 2017-2018 and specifically reducing the gap between Asian and white students by 75% which is ambitious yet likely to be attainable with the activities identified. Goals exceed State ESEA targets by increasing literacy scores and reducing achievement gaps between white and Asian students in a shorter timeframe than the State's projected targets.

Performance on summative assessments includes goals of increasing students scoring "proficient" and "advanced" in reading for program participants as they move into grades 3, 4, and 5. SDP lags behind State targets and proposed program's goals are to exceed these targets by the end of the project and beyond. Applicant fails to provide data for performance measures in math for all grade levels as specified in the criteria.

Applicant has set a goal for a 85% high school for participating students at the end of the four years with acceptable increases of 10% each year and states college enrollment rates will increase from 57% to 71% post grant. These goals do not seem feasible given that the program focuses on grades K-3 and data for participating students on graduation and college enrollment will not be available during the grant period.

SDP has provided detailed documentation on their vision to improve student learning outcomes in reading and will likely be successful in meeting their performance targets based on the identified activities. The middle range score reflects the lack of evidence to support goals that are not measurable for participating students and the lack of data for performance measures in math for all grade levels.

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 | 9 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

SDP has provided an impressive picture of how the current superintendent has created an infrastructure to enable change and improvement to take place in the district's financial and academic areas by closing and consolidating low-performing

schools, rolling out common core, training for teachers and principals, and training parents in the district's Parent University. Evidence is presented on literacy programs that have been effective in increasing student scores. However, there is no data to support how these specific efforts have positively advanced student learning and achievement over the past four years.

Applicant's high school graduation rate increased by four percent in the last year, but there is no data showing the trend over past four years or specific data indicating literacy initiatives had direct impact on raising the rate. No data was provided on college enrollment trends for the district over a four year period.

SDP has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in low-performing schools by closing or consolidating while expanding seats in high-performing schools. Applicant did not provide data to support how closing or consolidating schools or moving students to other schools positively impacted student achievement.

Applicant has built and continues to enhance extensive data management systems and makes data available to all parties, students, educators, and parents. The district's Instructional Management System is an effective way to manage, analyze, distribute, and provide access to all parties involved in student achievement because it provides data and reports that identify student skill deficits and gives the teacher a comprehensive profile for each student allowing instruction to be personalized.

Applicant's score in this area is in the mid-range due to the district's initiatives over the past year but its lack of data to support trends of improvement over the last four years.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

SDP has demonstrated evidence of a high level of transparency in their district's processes, practices, and investments with substantial public documentation for the district and each participating school. Detailed expenditures for school purchases, operating expenditures, instructional staff and support, school administration, and total amount allocated to each school to pay for school functions is available for public viewing. All school-level expenditures from all sources are accessible to the public through annual reports on their website and were included in the proposal for personnel salaries for all instructional and support staff at the school level. These salaries were documented for instructional staff, teachers, and non-personnel expenditures. An appendix detailed their school reform commission which further supported their level of transparency.

The high score reflects the thoroughness of the applicant in providing all the supporting evidence.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

SDP abides by the State of Pennsylvania Education Code and abides by the state's policy regarding education standards, promotion guidelines, graduation requirements, and educator effectiveness evaluation to enable design and piloting new models of personalized learning. The Pennsylvania State Department of Education provides resources and support for implementation of common core standards, professional learning communities, student-centered learning activities, vehicles to share best practices and expertise, and resources for building capacity. SDP's proposal aligns with the State's Comprehensive Literacy Plan (included as an appendix) to develop, implement, and evaluate an evidence-based school literacy program to improve literacy instruction and student achievement for all students but enables individual school districts the ability to implement the program that best fits their student population.

A high score depicts applicant's demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy in each participating school.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 9 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

SDP has submitted a proposal with strong stakeholder engagement and support including:

- A description of how classroom teachers, learning support teachers, ELL teachers, principals, administrators, community stakeholders, and parents participated in the development of the proposal and provided feedback

Applicant states that the The Philadelphia Federation of Teachers were provided drafts of the plan and based on feedback revisions were made to get positive support for the proposal. Based on these discussions, ELL and special needs students will have representation from expert teachers in these areas. However, there was no supporting documentation that teachers supported the final proposal.

There is evidence that students were engaged in the initial stage of gathering input for the development of the proposal. However, there's no evidence that parents or students were actively involved in developing the proposal. Given the age group of the target population (K-3), it would be difficult to get participation from students other than feedback as the applicant documented in the proposal.

Letters of support were provided from the Mayor of Philadelphia, businesses, private organizations, higher education institute, and the Free Library of Philadelphia. These partners are significant in successfully implementing the program. There is no letter of support or documentation from the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers which would solidify the support from the teachers in the participating schools.

Applicant's score in this area is in the middle range due to the lack of evidence through a letter of support from the Federation of Teachers and student support in developing the proposal.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

SDP has submitted a high-quality plan at the district-wide level plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment to support participating students in graduating college and career ready but does not sufficiently present a high-quality plan for the purposes of this grant. The proposed plan includes an approach to implement instructional strategies that enables all students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned with common core standards in reading and literacy and the On-Track for College and Career Indicators will monitor students' progress in meeting the goals of being prepared for college and career. SDP's plan to have all students reading on grade level by the end of third grade increases the students probability of graduating high school, probability of going on to college, and being more likely to succeed in subsequent grades based on scientific research presented in the proposal to support applicant's plan. Evidence or lack of evidence to support the quality of the plan:

- SDP's district-wide Action Plan has key goals with an anchor goal to improve academic outcomes for students in all the schools. Details in this proposal coincide with the goals of the district-wide plan to have all students in grades K-3 scoring proficient or advanced on reading assessments.
- Goals identified for graduation and college enrollment are unreasonable given participants are identified as students in grades K-3 and data will not be available to measure for these students within the grant period.
- Timelines were identified for identifying two cohorts including when the phased implementation will begin and for all activities identified.
- Deliverables seem reasonable for proposed activities and will likely yield the outcomes specified for each activity.
- Responsible parties have been identified for each activity being implemented.

A strong aspect in this proposal is teachers and the Office of Family and Community Engagement working with parents and students to learn the importance of literacy for future success by sharing how their learning is tied to the college and career readiness. Parents and students will work with teachers to develop goals and monitor progress through timely assessments, reports, and online portals. Providing partners, like the Free Library of Philadelphia, to extend the literacy learning in after school and summer programs is key in accelerating growth and lessening effects of summer learning loss. Applicant provides specific information on how students are able to pursue their interests, i.e., enhancing library collections, offering eBooks as well as hard copy books, providing different learning opportunities through apps or other media devices.

Target groups identified in the application are ELL and IEP students and SDP has explicitly described their plan to address the needs of these groups in literacy. The applicant proposes to make available reading materials that reflect diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives and students will have access to these materials. It is unclear in the proposal if activities will incorporate these types of reading materials in their classroom activities.

With the overall goal of having all students reading at or above grade level at 3rd grade, mastering critical content area will

be accomplished. Literacy is a component utilized in every academic area and is key to students' success. Applicant has provided an adequate plan to involve communication and teamwork between teachers, parents, and students. Students, in conjunction with teachers and parents, will learn to set goals, build communication and problem solving skills, and explore their creativity. Applicant failed to address specifically if high-need students will have a different approach to mastering content area or if all students will follow the same plan.

Applicant's plan includes a variety of instructional approaches and environments through direct whole class instructions, independent reading, guided small group instruction, and independent learning environments with mobile devices to prepare them for college and career readiness in reading and literacy. Data profiles are created for each student mapping a personalized instructional pathway with support from parents and teachers.

Utilization of mobile devices and digital applications for student learning has been documented in the proposal and an acceptable plan of acquiring goods and services to support the program has been presented.

Ongoing and regular feedback will be handled through a portal that captures data on a daily basis and makes it accessible to teachers, students, and parents. Teachers will review data with students and be available for parents if they have questions. Plans to train parents and students seems sufficient, however, there is no documentation indicating how parents who do not have internet access will interact with this program and receive the data.

Applicant provides sufficient evidence to support how the proposed plan accommodates all students to ensure they are on tract to meet college and career ready and graduation requirements in the content area of reading by providing a variety of instructional methods to address needs of all students, appropriate intervention and modifications, and comprehensive professional development and resources for district staff.

SDP has an appropriate strategy to ensure training and support of mobile devices are in place for students to understand how to use tools and resources to manage their learning. The plan is lacking specific details on how teachers, parents, and students will be trained on the portal to access data and how to interpret the data to help the student succeed or how ongoing support will be managed.

Overall, the applicant has met some of the requirements in this area but has not provided sufficient documentation to support how their proposed plan, not the district-wide plan, will improve student learning which is reflected in the middle to high range score.

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

20

12

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

SDP has submitted a high-quality plan at the district-wide level plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment to support participating students in graduating college and career ready but does not sufficiently present a high-quality plan for the purposes of this grant. The proposed plan includes an approach to implement instructional strategies that enables all students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned with common core standards in reading and literacy and the On-Track for College and Career Indicators will monitor students' progress in meeting the goals of being prepared for college and career. SDP's plan to have all students reading on grade level by the end of third grade increases the students probability of graduating high school, probability of going on to college, and being more likely to succeed in subsequent grades based on scientific research presented in the proposal to support applicant's plan. Evidence or lack of evidence to support the quality of the plan:

- SDP's district-wide Action Plan has key goals with an anchor goal to improve academic outcomes for students in all the schools. Details in this proposal coincide with the goals of the district-wide plan to have all students in grades K-3 scoring proficient or advanced on reading assessments.
- Goals identified for graduation and college enrollment are unreasonable given participants are identified as students in grades K-3 and data will not be available to measure for these students within the grant period.
- Timelines were identified for the two cohorts with details on the phased implementation and for each activity identified in the proposal.
- Deliverables seem reasonable for proposed activities and will likely yield the specified outcomes.
- Responsible parties have been identified for all activities being implemented.

Applicant has provided details in their timeline of professional development to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college and career ready graduation requirements through six core training modules including comprehensive literacy practices; utilizing data to personalize instruction; student social and emotional needs; assessments; digital learning; and working with parents. These modules are comprehensive and will likely result in teachers being able to personalize student learning in reading and support students to meet college and career ready standards.

Evidence to support individual and collective capacity for all participating educators includes:

- Participating teachers (all teachers in grades K-3) will be trained in multiple instructional practices in literacy and be trained on how to utilize data to personalize learning for students.
- Content and instruction will be adapted to provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks through professional development in using mobile devices in classroom activities as a group and for individual activities to meet students' needs.
- Intensive training on how to interpret data to meet the needs of the students will be accomplished through face-to-face professional development days; assessments will be utilized for student performance and to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher trainings; all data will be analyzed and adjustments made to insure successful implementation of the program.
- SDP has adopted a teacher and principal evaluation system and has indicated the teachers and principals have been trained with observations and evaluations beginning in year 2013-14. No data is available to determine the effectiveness of the program since it's just being implemented but applicant does provide specific details on how the process will be implemented.

Lack of evidence to support the individual and collective capacity for all participating educators:

- Applicant includes identification of Literacy Leads in participating schools that will attend intensive summer institutes but fails to fully explain what the Literacy Leads' roles will be and why they are being identified as the audience in the proposal to attend trainings as opposed all participating teachers attending.
- SDP's professional development plan entails multiple trainings on data analysis, assessments, literacy practices, digital learning, how to work with parents, how to deal with student social and emotional needs through multiple venues, face to face, online, and individual instruction. This appears to be several hours of professional development for teachers to attend and then put into practice. The proposal does not provide evidence on how or when teachers will receive all the training identified in the proposal.
- Compensation for professional development in the budget is for 150 Literacy Lead Teachers to attend a summer institute, monthly professional development offerings, and after-school workshops for all teachers. It is unclear how all teachers will receive the required training to carry out activities that are being proposed.
- The intensive summer institute is not clearly defined as to who will attend and what trainings will be offered.

Applicant has identified what participating educators need to have access to and acknowledges that they all need to know how to use tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college and career ready graduation requirements but fails to completely define how and when educators will be trained. SDP's six core training modules incorporate resources for providing actionable information to help educators optimize student learning in literacy by including how to: administer and use formative assessments; analyze data to personalize instruction; incorporate digital learning; and engage parents but does not provide convincing evidence that all required trainings can be accomplished within the implementation timelines for all participating educators.

High quality learning resources for literacy instruction will be available to participating educators through curriculum, school and free libraries, and digital content. Applicant does not indicate whether or not participating educators will be provided with tools to create and share new resources. Training on these resources is included in the plan but with no specifics on how many hours of training will be required and if all teachers will receive the training.

Processes and tools are included in the proposal to identify student needs and provide reading materials to personalize learning for all students. Data and reports will be available for students, teachers, and parents to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the resources. Data will be analyzed and adjustments made to insure students are receiving what they need in the appropriate method of instruction.

SDP has adopted a teacher and principal evaluation system being implemented this year. Teachers and principals have received trainings and they have access to tools, data, and resources to support an effective learning environment. Applicant does not include sufficient evidence to support how the evaluation system helps teachers respond to students' individual academic needs. Training, systems, and practices on how the district will continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps are not clearly defined. Applicant states professional development days are set aside each year to help ensure continuous development of instructional strategies for improved literacy learning but no details are made available indicating what training materials are used to accomplish the task.

Evidence to support SDP's high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals includes:

- Establishment of an office dedicated to plan and implement the teacher/principal evaluation system.
- Consulting teachers to support new and struggling teachers.

- Instructional coaches to support teachers in implementing promising instructional practices.
- Teacher coaches to support novice teachers.
- Trained principals on how to administer the evaluation system to support teacher improvement.
- Providing affordable housing to recruit teachers.

Applicant does not provide information on a plan to have effective and highly effective teachers in hard-to-staff, subjects, and specialty areas other than providing affordable housing in recruitment efforts.

A middle range score is given in this area due to the lack of evidence stated above.

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: | | |
| <p>SDP has provided documentation of support for the project implementation from the superintendent and other administrative staff and indicates how the goals of the program will be supported financially and through strategic planning and policies. Evidence to support the policies and infrastructures to provide every student, educator, classroom, and school with support and resources they need to facilitate personalized learning includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project staff will be housed in the Offices of Education Technology and Early Childhood to ensure appropriate academic programming and professional development. • Participating schools have the flexibility to control daily bell schedules as long as they meet the required instructional time; principals have staffing flexibility to meet needs of all students; budget decisions can be made at the principal level for their allocations to hire staff and to purchase materials and supplies. • Flexibility is given to design and manage schools to support ELL students, IEP students, and for students attending lowest performing schools. • Schools operating within the district allow students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery, i.e., a proficiency based district run high school, a high school of the future jointly developed with Microsoft, and a Science Leadership Academy with a 1:1 program. • District high schools are implementing programs like the Workshop School which is a project-based learning module program, launching a new model school with Harvard University Graduate School of Education, launched the SDP Virtual Academy, and has been awarded other grants to implement new and innovative practices. • District provides additional staffing and consulting to support ELL and IEP students by deploying bilingual counseling assistants, additional staff that have language skills to support students at school; established a Newcomer Learning Center for new immigrant and multi-lingual families; additional instructional resources to meet students' needs and learning styles. <p>Applicant fails to provide evidence that participating schools (grades K-3) have programs similar to those being implemented in high schools to provide students with the same opportunities to progress on demonstrated mastery, not time spent of a topic, demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.</p> <p>SDP as a district has provided documentation for a comprehensive infrastructure but the middle range score is given because there's no evidence that the participating schools provide the same opportunities as the high schools mentioned in the proposal.</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| (D)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>SDP's technology infrastructure plan to support every student, educator, classroom, and school with the support and resources they need is to establish technology-rich classrooms that prepare students to excel in a 21st Century learning environment utilizing local, Federal, and State funding. Information Technology staff will work closely with with teachers to manage and troubleshoot the integration of technology into daily instruction. Applicant acknowledges that 41% of households in the school districts do not have home access to broadband and fewer than 20% have high-speed Internet service. SDP is supporting initiatives to provide affordable Internet access to all families but fails to document in the application how their plan will be implemented effectively without students and parents having access to data and</p> | | |

information.

SDP has partnered with a vendor to provide access to their instructional management system portals for teachers, students, and parents. Open data exchange is available and data can be linked with external systems and application services by sharing information and key student data using XML and industry-accepted interchange formats. There was no evidence provided to indicate how students and parents without Internet access will be able to retrieve data to use for goal setting and personal learning environments.

Applicant's inter operable data systems include all critical information systems and serves as both a gateway and repository for retrieving and storing data. A comprehensive data management system and warehouse includes instructional applications along with human resource data, student information data, and budget data.

Overall, SDP has a comprehensive infrastructure to support personalized learning and a high score is given in this area.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 14 |
| (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>SDP's strategy for implementing a rigorous, continuous improvement process provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The strategy addresses how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments. Evidence to support the continuous improvement process includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participating students in grades K-3 will be divided into two cohort groups with a staggered implementation over the grant period to allow for mid-course adjustments and corrections in implementation and training. Feedback from the roll-out with the first cohort will be used to strengthen the program for the second cohort. • In-class, real-time data will be made available for teachers to adapt and augment their instruction through regular assessments and allows continuous improvement is built into the classroom experience. • Quarterly and annual assessments for reading levels, accuracy, fluency, and comprehension will be administered to all participating students and made available to students, teachers, and parents. Data will be used to modify instruction if needed, set goals for student progress, and evaluate the program. • Program evaluation will be ongoing and will provide formative and summative feedback to continuously improve the program. • Quarterly evaluation meetings will be held with stakeholders to report program progress. Data briefs for parents, the mayor's office and other stakeholders will be posted quarterly to the program website. Quarterly and annual reports will include a review of implementation and made available for stakeholders. <p>Applicant does not specify if the reports will include information on investments in professional development, technology, and staff.</p> <p>SDP's proposal presents a comprehensive strategy to implement a continuous improvement process which is reflected in the high score.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>Plans for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders is convincing and supported by evidence of an Early Literacy Project Steering Committee being established to meet weekly and monitor progress implementation and quality assurance. Program Directors will share the agenda and notes with all stakeholders. A project website will be created to share project events, milestones, and details with the wider school community and the public. Parents will be actively engaged throughout the entire course of the program by providing parent orientation sessions prior to implementation and quarterly workshops focused on literacy and reading at home. Parents will have access to student data and will be trained on how to use data to help their child improve their performance. Applicant meets criteria in this area receives a high score.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 4 |

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's proposal includes ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroups, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. Annual incremental increases proposed are aggressive but attainable based on the activities and processes identified in the program. Multiple measures have been identified by SDP for the required performance measures and additional literacy leading indicators for participating students in grades K-3 have been identified in the project to ensure each school has information to determine progress and make adjustments as needed for continuous improvement. Applicant does not provide baseline data or targets for the required performance measures for students having highly effective teachers and principals due to implementation of their teacher leader effectiveness program currently being implemented.

Rationale behind creating the 14 performance measures is appropriate based on the goals established in the project.

The measures for the additional literacy leading indicators provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to the proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern by addressing college and career ready goals in early education in reading and writing, educator effectiveness, social-emotional indicators, and chronic absenteeism. Plan provides professional development for teacher content knowledge, utilizes curriculum and resources to meet the needs of diverse learners, and uses technology to vary content delivery and manage the process. No baseline data was provided for the teacher and principal effectiveness measures but the goals and targets are sufficient based on documentation to support the goals with the teacher and principal evaluation being implemented in the current school year.

Applicant's approach to review and improve the measures over time is sufficient to gauge implementation progress. Measures will be reviewed quarterly, annually, monthly, and daily by program directors and SDP staff and reported to stakeholders. Adjustments to the measures will be made based on feedback from stakeholders, program evaluations, and project and SDP staff. Applicant does not indicate feedback from participants will be acquired or used in making adjustments to the measures.

The score for this area is in the high range due to the applicant addressing most of the components in this area with the exceptions as noted above.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has devised an extensive plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the investment to bring about school improvement. Specific aspects of the plan that documents the effectiveness include:

- Comprehensive collection of data for evaluation through teacher training post tests, student performance measures, parent surveys, structured interviews with teachers, classroom observations, program records, school records, and teacher/principal effectiveness evaluations.
- Detailed activities provided in a logic model table with identifiable outcomes and a detailed plan provided to measure the effectiveness of the activities in achieving the goals and outcomes predicted.
- Data being gathered measures the effectiveness of efforts.
- Technology is being utilized to increase productivity.
- Schools will be able to determine benefits of key practices based on evaluation
- Key practices will be reviewed and revised based on effectiveness
- Teacher training post tests will be utilized to evaluate professional development

The applicant has provided documentation to support the elements of this area through utilizing existing processes and introducing new evaluation tools so a high score is given.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 3 |

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The budget proposed by SDP does not fully identify all funds that will support the project including RTTD grant funds, external foundation support, LEA, State, and other Federal funds. A line item in the budget for funds from other sources indicates that approximately \$865,721 - \$5,083,594 will be from "various contributions" to support the project. The source

of these contributions has not been identified with the exception of the \$5,083,594 post award to fund staff from the project to continue implementation of efforts.

The budget amount requested is reasonable to support the development and implementation of the proposal given the dollar amount being requested to the number of participating students. Applicant fails to address how the technology support will be funded. A Mobile Device Coordinator has been included in the budget narrative but there are no funds directly allocated to technology support for students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders to access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources in and out of school.

Applicant fails to provide evidence of a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities due to the lack of a detailed description of all funds to support implementation and identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs incurred during and after the grant period. Applicant does indicate dollar amounts associated with operating and one-time costs but fails to fully explain in the budget narrative how the funds being requested will ensure long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

A low score is given in this area due to the lack of evidence to support the requested budget.

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

10

3

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant includes district funds to support key staffing positions in the last two years of the grant and after the grant period; continued funding for licensing of instructional materials; ongoing professional development; and will pursue private foundation funding to sustain and potentially expand the program. SDP's plan for sustainability builds on resources, materials, tools, and processes developed through grant funds to support activities after grant funding but does not address ongoing maintenance of digital tools, replacement or updates to resource materials, or how they will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use the data to inform future investments. Post-grant budgets for three years after the term of the grant were not provided in the application. Applicant references funds and support from the Mayor's Office but fails to define what the financial contribution would be or how funds will be utilized to support the program.

A low score is given based on the applicant not providing sufficient evidence in this area.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

SDP meets the competitive preference priority based on:

- Partnerships with the City of Philadelphia and the Penn Child Research Center, Departments of Behavioral Health and Human Services, the Free Library of Philadelphia, and the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education support the proposed plan.
- Population-level desired results for participating students in grades K-3 by increasing the percentage of students at or above grade level in reading; decreasing absenteeism, increasing students' social and emotional skills, and increasing family engagement align with and support the proposal.
- Tracking of the indicators will measure results at the aggregate level for all students and at the student level for participating students.
- Data collected will be used to develop materials and lessons to address identified challenges.
- Results will be improved over time by providing students with robust early childhood education opportunities that address readiness in elementary school and identify early interventions which is key to becoming college- and-career ready throughout the K-12 pipeline.
- Social services agencies are involved as partners in the proposal to integrate education with social-emotional and behavioral needs.
- Professional development will be provided to all staff with community based organizations providing resources to assess the needs and assets of participating students and families.
- SDP has entered into agreements with partners to share data while protecting student privacy to identify and inventory the needs of the school and community.
- A Response to Instruction and Intervention strategy has been established to identify and intervene for students at

academic or behavior risk and to monitor the student's response to the intervention.

- Applicant works closely with Turning Points for Children (2013 i3 grant recipient) to improve early learning and build relationships among parents, school staff, and community partners.
- Ongoing assessments of the program's progress will be evaluated to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems.
- Applicant provides evidence of annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level of students in grades K-3 and sufficiently describes desired results for participating students.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|---|------------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |
| Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>As stated in other sections, SDP has comprehensively addressed how it will build on the four core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting academic needs in literacy of each student in grades K-3; increase the effectiveness of educators by implementing a teacher and principal evaluation system; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and provided research to support how focusing on literacy in early grades has a positive impact on students graduating from high school prepared for college and careers.</p> <p>The applicant addresses the four core educational assurance areas to support comprehensive education reform: (1) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and workplace and to compete in the global economy; (2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction; (3) a plan to recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and (4) turning around lowest-achieving schools. Supporting evidence that the plan addresses these core educational assurance areas are documented in the other sections.</p> <p>The applicant provides sufficient evidence that these areas of concentration will positively affect student learning and insure goals under this proposal are met. The applicant meets Priority 1.</p> | | |
| Total | 210 | 152 |