Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0242AZ-1 for Humboldt Unified School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District (HUSD) articulated a comprehensive and coherant reform vison that will meet the needs of all students using the Common Core State Standards to prepare for college and career programs. There is evidence of an approach to support academic achievement and deepen student learning for elementary and middle school students using a three-tiered response to intervention (RtI) as well as one-on-one technology approach to support high school students. There is evidence that HUSD will provide students with a choice in their support systems. Also, there is evidence that program meets the personalized student support requirement. Furthermore, Humboldt Unified demonstrated evidence for providing specific instructional models and practices to accelerate student achievement including the following: Paxton/Patterson Action Labs, Guided Discovery Model, ACT Engage, Socratic seminars, and one-to-one technology.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District elected to have all nine schools participate in this reform and provided a list of all participating schools. The school district established a leadership team consisting of school, parent and community leaders; however, there is no evidence of a student representative on the leadership team. The process for participation began in the Spring 2012 when they surveyed their parent body following a survey with the local community college to determine the top ten skills needed for for college and career readiness in the 21st century. The school district used data from these surveys to determine their major issues. Humboldt Unified School District provided the number/percentages of the following: participating educators, participating students, participating high need students, and participating low income students.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District used the Change Management Theory to implement their educational reform. The school district identified the need for a continuous improvement model as well as the importance for strategic planning in their schools. The Humboldt Unified School District provided a proposed plan that included the goals, activities, timeframe, metrics, and responsible parties. The goals and metrics were specific to student achievement and learning outcomes. Also, majority of the activites proposed centered around student learning and individualized education. The Humboldt Unified School District provided a detailed plan for the next four years.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District will use the Arizona Instrument to Measures Standards (AIMS) to determine proficiency status and growth. The school district established ambitious goals to reach 99% or 100% metrics over the next 4 years. The 8th grade goal for reading proficiency at 99% in 2016-17 may be too ambitous since the baseline data is

currently at 73%. The same overly ambitious expectations have been identified for grade levels in mathematics as well. For example, Grade 3 math proficiency for 2011-12 is 72% and Grade 4 math proficiency is aimed for 82% in 2012-13. This is the same grade level cohort and a 10% increase in one year is overly ambitious. However, the annual goals for decreasing achievement gaps are not ambitious enough to significantly improve student outcomes in Humboldt Unified School District. For example, the achievement gap between Hispanic and White students in Grade 3 Math remain 12% from SY2011-12 through SY2016-17. These goals demonstrate an increase in achievement for each subgroup; however, it does not consider closing the achievement gap between the subgroups. The high school graduation rate goals for Humboldt Unified School District are ambitious; however, it is not clear whether their are alternative graduation requirements (i.e. students with disabilities) so these could be unrealistic. The college enrollment is ambitious; however, a goal of 100% is unrealistic when the purpose of the proposal is for college and/or career. Some students may pursue employment post secondary. The Humboldt Unified School District did not provide Postsecondary degree attainment information.

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:

The Humboldt Unified School District provided evidence for significant increases in reading for Hispanic and Special Education students from 2007-12; however, there was a decrease in the reading achievement for Grade 8 from 2007-12 (26%-18%). An explanation regarding this drop in percentage points would be helpful for understanding this decline. Since the school district mentioned the significant increase in ELL from 2007-12 (13% to 49%), it would be feasible to provide the reading proficiency for these students. However, there is no evidence of achievement for ELL students in reading or mathematics. The most significant percentage growth occurred in elementary schools with the highest low socio-economic students; however, the Humboldt Unified School District did not highlight the strategies and/or practices of these schools in the proposal. There is no evidence of high school graduation and college enrollment for the past four years. Parents, students and teachers have access to student assessment data via web based system. However, there is no evidence of how this data is used to improve participation, instruction, and services.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District provides a moderate level of transparency using a public document including operational efficiency and student achievement/teacher information for the district. The average teacher salary by district, peer LEA, and state is included as well as non personnel expenditures. However, the actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff/teachers were identified.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

According to the Humboldt Unified School District, the state of Arizonia provides a program, Move on When Ready, and possible autonomy with funding as well as possible changes from Carnegie Units to outcome based performance measures. Also, the state of Arizona is creating autonomy for schools that receive grade of an A. However, Humboldt Unified School District only had 2 out of 9 schools with an A. This does not support successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District provided evidence for parent input via parent survey using AdvancEd. The school district conducted a poll of teachers from each school and provided results; however, there is no evidence of specific feedback from teachers and how feedback was used to construct the actual concept map in Appendix D. The Humboldt Unified School District met the teacher support metric and provided letters of support from key community and school stakeholders including the state superintendent, mayor, school administrators, chamber of commerce, local colleges, and parent organizations. However, there is no evidence of student feedback, participation, or letter of support.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District identified ELL and SPED groups as well as Hispanic and Native American students as groups who need personalized learning environments. The plan provides a four year plan with goals, activities, timeframe, metrics, and responsible parties. There is no evidence of expanding goals and activities over the four year range to better serve the identified subgroups. The needs and gaps are not clearly articulated in the plan.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District will provide opportunities for parents, teachers, and students to collaborate as well as create an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP). The plan provides the training plan for students through a blended learning approach including technology and one-on-one instruction to ensure students understand how to use the tools and resources to manage their learning. However, there is no evidence of differentiated instructional approaches and high quality strategies for high need students to ensure students are engaged. The training will be provided in both English and Spanish which provides access to non-English speakers and student interest surveys will be administered to identify specific areas of interest. However, specific goal-setting and teamwork activities were not provided. There is no evidence of specific progress monitoring measures to ensure stduents are on track to meeting college and career ready standards. The Humboldt Unified School District provided moderate approach to engaging all stakeholders as well as progress monitoring systems for continuous improvement.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District will provide opportunities for training with principals and teachers to support personalized learning for students. Teachers and principals will participate in professional learning communities that will support dialogue and collaboration around student achievement as well as opportunities to share best practices for academic achievement. However, there is no evidence of high quality learning resources that are aligned with college and career ready standards. The plan identifies the training that will be provided to access data in order to make adjustments to individual learning plans as well. Also, the state of Arizona requires all teacher and principal evaluation systems to include 33%-50% of evaluation based on student achievement. This will identify whether teachers or principals are highly effective, effective, partially effective, or ineffective. However, there is no evidence in the plan of specific steps taken to improve effectiveness, school culture, and climate. The plan moderately meets the expectations for providing training to improve effectiveness, school culture and climate.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District will support all schools with implementation of the proposed plan by reorganizing central office as well as including additional support positions such as intervention specialist, content specialist, technology specialist, and director of curriculum and instruction. The school district will expand the role of the director of educational services and data coordinator to provide additional supports to provide students personalized learning environments. The school leadership teams will have the autonomy to establish master schedules based on students mastery as well as financial autonomy. However, there is no evidence of school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles, or responsibilities. The Humboldt Unified School District eludes to the fact that they will remove the Carnegie unit of seat time; however, the application mentioned that this must be approved by the state so this may not be a feasible option for students to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. Also, students will be given opportunities to demonstrate mastery on formative assessments; however, there is no evidence that these assessments will be measured at multiple times or multiple ways. Training will be provided to teachers on meeting the needs of ELL and SPED students; however, specific instructional practices were not provided in the plan.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**5**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District will ensure all students have access to digital resources as well as internet access; however, the plan does not explicitly state that this support will be provided out of school. The school district's plan shows evidence of appropriate technical support including students who may receive community service hours for providing technical support to their peers. Parents, staff, and students will be able to export data; however, there is no evidence of the ability to use data in other eletronic learning systems. The school district is working with the county on a data warehouse; however, there is no evidence of timeline for completion of this endeavor to ensure schools and students will have interoperable data systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District will use an observation tool, Teach4Success, to progress monitor student achievement and personalized learning environment implementation. A full program evaluation will be conducted and quarterly observations; however, the plan does not include specific ongoing feedback on the implementation as well as opportunities to improve and/or correct measures throughout implementation. There is inadequate evidence of a continuous improvement process for timely and regular feedback.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There are opportunities for the stakeholders to engage and communicate about the plan; however, these opportunities are not continuous and ongoing feedback. The only strategy for feedback from the community is through focus groups which may not capture the collective voice of internal and external stakeholders. Also, there is no evidence of teachers having opportunities to participate in discourse around the findings from the Teach4Success protocol.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District established performance measures; however, many of the measures are ambitious without the supports to be achievable. For example, a performance measure to have 100% of students with an effective teacher and/or principal in the next four years which is an increase of 65%. There is no evidence to support the training to increase effectiveness of teachers and principals over the next four years. Also, 100% of kindergartners will be ready for first grade by the end of kindergarten; however, there is no evidence of PreK supports to increase proficiency levels of students entering kindergarten. There is no evidence of how the Humboldt Unified School District will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

	Available	Score
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District plans to use a formal program evaluation to determine effectiveness of professional development as well as surveys to determine availability of technology. However, there is no evidence of ongoing feedback for continuous improvement. Compensation reform will be addressed through the teacher evaluation system which determines teacher effectiveness annually. Schools will be required to work with community partners and post secondary institutions to modify plan; however, there is no evidence of specific protocols and/or plan for this collaboration.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District provided comprehensive budget narratives and tables. The specific funding soures have been identified. Also, their support from other sources ($543,548) is reasonable and sufficient. The school district provided explicit cost descriptions and cost assumptions for the plan. Also, they will establish structures and systems to accommodate the implementation of the proposed expenditures such as professional learning and providing district wide early release Wednesdays to train teachers 4 times per month. Also, Humboldt Unified provided the actual source for each expenditure and sources; however, it appears to be some contradictory figures for other sources. For example, the total budget amount ($20,822,643.69) on overall budget summary does not match the total budget amount ($20,252,127.69) on overall budget summary project list. The request for the grant match; however, the other source funds do not match. If the plan is dependent on these additional funds from other sources; then Humboldt Unified School District will experience financial implications due to limited funds.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**2**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District plan does not have evidence for sustaining additional FTE's funded by grant. Specifically, there is no evidence of sustainability for content specialist, director of curriclum, technology specialist, and intervention specialist. There is documentation of state and local government leaders support; however, there is no evidence of financial support.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**5**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District provided a clear description of the coherent and sustainable partnership with the Mountain Institute - Joint Technical Education District (MIJTED), Yavapai College, Northern AZ University, and Yavapai Regional Medical Center that supports their low income students in the school district. Furthermore, this partnership will support college and career readiness especially in the area of the health care profession. The plan set a measurable objective to target 700 students annually; however, there is no evidence of student interest in the health care profession. Also, there is no documentation of how this partnership will specifically decrease drop out and graduation rates for the Humboldt Unified School District. A full library of web-based clinical cases will be created to provide students with an opportunity to explore careers in the health profession; however, there is no plan for when this class will be offered (i.e. elective period, math period, science period, after-school, weekends, etc.). The plan is lacking evidence of improving results over time with specific estimated percentages for drop out rate, participation rate, and employment rate. The Humboldt Unified School District described how the partnership will integrate health care practices and preparation into high school and post-secondary; however, there is no evidence of how these practices will be embedded in core content areas such as science, mathematics, and/or technology. The plan identified ways to assess the needs of students as well as identify the needs and assets of the schools. Also, the plan uses the results from the web-based clinical cases, health care mentors, and a simulation learning center as an infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports for the participating students. However, there is no evidence of engaging the parents and families of participating students in decision making and/or addressing student, family, and school needs. The performance measures are ambitious and achievable.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The Humboldt Unified School District's plan provides personalized learning environments that address the core educational assurance areas. There is evidence throughout the plan to support college and career standards, accelerate student achievement, and decrease achievement gaps in some groups.

	Available	Score
Total	**210**	**114**

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0242AZ-2 for Humboldt Unified School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The vision set forth by the applicant is moderately comprehensive and moderately cohesive. While all four core areas are addressed by the vision, core areas relating to instructional staff and turning around low performing schools are not given full consideration. The areas of college and career preparation and building data systems/assessment are addressed in more elaborate detail. Applicant has, to an acceptable extent, articulated a clear and credible approach.

Accordingly, an upper Mid-level rating is assigned for this criterion.

Elements that are good:

- Vision for student outcomes, family involvement, community outreach and partnerships with public and private organizations is provided.
- District learning management system, and district superintendent, principal and teacher evaluation systems are to be in place by the start of the 2013-14 academic year
- The *I Choose* model adopted by the local education agency (LEA) will enable students to select topics that are of their interest and to self-pace as they master proficiency of the Common Core State Standards and the College and Career Readiness Standards.
- During the 2012-13 academic year Bradshaw Mountain High School implemented the *I Choose* model in a pilot format, while the middle schools implemented an intervention/ enrichment model in which 7th and 8th graders were allowed to self-select on a limited basis and were placed in intervention on a four week rotation using data from the district formative assessments. These two piloted programs were the impetus for the selection of *I Choose* model of reform for district-wide implementation.
- The elementary and middle schools will use a 3-tiered response to intervention system.
- Multiple program interfaces are included in the strategies outlined for college and career programs.
- Humboldt Unified has the leadership and vision to implement personalized, student-focused approaches to learning and teaching that will produce excellence and ensure equity for all students.
- All nine schools in Humboldt Unified chose to participate in this reform. All teachers and students enrolled will participate including those sub-groups defined in the notice. Because the LEA has a diverse population across all campuses in the district, the leadership team determined it was important to include all schools in the reform process from the beginning rather than scaling up the model.
- Both strategic and operational and essential components, using change management theory, are planned to be in place.
- District's reform proposal identifies the need for intervention in Math and proposes to modify the Reading First intervention model to increase student achievement in reading and mathematics.
- College and career readiness are key themes integrated into the vision statement. Applicant closely works with a local community college in planning for these components.

Missed elements and those lack clarity:

- Equity gap for English Language Learners and students with learning disabilities are identified. Specific strategies applicable to these high need groups are not spelled out.
- Two of the nine schools are performing at an acceptable level, but are the lowest performing in the district. Specific strategies for addressing between school differences, especially those of the lowest performing schools are not included in the vision.
- While professional development is a key component of the proposed project, there is no clear cut strategy/approach for recruitment and retention of qualified and highly qualified teachers and leadership.
- College and career readiness are key components of the project, yet the vision does not address strategies/approach for incorporating input from four year colleges and employers in the region for ensuring that graduates will be college and/or career ready.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal has a moderate potential to support all schools, all students, and all grade bands within the LEA. All core subject areas will be impacted with a special emphasis on reading and mathematics.

Based on the characteristics of the approach to implementation presented in the application an **upper Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.**

Evidence of this potential

- District plans to implement the project in all of its nine schools. A list of all nine schools is provided. All grade bands will be served.
- The total number of educators, students, and numbers and percentages of students in subgroups are provided.
- LEA/School level, grade band and subject area instructional reforms are proposed.

Lack of evidence of this potential

- There is an absence of well structured, high quality, LEA level and school level plan for implementation of the reform proposal. Description of approach centers on a few key catchy concepts such as *I Choose, Change Theory,* etc. Thus, there is a lack of coherence and clarity about how the support will bring about change at all levels, and fulfills the potential of the approach.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The plan included by the LEA is of mediocre quality. It is not a *High-Quality Plan* as defined in Appendix-A of the NIA.

Thus, an upper Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.

Features that add quality to the plan

- District plans to implement proposed project in all its nine schools. Thus, the plan is for district-wide reform/change, and hence scaling up is a built-in feature.
- The project is based on pilot strategies implemented (being) in select schools during the 2012-13 school year, and were found to be useful.
- SEA requires that some of the major components of the project are to be implemented in all schools beginning with the 2013-14 school year, even in the absence of RTT-D funding.
- Applicant has presented a plan for each of the four years. The plan includes goal, activity, timeline, deliverables/metrics, and responsible party.

Features that are lacking and/or diminishing the quality of the plan

- Knowing that the LEA's goal is to develop individual learning plans, refine it, and train users during the first year, it is not practical and desirable for the LEA to target to have the plan in place for 80% of its students during the same year.
- There is limited detail of the plans (activities, timelines, etc.) for the goals and associated targets specific to improving graduation rate, college readiness, reduction of between group gaps in performance, etc.
- The target for graduation rate of 82% during the fourth year of the project is achievable, yet not ambitious.
- While it is ambitious to have 100% of graduates to enter college, the target is not achievable.
- There are no plans and processes for recruitment, induction and retention of high quality teachers.
- Detailed plans (activities, timelines, deliverables, etc.) for the key stated goals of *creating transparency*, *building infrastructure* and *professional development* are not provided. LEA provided only generic outlines and evaluation metrics for these goals. This lack of detail affects credibility of the plan.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

LEA's application includes ambitious yet achievable annual goals for student outcomes that are of acceptable quality (not *High Quality)*.

As such, an upper Mid-level rating is given for this criterion.

Elements that add to the quality of the goals and targets

- There is likelihood for achieving improved student learning and increased equity through the use of individual learning plans, improved teaching strategies, professional development, and performance on summative assessments.
- Goals and processes for reducing achievement gaps are included.
- A number of goals and targets are ambitious and achievable.

Elements that diminish the quality of the goals and targets

- Specific accommodative strategies for improved learning outcomes for high need student groups are not identified.
- Gap reduction targets for high need students in certain grade clusters are not up to par.
- Targets for certain goals are ambitious but may not be achievable.
- Specific college/career readiness requirements (such as required courses/competencies) have not been identified.

Details of higher education outreach, except for local community college, are not planned.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district has presented data to show that there is a mixed record of district-wide success in improving student performance and enhancing equity across subgroups.

Consequently, an upper Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.

Demonstrated record of success

- Data provided for reading performance shows that district has shown considerable progress during the past four years. Performance overall, across grade levels has shown consistent progress.

- The data also shows that there has been reduction in achievement gaps between subgroups, and in some cases this reduction has been remarkable.
- LEA states that the English Language Learner (ELL) reclassification rate increased from 13% in 2007 to 49% in 2012.

Presented un-supporting data or no data at all

- School level track record cannot be inferred because school level data are not provided.
- Reading First program was implemented in three schools for three years (2007-2009). Data specific to these three schools for the three years is not presented in support of district's claim regarding track record of successful implementation.
- A growth model was adopted in 2010-2011. District and school performance data are provided in Appendix-B and Appendix-C. It is stated in the narrative, without specifying the source-year, that there are two A schools, five B schools and 2 C schools in the district. Appendix C (2011) shows that there are four A schools, four B schools and one C school. If the data in the narrative is for 2012, then there is a decline in the rating – in performance/efficiency. Not knowing the source of the data makes it difficult to interpret the same.
- Growth in 6-7-8 grade Special Education subgroup has not kept pace with other grades or other subgroups.
- Improvement in graduation rate, (three years) from 78% in 2007 to 82% in 2012, is not remarkable. It is not clear whether the method of calculating graduation rate remained the same over the years. Also, it is not clear what method is being used.
- It is not clear whether the improvement reclassification rate is a result of improved education programs or changes in the Arizona ELL regulations over the last five years.
- When data is presented, it seems, there is vagueness of the distinction between (or swapping) Hispanic and ELL subgroups.
- As shown in the table above, data are not provided 10th grade subgroups and across all grades for ELLs.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Narrative states that school level information is shared with stakeholders through newspapers, board meetings, etc. No supporting evidence is included in the application. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether the LEA actually shares the information it claims to, and if so in what format and with what levels of transparency. Creating transparency about individualized learning environment in the district is one of the major goals proposed to be accomplished during the first year of the project.

A low-mid score is assigned for this sub-criterion.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Narrative, with some exceptions/gaps, indicates that the State affords successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to the LEA for implementing its plan and the plan is aligned within the State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements.

Thus, an upper Mid-level score is assigned.

Where the plan is aligned with the State context

- Arizona State laws provide for autonomy and flexibility.
- LEA states that it intends to apply various aspects of the autonomy and flexibility provisions in the implementation of the project, including those for personalizing learning environments.

Where the plan is not aligned with the State context

- The State permits additional flexibilities only to schools which receive an 'A' rating. Thus the extent of flexibility available to the seven schools that did not receive an 'A' rating is not addressed in the narrative.

Additional information on the current state context with reference to required assessments, calculation of graduation rates, programs for ELL sub-group, etc. are not presented, and thus alignment of implementation with regard to these elements cannot be determined.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

LEA implemented a process for meaningfully engaging stakeholders and garnering support from them. Details regarding processes and the extent of involvement by certain stakeholder groups are lacking.

Thus an upper Mid- level score is assigned.

Information provided by the LEA

- LEA conducted a parent satisfaction survey through which highest need areas were identified. Survey data presented in appendix-A shows aggregated percentages of 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' by school for each survey item.
- The schematics of the framework presented in Appendix-D seem to have guided the development process.
- Letters of support from relevant/significant stakeholders are presented in Appendix-F. This LEA seems to be one without collective bargaining. (A search for the text *collective bargaining* within the text of the application did not return any occurrence to confirm.)
- The table showing percentages of affirmative votes by teachers within each school indicates that LEA met the required minimum of 70% or more teacher/leadership approval of the project plan.

Factors that limit the quality of the information provided by the LEA

- Information on the exact constituents of the affirmative vote percentages (how the percentages were calculated – i.e. the numerators and denominators) is not provided.
- No evidence (such as who, when, how, etc. of the voting) is provided. In the absence of any evidence, the exact 70% approval from teachers of Liberty Traditional School casts doubt about the process and the data.
- Differences between schools in the responses are wide and are not addressed in the project design process.
- No supporting evidence, such as number of meetings, number attending the meetings, etc. is presented.
- There is no evidence of representation from students during the processes. (A support letter from the high school student council is included in Appendix-F)
- There is no information on whether any language (Spanish, sign language, etc.) support was presented for parents and community members who needed such a support.
- Some of the letters are boiler plate letters with exactly identical texts, signed by different individuals. Thus, they lack individual perspectives about the proposed project.
- Of the nine schools in the LEA, support letters are presented from principals of only three schools.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

An acceptable logic behind the reform proposal (model) is presented. Parent survey data presented in Appendix-A is cited as response to this criterion. LEA conducted a parent satisfaction survey through which highest need areas were identified. Survey data presented in appendix-A shows aggregated percentages of 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' by school for each survey item. However, LEA fails to provide a coherent current status of implementing personalized learning environments and specific school level gaps and needs. District-wide Gaps and needs in the academic areas are identified and are presented as isolated information/statements in various Sections of the proposal. Plan for analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and addressing specific needs and gaps is not presented in response to this sub-criterion.

Thus a low-mid score is assigned for this sub-criterion.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented a plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment for supporting all students to graduate college- and career-ready. A description of how the instructional strategies will be implemented is provided. The plan intends to accelerate individual student's learning through supporting individual needs.

An upper Mid-level score is assigned because of lack of high-quality in certain aspects of the plan.

Elements of high-quality plan included in the narrative

- I choose Model of the LEA's reform plan (redundantly presented in two contexts: in response to criterion A – Vision and criterion B5) essentially has three goals for each of the four project years: (1) professional development, (2) develop/revise individual learning plans, and (3) evaluate progress on performance measures.

- Additional goals for the first year of the project are building needed infrastructure, creating transparency on the case for personalizing the learning environment, and adapting needed policy changes.
- A general description of the strategy for accelerating individual students learning through support of the needs of individual participating students is presented. A list of grade-cluster topics for parent, teacher and student training on the individual student learning plan and associated technologies is presented.
- Mechanisms will be in place to provide training and support to teachers, students, parents, and administrators so that the system is used effectively.

Elements of high-quality plan NOT included in the narrative

- Plan does not give details of how the LEA engages and empowers high needs students, especially those relevant to items listed as criteria (C)(1)(a) (i) through(v).
- Plan does not give details regarding how the LEA 's strategy to ensure that each student has the characteristics specified in criteria (c)(1)(b)(i) through (v).
- Outlines and/or specifications of the approach to engaged learning for college- and career ready standards and requirements, especially for high need students are not spelled out. For example, a course sequence (learning and development goals) needed for graduation that will ensure college readiness and career readiness is not indicated.
- Information specific to the nature and frequency of data on student progress toward graduation, college readiness, and career readiness that takes into consideration the personalized approach is not presented.
- Specifics of school level adaptations of the intervention are not addressed.
- Specific details (activities, timelines, deliverables, etc.) pertaining to the major goals, especially those for personalizing the learning environment are not presented.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant affirms through statements that all sub-criteria of criterion C (2) will be implemented. One primary goal of the project is to provide professional development for teachers, students and parents on different aspects of implementing personalized learning experiences. A list of sample professional development topics is presented. Applicant has identified early release Wednesdays, vertical-horizontal articulation and data analysis meetings, and summer learning institutes as avenues for implementing professional development. However, no clear-cut and thought out details of a high-quality plan that addresses all elements of criterion C (2).

Thus a middle Mid-level score is assigned for this cub-criterion.

Some characteristics (positive and negative) of the proposed plan include:

- Project level budget narratives (present elsewhere in the application) give some insight into the strategies being contemplated.
- Topical areas for professional development and parent training are listed.
- LEA plans to use teacher and principal evaluation systems as required by the State of Arizona.
- The nature and frequency of this evaluation and feedback are not specified.
- Applicant has restated the many of the elements of the criterion as planned strategies without giving specifics.

A synoptic statement, if not a detailed description, of the current/ proposed data systems which will facilitate personalization and continuous improvement planning by teachers and school leadership is not provided.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**11**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

LEA has provided a general description covering major elements of this criterion. The district has (or will have) practices, policies and rules for re-organizing its central office as needed. The proposed plan includes provision for certain existing staff positions to have added responsibilities, and to add positions with new responsibilities. Granting of autonomy and flexibility with all aspects of building level decisions is part of the proposed project. Policies relevant to giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credits based on demonstrated mastery will be in place during the first year of the project. Plan to use multiple formative assessments is included.

Details are lacking as to the LEA's plans for providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible. This is especially so with specific reference to resources and practices for high need students. There is mention of *digital tools* without giving specifics regarding the nature, types, characteristics, etc. of such tools. Specific plans as to who, when, what, how, etc. are not provided.

 Thus an upper Mid-level score is assigned.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

LEA has provided a general description covering major elements of this criterion.   LEA's description includes plans for ensuring all stakeholders, regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools and other learning resources both in and out of school. The district plans to provide appropriate levels of technical support to all stakeholders. Applicant plans to ensure that information technology will use interoperable and open data systems which will permit ease of resource and data use by stakeholders.

Details are lacking as to exactly how and what information technology resources will be used as part of the infrastructure. Applicant has not incorporated preliminary thoughts about the nature of this infrastructure. LEA plans to accomplish its planning as part of the goals for the first year of the project. Specific plans for even this process (to when, what, how, etc.) are not provided.

 Thus an upper Mid-level score is assigned.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

LEA has addressed this criterion from the perspective of required summative (annual or quarterly) evaluation of its academic programs and fiscal conditions.

Only a limited plan of strategy, process and procedures for a continuous improvement process within the context of an individualized learning environment, with timely and regular feedback on progress and associated improvement of project is not provided.

Thus, a low Mid-level score is assigned.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

LEA has addressed this criterion from the perspective of required summative (annual or quarterly) evaluation of its academic programs and fiscal conditions.

- Applicant plans to post district level student achievement and classroom instructional quality on the district website, and shared with local media including newspaper and community television/radio stations.
- LEAt will prepare and present a formal executive summary of the program evaluation for the Governing Board and other stakeholders.

Only extremely limited and sketchy information on these strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders is provided. No plan for these actions is presented.

Thus, a low Mid-level score is assigned.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Ambitious and achievable performance measures with annual targets are specified for qualified and highly qualified instructional and administrative staff.

Ambitious, but difficult to achieve performance targets are set for putting in place individual student plans. LEA sets the first year target of 80% of all students to have such a plan in place, which seems to be not realistic due to the fact that systems and structures for the plan are not in place. Further, it takes time and concerted effort is needed to train the leadership, staff, parents, and students in the use of such a plan. End of the project target of 100% is achievable.

Rationale for selecting the specific performance measures is not provided. The capacity of the selected performance measures to provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information is not evident. For example, the selected performance measures for grades 3-12 are annual measures which do not provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information.

Also, no plan is provided to review and refine the performance measures themselves when found to be ineffective, in an ongoing manner. For example, applicability and relevance of the Observation Record (Appendix-E) needs continuous review. A plan or process for reviewing and improving these instruments is not included. Issues like performance measures appropriate for high need students, including language/accessibility supports are not addressed.

The plan to keep formative data, from the individual student's learning plan, in the permanent record of the student may need a critical review by policy makers and stakeholders.

Thus a Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	**5**	**3**

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A plan of moderate quality to evaluate the effectiveness of significant RTT-D funded activities is presented in this section of the application. A structured plan that includes all the elements of a high quality plan is not provided.

Formative and summative evaluations of project activities, progress and outcomes using multiple assessment and data collection formats are presented as part of the evaluation plan. The plan includes evaluation of the effectiveness of professional development, technology, productivity, school leadership teams, and partnerships. Observations, surveys, focus groups and stakeholder meetings are used as data collection strategies/methods. It is not clear whether the observation instrument presented in Appendix-E is the same as the *Teach4Success* observation instrument mentioned in the evaluation plan. If it is the same, then the instrument needs to be refined for applicability to the RTT-D project.

Thus an upper Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In the *Overall Budget Summary* and associated narrative the applicant has:

a. identified all funds that will support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal;
b. described all the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal,
c. Identified funds that are one time investments versus those that will be used for operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period with a focus on long term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

The applicant has provided limited or no description of total revenues from other sources that the applicant will use to support implementation of specific element s of the proposal.

There are some observations on the sufficiency/reasonableness of the budget from the overall budget summary:

1. It is prudent that travel line is kept to the minimum.
2. It is sensible and practical that a major part of the equipment funding is scheduled for the first year.
3. Personnel and benefits lines do not show the effect of any possible annual increases.
4. A substantial amount (20%) of funds from other sources is committed and yet limited details regarding other sources of funding are provided.

The project level budget and narrative includes minimal information on the budget details from which the reasonableness and sufficiency of the budget can be assessed. For example, there are no details for the total $1,320,000 requested in the *personnel* line for Project-1 over the four years of the grant. Itemized cost, as well as sources of funds, for each year of the project is not provided.

However, a review of the project level budget summaries and associated budget narratives lend to conclude that the project budgets are reasonable and sufficient.

Based on these observations, an upper Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.

[Note: There is a need to verify whether Federal grant funds can be used for construction or purchase of modular buildings, which the LEA plans to do for a community commons.]

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**5**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

One-time and ongoing expenses are identified in the overall budget summary. LEA is committed to long-term sustainability of certain ongoing expenses with funds from other sources (through "override"). The Appendix-E is an observation instrument and does not have any relevance to the override, as stated in the budget narrative.

Limited details regarding other sources of funding that will contribute to the sustainability are provided. A high-quality plan that includes financial support from local and State government leaders as well as the suggested three year plan for the post grant period is not provided.

There are elements of sustainability for the project, but there is no viable plan.

Based on these observations, a mid Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to integrate public and private resources from approximately ten community/private agencies. These partnerships will address social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students. The partnerships included in the LEA's plan are coherent and sustainable and are aimed at supporting the plan described in response to *Absolute Priority 1.* The applicant has presented six (6) population level desired services (under the column of desired results) that align with and support the applicant's broader RTT-D application. Anticipated results are not listed.

The applicant provides a limited description of how these partnerships will track the selected indicators (services), target the resources, and improve the results. Scaling is not an issue in this project because all schools and all students are involved in the project. The applicant provides some details regarding how the partnership will integrate educational and other services, and how the consortium will contribute to building capacity of the school staff. Relevant, ambitious and achievable performance measures for Kindergarten, fifth grade and twelfth grade are provided.

Over all, LEA has provided a reasonable description of the partnerships, benefits, outcomes and performance targets.

An upper Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has coherently and comprehensively addressed how it will build on the core educational assurance areas (as defined in the NIA) 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 or college- and career-ready graduation requirements that are aligned with common core standards and student needs;
- accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student;
- increase the effectiveness of educators;
- expand student access to the most effective educators;
- decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and
- increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers

The LEA proposes to provide personalized learning environments and strategies through the following actions:

- The *I Choose* model adopted by the local education agency (LEA) will enable students to select topics that are of their interest and to self-pace as they master proficiency of the Common Core State Standards and the College and Career Readiness Standards;
- Elementary and middle schools will use a 3-tiered response to intervention system;
- Apply various aspects of the autonomy and flexibility provisions in the implementation of the project, including those for personalizing learning environments.

As a result, the applicant has met the *Absolute Priority 1* criterion.

Total	**210**	**125**

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	12

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has proposed an optional project that collaborates with the Health Services Program (HSP) of the Mountain Institute – Joint Technical Education Institute (MIJTED) proposed optional project is aligned with the school reform project and the Absolute Priority 1.

Considering the rural environment of the LEA, having this project will enhance access to career programs in the health care field and increase the capacity of the LEA to strengthen career readiness of students interested in the health care field.

LEA has provided a description of essential elements of the partnership, but has NOT presented a reasonably structured description of the plan.

The proposed budget includes allocations for MIJTED staff personnel who will be providing project oversight, contracted personnel necessary for the development of Web-based content and case simulations, professional development of LEA staff, and items such as space, equipment, materials and supplies. At the reviewer's experiential judgment, the proposed budget is reasonable and adequate for the four year duration of the optional project.

Based on the above review and analysis and value of the project to the students, the *Optional Budget Supplement* **is given a low High-level score.**

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0242AZ-3 for Humboldt Unified School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates its commitment to college and career readiness standards throughout students' educational careers K-12. This is evidenced by the use of several strategies -- Advancement via Individual Determiniation (AVID), Educational Talent Search (ETS), and GEAR UP. The four goals established by the applicant's governing board are reasonable and supported by the applicant's reform vision, however the applicant does not provide specific details on how increasing parent and community involvement will address Absolute Priority 1.

The data charts provided annual goals for student achievement on state assessment tests (math, reading, and science). There were no goals stated to deepen student learning.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	**10**	**3**

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The I Choose model is innovative and will satisfy components of Absolute Priority 1 by personalizing strategies for student learning in focused efforts to raise student achievement and decrease achievement gaps. However, the applicant doesn't provide data to support the I Choose model. A pilot program is mentioned, but that started in the current school year, so no data exists at the present to validate the program's success. The I Choose model as detailed by the applicant does not satisfy all components of a high-quality plan. While the activities provided by grade level are appropriate, no deliverables from the activities are stated to gage process other than end-of-year tests. For example, the applicant mentions Paxton/Patterson Action Labs will be installed at the middle school level, yet there is no data provided regarding the amount of time students will use the labs. Information regarding professional development for teachers to be effective using the labs is also not provided.

Years one through four of the process were outlined and a list of participating schools, students (by required subgroups), and educators were provided.

(The percentages in chart A(2) column I don't reflect the numbers provided in column D.)

Overall this is a low response due to the fact that this is not representative of a high quality plan. While strategies are provided, the rationale for the programs detailed is unclear. Also, the timeline only details annual measurable outcomes and there is no mention of persons responsible.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes achievable and reasonable strategies by grade level to support district-wide reform. The applicant's decision to include all schools in the reform process is justified by the student data provided on all schools. The key stakeholders include non-school personnel which supports the applicant's focus on college and career standards. The applicant's ongoing process of assessing school personnel, parents, and students support district-wide reform, but the frequency is not stated and the provided timeline does not reflect this action or the responsible party.

The outcome goals are feasible, yet they do not include the Leadership Team's input. The purpose of the Leadership Team beyond the grant application is not clearly defined.

Also, the timeline provided does not include professional development training for several strategies mentioned -- ETS, Paxton/Patterson Action Labs, and GEAR UP. If these strategies are already in place across the district that should have been stated along with supporting data.

The plan provided includes the necessary components of a high quality plan - goal, deliverables, timeline, and party responsible. These are detailed in the provided chart. However, items are mentioned throughout section A that are not included in the plan -- Leadership Team input and professional development for previously mentioned strategies. And the activities within the chart are vague.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The focused efforts through the I Choose model support the likelihood of improved student outcomes for English Language Learners and students with disabilities. However the details of implementation are vague (timeline, professional development, responsible parties, frequency, and expectations other than the annual tests). The applicant also has limited experience and no data regarding the I Choose model since it has only been piloted in one school for two months. Without this data it isn't possible to expect improved student learning and performance.

The anticipated percentage increases each year are reasonable. Over the course of the grant (four years) significant achievement gaps are predicted to still exist, yet they are decreasing approximately ten to twenty percentage points. This does not demonstrate an ambitious goal.

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**	**14**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has three Reading First Schools. The applicant presented strong, convincing data regarding reading scores from 2007 to 2012 for all students in grades three through eight. The gains were also present for Hispanic students in grades three through eight and even more significant for students with disabilities in grades three through six. The applicant presented information to directly tie the success to the work of the school district and teachers.

The graduation rate over the past three years has increased by four percent. This wasn't attributed to a specific measure, however the reading gains should positively affect this percentage in future years.

Under the Arizona Growth Model, the applicant ranks a high B average and has 2 A schools and 5 B schools. The two A schools are also the district's lowest socio-economic schools. This further supports the applicant's ability to close achievement gaps.

Current data regarding college enrollment does not exist, but will moving forward by using National Clearinghouse data.

Student grades and attendance data have been available to parents. Beginning this school year, parents are able to access student assessment data in real time. This new addition supports improved communication.

Overall this was a high response. However, no data was provided regarding science or mathematics, although that was present on previous charts as a measure being used by the applicant. Therefore, it is unclear whether the applicant has demonstrated success in these two subject areas.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided no evidence of actual salaries at the school level, only a one-page data sheet for the division which was posted online and provided by request only. The applicant stated this would be done if the grant is received, but this is not demonstrated evidence.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides an insufficient response to this criteria. There is no demonstrated evidence of the applicant's ability to implement the personalized learning environment described. While the applicant does state it "will apply," it has not done so yet. The applicant also refers to the state's progress for this criteria, no evidence is provided to support the applicant's progress.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant mentions a survey conducted in the spring of 2012 to students and parents, however, the results are not provided nor is it clear if the purpose of the survey was to obtain information for the development of a RttT-D proposal. No clear evidence of student and parent engagement is provided. The concept map provides details on how stakeholders will be engaged if the grant is received, but not engagement of the proposal development.

The applicant also stated the county needs included growing health care careers and jobs in aeronautics and engineering, yet these were not reflected in section A.

Evidence of teacher support was provided on a chart. The applicant stated revisions were made to the proposal based on teacher feedback, but these revisions were not included or elaborated upon.

Letters of support were provided by various key stakeholders and demonstrate community support.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant stated district data was reviewed to determine the needs and gaps, Appendix A. Appendix A is parent survey results. While parents are a key stakeholder, it appears their input was the primary/only input determine the district's needs and gaps. The plan includes goals for professional development based on the parent survey results for "teaching and assessing student learning" being low for most schools.The determination of the district's needs and gaps is limited due to the one method of collecting data - parent survey.

Also, in year 1 of the plan, a goal is to build infrastructure for on-to-one technology, but there are no clear strategies of how technology will support I Choose or what the expectations of one-to-one will be academically.

> The presented plan contains the necessary components of a high-quality plan, but the data used to determine the needs and gaps is insufficient.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	**20**	**2**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide specific strategies for engaging and empowering student learners. The ideas mentioned are vague, for example: solve problems with real world applications. There are no other details provided and the ideas are not tied to a goal, timeline, or responsible party. The applicant state and intervention specialist will be available at each campus to be a resource to teachers, however, no other rationale is provided regarding these positions. No qualifications are included and this position has not been included in previous timelines.

The applicant states students will use a variety of technology to be successful academically, however, no specific technologies are listed. The same applies to the mention of manipulatives. The applicant also refers to "learning lab environments." However, no further details are provided regarding the quantity of labs, frequency of use, and which grades/subjects.

The chart provided does not include a timeline, measurable outcomes, or responsible parties. Some of the activities listed also repeat at each grade level, such as Family Link Training, Understanding Your Student's ILP, and Using Your Child's Personal Technology. Again, technology is briefly mentioned, but no specific details are provided. The technology is available for grades four through twelve, but how these will be applied is not included.

It is also undocumented how the applicant will address parents who do not attend the training provided.

Providing parent trainings in Spanish and English is appropriate and reflects the diversity of the population being served. Storing these trainings digitally for future reference is a good practice.

The practice of using writing in all subject areas is supported from previous timelines which include professional development for writing assessments. This also supports a comprehensive, cross-curricular approach to instruction which is proven to yield positive results.

The applicant included student surveys which will help the district measure the students' understanding of personalized learning. However, the applicant does not provide details regarding the type of survey and frequency.

Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students are not documented.

Overall, the applicant's approach is confusing and there are insufficient details supporting the applicant's ability or plan to engage and empower all learners.

	Available	Score
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	**20**	**4**

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides instructional strategies to be offered through professional developments for teachers to implement that support a personalized learning environment. Further professional development examples are provided regarding mathematics, English, and science (STEM). However, no specific strategies designed for students with disabilities, Hispanic students, or high-need students are provided.

No details are provided regarding the parties responsible and how teachers will be evaluated. It was stated that professional development would include opportunities for frequent feedback by means of an evaluation system. But an evaluation system is not currently in place.

Also, the applicant does not distinguish professional development opportunities for effective vs. highly effective teachers.

It is stated training will be provided on accessing student data to measure student progress, however, the type of technology being utilized and how frequently the data will be accessed is not provided.

Professional development linked to college and career ready standards are limited. The only two are college fair and STEM, however without further details regarding the implementation of the two professional development opportunities, it is unclear if they support the selection criteria.

The applicant refers to professional teams, but no further explanation is provided regarding the makeup of these teams and their expectations.

The use of early release days for professional development will further ensure all teachers participate.

Improved teachers' practice will be supported by one strategy detailed, video archive of exemplary lessons.

There is no evidence regarding the number of effective and highly-effective teachers or the applicant's plan to increase the latter.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes the support system currently in place along with additional staff to support the project. The additional staff of six intervention specialists is adequate for the project. The addition of nine math content specialists and six additional English language arts specialists are not supported by the limited job details provided. The four technology specialists are reasonable for the one-to-one initiative suggested. The director of curriculum and instruction position is appropriate for the scope of the work detailed in the project.

There is no supporting evidence provided regarding the development of multiple opportunities and methods for students to demonstrate success.

School leadership teams will be formed and they will have sufficient flexibility and autonomy as they design master schedules, implement mastery of content versus seat time, and manage school-level budgets.

The applicant states teachers will be trained to accommodate for students with disabilities, ELL students, and gifted students, however, no strategies are detailed and the person responsible is not provided.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes learning resources that will be provided to all students and parents including technology (one-to-one), Internet access, and a help desk during school and non-school hours. This will ensure all students and parents, regardless of socio-economic status, have access to the necessary resources in and out of school to support academic success. The help desk further supports appropriate levels of technical support.

The district is also working with local government on a data warehouse.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states Teach4Success will be used to evaluate teachers and principals. It is further stated that the applicant will post the results of the data collected. However, the applicant does not state when the data will be collected. And the applicant does not mention what the plan is if the data does not meet the performance measures that are expected. There are also no statements regarding the individuals or departments responsible for the implementation of Teach4Success.

While this response does identify the measure for evaluating teachers and principals and provide details for how this will be shared with the public, the applicant does not provide a timeline or persons responsible. And there are no details regarding the change of plans if the data does not meet the applicant's expectations.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	**5**	**4**

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a strategy for monitoring, measuring, and publicly sharing principal and teacher evaluations with the public by posting the results on the district's website and sharing with local media. To maintain ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders, the district will internally conduct a comprehensive evaluation by using focus groups, surveys, and student achievement data. These strategies will provide deliverables to all stakeholders for regular communication and engagement with stakeholders. However, the applicant does not state how often this information will be updated and who is responsible for posting the information.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states several reasonable performance measures in the chart on page 79 that support Absolute Priority 1, such as: "100% of all students will have an effective teacher and principal" and "100% of all students in grades six through nine will compete the ACT Engage assessment." One performance measure for all students states that 80% of all students in the applicable population will have an individual learning plan in place by the end of the first year. Details are not provided regarding which 20% of the population are not included and how they were selected, therefore there is not rational for this goal. With the increase of staff previously described and the entire focus of I Choose being individual learning plans, it is insufficient to exclude 20% of the population on this key element.

On performance chart E3(a) rationale is provided for why the applicable population is students in grades four through eight. However, two of the subgroups are male, female. Gender equity has not been mentioned in the proposal to this point and the data suggests there is no discrepancy between the two; making it unclear what is hoped to be gained with these two performance measures or how the project can measure success.

On performance chart E3(c), female and male subgroups are again included without rationale and the jump from the baseline year to 2012-2013 for female and male students with an individualized learning plan is 10 to 50 percent. Based on the chart on page 79, this number should be at least 80% and should be specific to students in grades six through nine, not all students. Also, if "all students" are not completing the ACT Engage assessment as detailed on the chart on page 79, then it is unrealistic to set a goal of 100% during the 2016-2017 school year.

The percentage increases on sections a and b of the chart on page 86 are realistic.

The post-grant expectations of the chart on page 87 regarding students on track to college and career readiness standards is 80% for all subgroups, yet the baseline data by subgroups varies between 28% and 76%. It is not ambitious to make a gain of only four percentage points in this area for the Hispanic reading subgroup (76% to 80%) over a six year period. It is also not ambitious to set the final goals for all subgroups at 80% in this area since college and career readiness is one of the four focus areas of the I Choose model.

One chart in section E3, again includes gender based subgroups, but not a subgroup for students with disabilities. And there are insufficient expectations for the males reading goals each year. For example: from the baseline year to 2013-2014, the percentage gain expected is 1%. While the females reading percentage gain is expected to be 8%. No rationale has been provided for including gender based subgroups or the discrepancy between males and females in some areas.

The expected goals for students completing a FAFSA are reasonable and support the I Choose model.

Overall this is a low response due to several factors which examples have been provided for. The applicant's goals were not consistently ambitious, no rationale was provided for different subgroups selection and the applicant does not provide a performance measure for evaluating one grade-level appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator for successful implementation of the plan.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates their understanding of evaluating the effetiveness of the program by planning quarterly observation sweeps using the Teach4Success observation instrument, using technology, conducting small focus groups at each school, and colecting quantitative and qualitative data.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant details all funding sources within the budget narrative and supporting charts (E-rate, B-bond, Title I, and Title II).

Overall the budget requests are reasonable and sufficient to support the applicant's proposal.

Salaries: The full-time salaries are reasonable. The salaries for math and English specialists are not competitive considering the expertise expected and the eleven month contract, but they are reasonable. The one salary concern is the amount for student part-time technology assistants. It was detailed by the applicant within the application that these hours would fulfill community service requirements. And the salaries for the part-time students include retirement. This doesn't seem necessary.

One-to-One Technology: The applicant states the one-to-one technology implementation will take place in year two of the grant, however, the budget table details the amount for equipment under the "Teaching with Technology" initiative to cost the same over the last three years ($738,340.00). It isn't clear in the narrative what this amount is for and within the budget narrative, the purchase of technology is to take place in year one, which is not supported by previous timelines. Also, the budget narrative states students in grades two through twelve will receive technology devices, yet the proposal states grades four through twelve. The replacement cost of $110,093.20 for the four years seems low and no details are provided to support this estimate or plans if the funding amount is insufficient.

Sustainability: The applicant states an anticipated student enrollment increase will support the grant beyond funding, however, no details are provided regarding the amount of students expected or how the district plans to accomplish this.

Personalized Learning Environments: Other than the professional development costs, the applicant does not make a clear case regarding the commitment to personalized learning environments. This could be the purpose of the one-to-one technology, however, the purpose for the technology and how it directly ties to the I Choose model is not clearly stated.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states the district proposed a Maintenance and Operations or Capital override to sustain the grant at the end of the four years, yet no details or anticipated amounts are provided. The other sustainability strategy was to increase student enrollment, yet no strategies were provided to increase the likelihood this will in fact occur.

Letters of support for the proposal were provided by the school board president and mayor, yet neither stated a financial commitment to the project.

Overall, this was a low response due to the fact that there was not a plan provided regarding the sustainability of the project. This includes no evidence of a timeline, strategies, parties responsible, and specific goals.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**1**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant refers to existing partnerships with Educational Talent Search and Upward Bound and details the current responsibilities of a district employ, volunteer coordinator. However, the applicant does not describe a coherent partnership that would provide additional resources to student and family supports. A chart is included, but there are no goals, timelines, or tangible outcomes described. The desired results listed are vague and do not demonstrate targeted resources or the possibility of scaling up the efforts.

One chart provided states an idea that all kindergarten students will be ready for first grade, however this is subjective and no measure is in place to effectively assess this idea. This is not a measurable outcome or goal. Similarly, the performance measure for fifth grade students is to be determined by teacher exit cards. This is not a valid assessment of the measure detailed and other data should be included. The applicant also refers to an exit survey upon graduation for all students. The measure does not describe what the expected results are, only that it will be completed. And the anticipated percentages do not match the same measure which was detailed on one chart, where the goal was 90%.

Overall this is a low response due to the fact that there is not a plan in place for the partnerships described. While the applicant does state how the groups currently collaborate, there is no evidence of providing further student and family supports or desired results.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does meet Absolute Priority 1 due to the fact that evidence is provided to improve learning and teaching through professional development opportunities and increased technology access. Personalization strategies will be encouraged through the implementation of the a student data system that was described. Performance measures detailed by the applicant support the applicant's understanding of college and career readiness standards, effectiveness of teachers and principals, and the ability to decrease achievement gaps based on previous results in several areas, specifically reading in grades three through eight.

	Available	Score
Total	**210**	**85**

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	10

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a health services program that will be co-developed and utilized with seven high schools and Yavapai College. The rationale for the career field is adequately explained and there is also supporting data regarding the community's future healthcare workforce demands. The program implementation and budget are complete, however the plan for the facilities use is vague. The applicant states 700 students will use the facility, however, there are no details regarding the source of this number and how often the facility will be used. Likewise there are no future performance measures or strategies for the center once in place.

The applicant describes a hard to measure strategy - "possible selves." The rationale for this concept is provided and is focused and reasonable, yet the details with regards to how the healthcare program will be introduced to students and when is not mentioned. The "possible selves" concept is lacking in the applicant's plan.

The only concern noted regarding the budget is the rental fee and sustaining this in the future.

The application across districts and with the local college is supported.