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SCOPE OF WORK

This document presents a summary of the proposed external evaluation work that will be conducted with the Puget Sound Educational School District (PSESD) and its partners during its three-year implementation of the Road Map Region Race to the Top District (RTTT-D) grant. RTTT-D builds upon and extends the work of the Road Map Project. Through targeted projects, RTTT-D aims to dramatically improve student achievement for 147,000 students in the seven Road Map District Consortium districts, including Auburn School District, Federal Way Public Schools, Highline Public Schools, Kent School District, Renton School District, Seattle Public Schools, Tukwila School District, and the Puget Sound Educational Service District (PSESD).

The main thrust of the RTTT-D external evaluation will be to measure the success of the Partnership at achieving its primary goal, serving students from cradle to career in consortium districts. The evaluation plan describes how RTI will document and evaluate implementation of the RTTT-D grant and contribute to the establishment of ongoing and consistent data collection and reporting that will lead to an understanding of the intervention’s impact.

This Scope of Work is intended as a working document that will change as the needs of RTTT-D change, as we learn more about the implementation and impact of the project, and as we learn more about how the partners work with and learn from one another.

Evaluation Approach

RTI prides itself on conducting studies that are methodologically sound, transparent, and meaningful. Evaluating systems efforts like RTTT-D in ways that both capture their impact and inform their ongoing development can pose significant challenges. RTI believes that using a process of Development Evaluation is the most effective approach to examine and provide feedback on the implementation of RTTT-D. Overall, Developmental Evaluation separates itself from more traditional evaluative approaches in that the evaluators are seen as an internal member of the group or team that helps gather, analyze and interpret data in real time. Using a Developmental Evaluation framework allows for greater flexibility when analyzing initiatives or innovations, which in nature tend to continuously develop and evolve. When a great deal is in flux, it is impossible to establish a static logic model that reflects precisely what is to happen as implementation advances. Alternatively, linear logical approaches work well when the problem is well understood and the solution is clearly defined.

“When innovating within a complex system, [however], it is difficult to understand the ramifications of changes. The dynamics of a complex system have a high degree of connectivity and interdependence. There are diverse elements whose interactions create unpredictable, emergent results…The very techniques that enable evaluation excellence in more static situations—standardization of inputs, consistency of treatment, uniformity of outcomes and clarity of causal linkages—are unhelpful, even harmful, to situations where there is a lot of uncertainty and ‘moving goalposts…Developmental evaluation applies to an ongoing process of innovation in which both the path and the destination are evolving” (Gamble, McConnell Family Foundation, 2008, pp. 14-15).

The Road Map Project involves multiple programs, players, and feature outcomes at multiple levels. It also requires aligning goals and coordinating actions across organizations with different political cultures and decision-making structures. And as this initiative is imperative because it tackles difficult and deep-rooted problems such as gaps in educational services and outcomes based on race, income, culture, and language, these many complexities place systems initiatives directly outside of the more familiar and more traditional program evaluation comfort zone. Therefore it is crucial that the framework be flexible.
enough to be accommodating of these sensitive issues, but firm enough to serve as a justifiable and defensible approach to evaluating RTTT-D.

The evaluator assumes a unique role when Developmental Evaluation is employed. Essentially, the evaluator becomes part of a team that is working to conceptualize and test new approaches, and brings evaluative thinking to the process. Developmental Evaluation also takes into account changes to an organization’s structure, governance, and relationships and goes on to assess how these factors affect the efficiency of the program. The approach may also consider the dynamics of collaboration and, “helps collaborators to recognize and work through differences in perception that might otherwise fragment the work and hamper ongoing developments” (Gamble, 2008, p. 18).

The data collection techniques that can be used in Developmental Evaluation are often similar to those used in formative or summative evaluation, but the nature of the questions asked, for example, may differ in perspective. In other cases, some unique tools can be used depending on the stage of development and complexity of the Consortium.

For instance, one particular approach within Developmental Evaluation is Appreciative Inquiry, a technique that involves asking questions in ways that strengthen a system’s capacity to understand, anticipate, and enhance its potential. It is a systematic search for what it is that enlivens a system when it is its most effective and productive. Asking the question is both a query and an intervention. Appreciative Inquiry focuses on positive attributes and uses case examples to uncover key themes and patterns about what succeeds.

Finally, a basic framework for reporting and providing feedback to the RTTT-D partners that is consistent with Developmental Evaluation involves asking these three questions:

- **What?** What do we see? What do the data tell us? What are the indicators of change or stability? What cues can be captured to see changing patterns as they emerge?

- **So what?** What sense can we make of emerging data? What does it mean to us in this moment and in the future? What effect are current changes likely to have on the Consortium, on cases, on county practices, and on the Consortium?

- **Now what?** What options are available? What resources are available? When and how can the Consortium act—individually or collectively—to optimize opportunities now and in the future?

Informing all of our work is the underlying belief that our role is not only to serve as experts in the design and conduct of evaluation, but also as partners with clients and stakeholders who are involved in the development of the intervention and its implementation. The goal of our work is to help the initiative leaders put their work in perspective within the bigger picture, allowing project staff to better understand the influence of their work. Further, we will focus on how the consortium partners work together specifically to help all involved parties work more efficiently, to help them develop a more sophisticated understanding of their theory of change and their common understandings, to work through differences, and help them focus on how to renew their initiative through intentional changes in the initiative and its theory of change.

However, we must also note that using a Developmental Evaluation approach will require close contact and consistent conversations with PSESD staff. This allows the most optimal use of the resources provided in the most effective and efficient manner, due to the large scope of RTTT-D, the constraints of the evaluation resources, and our geographical location.
Evaluation Tasks

The following section details the four main tasks that will be undertaken to evaluate the implementation of RTTT-D. For each of the tasks, we expect that the work will reflect a close collaboration among all of the implementation partners, including the evaluators.

Task 1: Mapping the Network

Activities

An initial step in RTI’s evaluation of RTTT-D is to develop a deeper understanding of the extent of the network, both in terms of its partners and its goals and related activities. To that end, we propose developing the following three artifacts.

- Development of a Network Map of Partners

  RTI has already begun to work with the PSESD evaluation liaison staff to develop a project map of stakeholders and their roles and responsibilities. These partner groups include RTTT-D Executive Committee, District Superintendents, Community Network Steering Committee, and project work groups (Data Advisors, School Board Members, Principals and Teachers, Youth Development Organizations, etc.). RTI will have to note which groups and committees work more directly with the RTTT-D projects and continue to differentiate RMP work from RTTT-D work. This map of the various entities and party involvement in the overall scope of the Road Map Project will help address organizational strength and challenges, and ultimately help evaluate the nature and quality of the RTTT-D partnerships. See Appendix A for an example of the network map.

- Development of a Fiscal Resource Map

  Similar to a partner map, a Fiscal Resource Map will document at a broad level how the RTTT-D’s fiscal resources have been distributed among its partners. See Appendix B for an example of the fiscal resources map.

  The current example of the Resource Map examines only the resources provided to schools and districts. We can also show resources distributed to community-based organizations. A question that we have, however, is how to balance that the RTTT-D funding is but one piece of funding in the seven districts—should RTI also collect information on other funding (RMP, Gates) that is being provided to support the larger Road Map Project. This would allow us to contextualize the resources provided directly by RTTT-D. For example, do some organizations who play a role in RTTT-D get more resources through other means or use their own resources to support the project?

- Development of a project Logic Model

  We propose to collaborate with project staff to develop an initiative-wide logic model. We have commonly used logic models in our work to provide a framework that links the activities and strategies of a project with its desired outcomes and impact. This has frequently evolved into depicting a theory of change that more explicitly articulates the fundamental assumptions about how change is believed to occur by working backwards from a depiction of the desired impact. Simply put, logic models help to clarify what activities lead to what impact, and they provide a map for evaluators in determining what to measure.

  In a developmental approach, one of the implications is that any model will have assumptions and areas of uncertainty. Thus, in Developmental Evaluation, the model is updated periodically, given changing priorities and new understandings. We expect it to change and evolve over time. Such a process may be augmented by the use of a contribution analysis whereby causal questions are assessed and causality inferred using a step-by-step approach to arrive at conclusions about the contribution a practice or strategy
made to particular outcomes. The essential value of such an approach is that it offers an approach designed to reduce uncertainty about the contribution the intervention is making to the observed results through an increased understanding of why the observed results have or have not occurred and the roles played by the intervention or practice as well as other internal and external factors.

We propose developing the logic model through an iterative process. Initially, RTI will develop a first draft based upon a review of the RTTT-D proposal and scope of work. We would prefer to first receive feedback from PSESD staff, and then develop a second draft to share widely with relevant stakeholders. In RTI’s initial internal conversations, we propose developing multiple logic models—one for the project as a whole, but also one for each ‘grouping’ of projects (Foundational, STEM Strong, etc.). An initial conversation with PSESD staff, after submitting our first draft, will help us determine what adjustments, if any, need to change to best align with PSESD. RTI suggests that we could conduct an on-line meeting as a way to share the draft logic model and receive feedback from the relevant stakeholders. RTI would work with PSESD and any Evaluation Advisory Group members to determine the appropriate partners and staff to provide feedback on each model.

Further, the development of a logic model typically highlights potential gaps and thus aids common understandings of the work. In our preliminary mock-up, we have noted that the outcome measures proposed by RTTT-D are long-term outcomes. This point has also been raised by a number of RTTT-D staff (district and PSESD). Logic models generally include both intermediate indicators as well as long-term outcomes. A key piece of creating the logic model may be the development of these intermediate indicators. Developing these indicators may also have some impact on RTI’s outcome reporting and analysis. For example, measureable outcomes such as state test scores might take years to capture any early impact (any K interventions in science would show up five years later, as the only elementary grade that Washington tests in science is 5th grade). Instead, local measurements (such as the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System for literacy) and performance indicators could be used alternatively as predictive indicators, and be measured much more often during that same five year time span. Additionally, data on courses that help students avoid remediation (e.g., Algebra 2) could be seen as an intermediate indicator—or a ‘lead indicator’—that is predictive of the final outcome indicators. For an example that’s not predominantly school-based, such an indicator could be the extent that project leadership and decision-making, including decisions on budget and programming, are shared among District, school, and community partner(s) or the degree to which schools and CBOs are sharing data with one another.

RTI could focus their analysis and reports on these intermediate indicators. This approach is very different than previously discussed, and would require discussions with PSESD/the Evaluation Advisory Group in order to decide how to use their evaluation resources to best align with the goals and outcomes of the study.

---

1 ‘relevant stakeholder’ could include any person or organization (ESD, school district, school, CBO, or community) that plays a significant role in the particular project strand, or who’s organization is being held accountable for the outcomes associated with the projects. This definition of stakeholder holds throughout this report.
2 Currently we are writing that we would “work with PSESD.” We would like to propose developing an Advisory Group of representative stakeholders (district, CBO, etc) who can provide feedback and direction from multiple perspectives. We discuss this group in more detail in Task 4.
3 RTI can also receive feedback in person. However, we are suggesting an on-line forum as it may be an easier and more cost-effective way to receive feedback. We have experience with this type of forum.
4 For example, this comment on a draft of the evaluation plan: “Some of the performance measures are broad and large. Moving the needle on some of these will take a concerted effort over time. I wonder if we have time prior to evaluation in order to fully implement programs. This is not new, but I still wonder.”
5 These examples are taken from the public RFP for the Road Map Consortium: Race to the Top-District Deep Dive 3 Investment Fund: School-Community Partnerships.
A logic model would list student outcomes, but in a project such as this, it would also include systems outcomes. For example, one outcome of this project is to develop a data system to be able to share data across the region to measure progress of students who move between and among the districts. RTI will look to the logic model when developing interview protocols, so having such an outcome on the logic model ensures that we will collect data on its implementation and effectiveness.

**Deliverables**

1. Network Map (April 2014)
2. Resource Map (May 2014)
3. Logic Model (June 2014)

**Task 2: Outcomes and Fiscal Analysis**

**Evaluation Questions**

*RTTT-D efforts towards reaching regional and district performance targets*

a) How well have RTTT-D efforts helped meet Goal Areas and Performance Measures targets for all students? For students in high-need schools?

b) What district and school-community strategies have contributed to gains in student achievement or to decreases in achievement gaps, especially for high-poverty and ELL students? At what cost?

**Activities**

RTI’s evaluation of these questions will include Outcomes and Fiscal Analysis.

- **Outcomes Analysis**

  RTI’s approach focuses on changes over time in the Road Map indicators within RTTT-D schools—in effect, using RTTT-D schools as their own control group. RTI will use historical data, or the data that the Road Map Project had collected before the implementation (e.g., the Road Map Project’s baseline indicators from the 2009-10 school year), as a comparison against data that are collected during implementation to draw conclusions about the consortium’s potential impact over time. RTI will analyze the Goal Area and Performance Measure targets collected by CCER to determine the extent that the project has reached its goals, looking specifically to see which districts and schools have made the greatest gains.

  The outcome analyses will be conducted at the school level where possible. We will examine changes over time in the proposed indicators overall, for each school, for each school type (such as high-poverty schools), and district. To assess which strategies might be contributing to improvements, we will analyze the relationship between changes and strategies employed by schools and districts. Finally, in order to

---

6 By this we refer to the resources provided by RTTT-D.

7 We need to acknowledge the change in state assessment and that we will need to develop strategies for establishing how this change will be accounted for in the RTTT-D work and how that change might effect the external evaluation analysis. Changes include the piloting of the Smarter Balanced Assessment in Kent and Highline (as well as one elementary school in Tukwila). This pilot means that there will not be any state assessment results available for these school districts in Math and Reading, Grades 3 to 8 (but there will still be results for Science, Grades 5 & 8). Further, the entire state will use the Smarter Balanced Assessment next school year, 2014-15. CCER and PSESD have begun conversations with the Data Advisors’ Group to problem solve the needed next steps in anticipation of this change.
address the possibility that changes in the indicators are a result of state or regional trends or efforts unrelated to RTTT-D, we will compare trends in indicators among Road Map Project schools to trends in the broader PSESD and in Washington as a whole. Even though Road Map Project schools serve a more disadvantaged population and likely differ in a variety of other ways from nearby schools and districts, the comparison of changes in indicators (not absolute levels) within groups allows examination of the independent contribution of RTTT-D.

The statistical technique is a non-equivalent groups pre-test/post-test design—comparing trends (changes in each key measure) across groups over time (e.g., using dependent t-tests). So, for example, we would compare the change in the percent graduating at each school within the Road Map Project to the change in the percent graduating in other schools within the Educational Service District. If there are not sufficient data from surrounding districts, then this is a descriptive or associational analysis of changes over time among the Road Map Project schools. If the only data were Road Map Project data, but they included three or more years of pre-implementation outcome measures and three or more years post-implementation outcome measures, we could do interrupted time series regression and see if there was a jump in outcomes or a change in slope (e.g. accelerating improvement in graduation rate) after implementation.

The modified predictive systems initiative evaluation, which will include a thorough integration of the outcomes data through an outcomes evaluation, will help the RTTT Project better understand which practices seem to be associated with promising practices. Given the scope of the current evaluation, RTI, in collaboration with RTTT, will select two districts that are exceeding their annual on-track indicators that are tied to district growth. The selection of high-performing districts will allow RTI to efficiently focus on developing instruments that will assist in efficiently highlighting practices that seem to be closely associated with promising practices.

Given the wide range of interventions occurring through RTTT-D, we understand that there will be substantial variation among RTTT-D schools, and consequently, school districts. RTI sees its role as collecting information, via formative evaluation methods, that could further supplement historical data and add context to these findings, and would help in understanding how partnerships are working, how stakeholders are reacting to the changes, and which practices they see as most effective. Collecting substantial qualitative data from all seven districts is beyond the scope of this evaluation. In these cases, RTI recommends leveraging the outcome indicator data that have been collected by CCER for the 2011 Baseline Report and the 2012, and 2013 Results Reports to drive the selection of two districts that have met or exceeded annual targets. The selection of these two sites will allow RTI to highlight promising practices that appear to be strongly associated with gains in student achievement and decreases in achievement gaps. Although RTI will initially recommend the methodology to select the two districts, the final district selection will happen in close collaboration with key consortium stakeholders.

RTI proposes that these case studies be conducted in the 2015-2016 school year. We do so for two reasons. First, it allows us to ensure that we are highlighting districts that have made and sustained improvement during this project. Second, it allows us to use the limited evaluation resources most effectively. In addition, RTI would like to highlight that the case study may be an effective use of resources to use to understand the impact of the project’s partnerships with community-based organizations (CBOs). The currently overall project performance measures and goals (that RTI will receive from CCER) are all school outcomes, thus they are currently missing the projects impact on CBOs. The case study could allow the project to examine more closely the impact that the project is making through its work with CBOs.

8 Please note that the Road Map Project Results Report includes only the South Seattle area of the Seattle Public Schools district.
Outcomes Evaluation Activities

1. Collect Goal Area and Performance Measure targets from CCER<sup>9</sup>.
2. Analyze target data.
   a. Focus on changes over time in the Road Map indicators within RTTT-D schools.
   b. Conduct analysis examining school-level change.
   c. Examine changes over time in the indicators examined overall (i.e., for all Road Map Project schools) and for each school, school type (such as high-poverty schools), and district.
   d. Analyze the association between indicator changes and strategies employed by specific schools and districts to assess which strategies might be contributing to improvements.
   e. Compare trends in indicators among RTTT-D schools to trends in the broader PSESD and in Washington as a whole to address the possibility that changes in the indicators are a result of state or regional trends or efforts unrelated to RTTT-D.
   f. Look for increases/decreases in test scores for all schools for all students and for students in high-need schools.
   g. Look for increases/decreases in the achievement gap for underserved students, especially high-poverty students and for ELL students.

• Fiscal Analysis

To answer the cost question, above, RTI will conduct a fiscal analysis. By cost, we mean the monetary value of the resources that were used for programs. To do this, we will identify and the collect expenditure estimates from existing accounting systems<sup>10</sup>. Cost estimation involves tracking all costs associated with each RTTT-D project. Examples include:
   • Personnel (and fringe costs),
   • equipment and materials,
   • and other program inputs (e.g., insurance, training sessions, contractual services).

The costs will be evaluated grouped by project/district. Resources dedicated to PSESD would also be tracked separately. To obtain this fiscal data, RTI will work with the Director of Business Services; the Business Office Manager/Grants Manager; and the RTT Fiscal Coordinator. We have reviewed preliminary data and it can be organized in the manner described in this evaluation plan.

We anticipate that the cost analysis will cover a 12 month period from September 1 to August 31. Our understanding is that final costs for this period will be available within 90 days of the end of the school calendar year. Data review, validation, and organization will be performed during November and December and the cost data will be organized to complete a cost-effectiveness analysis when educational outcome measures are available. Our economists will work with educational content experts to determine the appropriate outcome measures.

Cost-effectiveness analysis compares the costs and outcome measures for two or more alternatives (Levin and McEwan, 2001). We will use a cost effectiveness ratio (CER) where cost (C) is divided by one or more outcome measures that describe the program effects (E). Examples of program effects (E) would include improvements in average end of grade test scores or reductions in potential high school drop outs.

<sup>9</sup> Again, noting the change in state assessments tests and the impact this may have on the external evaluation.

<sup>10</sup> Unpaid input like donated time and equipment would be included in cost analysis since using resources in this way means that other alternative uses of those resources were sacrificed. However, our discussions with project staff suggest that unpaid inputs are not part of the project and/or are not tracked.
Once the ratios are calculated, they can be compared and contrasted. For example, they may be ranked from lowest to highest. An example table is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>CE Ratio</th>
<th>CER Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$A</td>
<td>$A</td>
<td>$A/E_A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$B</td>
<td>$B</td>
<td>$B/E_B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the extent that cost or effect measures are uncertain and are reported in ranges versus a single value (i.e. confidence intervals), we can calculate CER over a range of values to determine whether the ranking of alternatives are to changes to changes in the assumptions underlying the CER calculations.

As noted in our discussion of the Resource Map, we discussed how RTI is currently only examining the resources provided to schools and districts. To what extent can and should RTI gather data on resources distributed to community-based organizations? To what extent can RTI collect data on whether organizations are using other resources (other funding resources, their own internal resources) to provide support to RTTT-D activities? These are questions that we will need to discuss more fully to be able to paint an accurate picture of the true cost of the project and its impact.

**Timeline**

We present a timeline for year 1 only, but this timeline will stand, with potential modifications with PSESD staff, as the general yearly plan. Please note that RTI will not receive the data from until November and December, so although the end of RTI’s reporting year is December 2014, we will be unable to complete the analysis within that timeframe.

**Table 1: Timeline for Outcomes and Fiscal Data Collection and Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1: 2013</th>
<th>PSESD</th>
<th>CCER</th>
<th>RTI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>End of fiscal year</td>
<td>Receives outcomes data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Finalizes fiscal data from end of fiscal year</td>
<td>Provides data to RTI</td>
<td>Provides data to RTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Provides data to RTI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyzes Outcomes data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2: 2014</th>
<th>PSESD</th>
<th>CCER</th>
<th>RTI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary findings on outcomes and fiscal analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reports on findings from combined outcomes and fiscal analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverables

1. Annual Outcomes and Fiscal Report (February 2015, 2016)

Task 3: Collective Impact Evaluation

Evaluation Questions

*Nature and Quality of the RTTT-D Partnerships that facilitated achievement of performance targets*

a) How have RTTT-D consortium partners engaged in collective efforts to help close achievement gaps and to help students in the region gain ground? How did RTTT-D investment funds impact the efforts?

b) What events (e.g., standards roll-out; new assessment systems) impacted RTTT-D efforts and how well did partners tackle challenges they presented?

c) How have RTTT-D partnerships helped build capacity in the individual districts?

d) How well are/were partnerships appreciated in the districts? In the region?

e) How have the RTTT-D partners prepared for sustainability of RTTT-D efforts and gains achieved?

f) How has RTTT-D work impacted the development of systems in the and across the region? What systems were created? What systems were impacted by a project?\(^{11}\)

g) Have the RTTT-D partnership efforts helped stimulate district-, regional-, or state policy-development conversations? How?

Activities\(^ {12}\)

RTI understands that the Road Map Project was established on the collective partnerships of a myriad of partners and stakeholders. Inherently, such an elaborate system can be complex, and contain both areas of strength and areas in need of improvement.

RTI currently proposes conducting the first round of data collection on the partnership in spring 2014, at the end of year 1 of implementation. This would allow us to provide feedback to PSESD over the summer for preparation for year 2. RTI also proposes that we could present our results to the appropriate stakeholders and facilitate a conversation with the stakeholders based on the ‘What’, ‘So What,’ ‘Now What’ framework we presented earlier, in order to help all stakeholders understand where they are, what it means, and how they can move forward to create a stronger partnership. RTI specifically would like feedback from PSESD to determine the best timeline for this process; table 2 below provides our best thinking as of now.

To evaluate the efficacy of the Road Map Project, RTI will take a closer look at the structure and role of the RTTT-D partnerships using the following methods:

1. Prepare for and conduct interviews with key stakeholders.

---

\(^{11}\) This question has been added to the original questions outlined in the proposal as a response to stakeholder feedback. While we believe that these questions are addressed within the other questions, it seemed appropriate to highlight and explicitly ask such questions.

\(^{12}\) RTI had an initial conversation with Ed Northwest in early April at which we discussed keeping each other informed of our plans and timelines and in which RTI broached the idea that it could be possible that each group could collect information needed by the other, in a way to support PSESD and not overburden the stakeholders.
a. Baseline interviews.
b. Annual interviews (spring).

2. Social Network Analysis.
   a. Develop SNA Survey.
   b. Conduct in spring 2014 for baseline and winter annually.

3. Conduct Road Map Project event documentation.
   a. Develop observation protocol.
   b. Conduct participant intercepts.
   c. Collect other relevant documentation.

4. Conduct Road Map Project meetings and partnership functioning documentation.
   a. Collect meeting notes.
   b. Track decision making and innovations.
   c. Collect other relevant documentation.

RTI will work with PSESD and the Evaluation Advisory Group to determine which partners will be involved in the interviews and the surveys. The creation of the partner map, under development now, will inform that discussion.

**Timeline**

**Table 2: Timeline for Collective Impact Analysis, 2013-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ED Northwest</th>
<th>RTI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Determine, with PSESD/Evaluation Advisory Group, who will be inter-viewed and/or surveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Conduct Interviews/surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Conduct Interviews/surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Analyze data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Analyze data/preliminary findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Report on Collective Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Expected data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Presentation to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deliverables**

2. Summative Collective Impact Report (December 2016)

**Task 4: Meetings**

**Activities**

RTI will attend the following meetings:

1. RTI will attend up to 2-3 on-site meetings/year. These meetings will determined based upon meeting content or RTI reporting timelines.
2. Conduct monthly check-ins with the PSESD data liaison, and others as necessary
3. Conduct semi-regular meetings with Evaluation Advisory Group
4. Participate in additional meetings and calls as needed.

As noted earlier, we would like to propose developing an Evaluation Advisory Group of representative stakeholders (district, CBO, etc) who can provide feedback and direction for the evaluation
from multiple perspectives. We would expect this group to meet\textsuperscript{13} quarterly (though we are open to other meeting schedules) and that their goal would be to (1) help ensure that the evaluation is meeting the needs of all the stakeholders in the project, (2) provide feedback on evaluation activities, including data collection, analysis, outreach and dissemination of results, (3) to share context regarding the RTTT-D work, and (4) to provide other feedback, as necessary. Meetings will be timed to provide the greatest potential feedback for the evaluation activities.

Below is a current list of known meetings for RTTT-D\textsuperscript{14,15}:

### 2013-2014 Remaining District Leads Meeting Dates
- Friday 18 April, 1-3pm
- Friday 23 May, 9-10:30am
- Friday 20 June, 1-3pm
- \textit{(July 2014 – June 2015 District Leads Meeting Dates to Follow)}

### 2013-2014 Remaining RTT Executive Committee Meeting Dates (9am-noon)
- Thursday, April 17\textsuperscript{th} 2014
- Thursday, May 15\textsuperscript{th} 2014
- Thursday, June 19\textsuperscript{th} 2014

### 2014-2015 RTT Executive Committee Meeting Dates (9am-noon)
- Thursday, August 14\textsuperscript{th} 2014
- Thursday, September 11\textsuperscript{th} 2014
- Thursday, October 16\textsuperscript{th}* 2014
- Thursday, November 13\textsuperscript{th} 2014
- Thursday, December 11\textsuperscript{th} 2014
- Thursday, January 8\textsuperscript{th} 2015
- Thursday, February 12\textsuperscript{th} 2015
- Thursday, March 12\textsuperscript{th} 2015
- Thursday, April 9\textsuperscript{th} 2015
- Thursday, May 14\textsuperscript{th} 2015
- Thursday, June 11\textsuperscript{th} 2015

### Other Meetings, as scheduled
- Thursday April 23\textsuperscript{rd}, District Sharing Event

### Task 5: Reporting

This section summarizes the deliverables that have been discussed in previous sections.

\textsuperscript{13} Meetings could be via conference call.
\textsuperscript{14} RTI does not plan to attend these meetings, but rather wants a list of meetings to help us plan our work.
\textsuperscript{15} RTI understands that the include lists do not represent the full extent of meetings on the project. We would still like to collect information on other relevant meetings, including community-based meetings supported by the project.
In our initial discussions, we first proposed submitting an annual evaluation report that would be due in December of each year. This report was to include the results from the outcomes, fiscal and collective impact analysis. However, because we will not receive the fiscal and outcome data until November and December each year, we propose submitting two reports: One focused on the collective impact questions that could be delivered earlier in the fall and the second report focused on the outcomes and fiscal analysis submitted in February.

In addition to submitting a written report, RTI would like to present and discuss the results in person, if applicable, to relevant stakeholders. This could include more than one meeting, to more than one stakeholder group. For example, it could include an overview of the results with one (or more) stakeholder group(s), but a facilitated session to help another one or more stakeholder group(s) understand their data and support them in developing next steps in their work.

**Deliverables (summary of all deliverables)**

1. Network Map (April 2014)
2. Resource Map (May 2014)
3. Logic Model (June 2014)
5. Summative Collective Impact Report (December 2016)
## Timeline (overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1: Mapping the Network</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collect partnership documenta-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2: Outcomes and Fiscal Analysis</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of fiscal year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 3: Collective Impact Evaluation</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 4: Meetings</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend April District Learning Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 4a: Evaluation Advisory Group (proposed)</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 5: Deliverables</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Deliverables         | Collec- | Collective | Collective |
|----------------------|         | Impact     | Impact     |
|                      | tive    | Impact     | Impact     |
|                      | Map     | Report     | presentation |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of current year scope of work
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Appendix A: DRAFT of Network Map of Partners

The following visuals are examples of a project map of stakeholders and their roles and responsibilities. This map of the various entities and party involvement in the overall scope of the Road Map Project will help address organizational strengths and challenges by showing the depth and breadth of participation from community organizations, and ultimately help evaluate the nature and quality of the RTTT-D partnerships. While we did use actual data from the project to develop this and other charts in this document, PSESD has not yet reviewed and approved the classifications and some organizations may be coded incorrectly at this time. Thus, this document is an attempt to provide a ‘quick and dirty’ example to help PSESD and its partners visualize what such a map would look like and how it might inform the project.

Figure A-1 shows how many organizations, and of what kinds, are represented in the Road Map Project Committees, as listed below.

- Advocates Caucus
- Birth to 3rd Grade Work Group
- Community Network Steering Committee
- Data Advisors Group
- ELL Work Group
- Executive Committee
- High School to College Completion Advisory Group
- Opportunity Youth Work Group
- Project Sponsors
- Youth Development for Education Results Work Group

Figure A-1: Number of organizations involved in Road Map Project Committees, by organizational type
Figure A-2 shows the involvement of each organization by the number of committees on which they serve. In addition, it also shows the number of people involved from that organization who are on one or more committee(s). For example, there are 16 (the number in parentheses represents the number of people from that organization who are involved) people from the Puget Sound Educational Service District involved in at least one committee and they serve on a total of 8 committees (represented by the bar value). Figure 2 shows only those organizations that are involved in more than one committee.

**Figure A-2: Representation of organization in Road Map Project Committees**

**Committee Involvement by Organization**

- Puget Sound Educational Service District (16)
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (5)
- Federal Public Schools (10)
- Seattle Public Schools (5)
- Highline Public Schools (4)
- White Center Community Development... (5)
- OneAmerica (5)
- League of Education Voters (6)
- Renton School District (6)
- United Way of King County (4)
- Tukwila School District (5)
- Kent School District (3)
- Auburn School District (2)
- University of Washington (4)
- Seattle Community College ()
- Green River Community College (3)
- City of Seattle Office for Education (3)
- City of Seattle (3)
- Youth Development Executives of King County (2)
- Treehouse (3)
- South King Council of Human Services (2)
- Community Center for Education Results (3)
- UW Dream Project (1)
- The Seattle Foundation (2)
- College Success Foundation (2)
- YouthCare (1)
- SOAR (2)
- Seattle University Youth Initiative (1)
- Safe Futures Youth Center (1)
- Neighborhood House (2)
- Child Care Resources (2)
- CCER (5)
Figure A-3 is a list of all organizations that are involved in RTTT-D as either project partners (working with schools on investment fund projects) and/or that serve in at least one committee.

**Figure A-3: Representation of Organizations in Road Map Project Committees and as Investment Fund Project Partners**

(Note: The number in parenthesis represents the number of people involved from that organization. A ★ represents the number of projects in which the organization is involved.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations that are project partners and which are involved in committees</th>
<th>Organizations that are project partners but have no committee involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Education (1) ★</td>
<td>Arts Corps ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Year (1) ★</td>
<td>Arts Impact ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Schools Collaboration (1) ★</td>
<td>Auburn Food Bank ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity Schools (1) ★</td>
<td>Auburn YMCA ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton Area Youth Services (1) ★</td>
<td>Auburn Youth Resources ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese Friendship Association (1) ★</td>
<td>Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent School District (3) ★</td>
<td>City of Renton ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Resources (2) ★</td>
<td>City of Tukwila ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle (3) ★</td>
<td>Communities in Schools ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Dream Project (1) ★</td>
<td>Friends of Renton Schools ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood House (2) ★</td>
<td>High Impact Educational Consultants ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois Mathematics &amp; Science Academy ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King County Housing Authority ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King County Library Systems ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Coalition of Certification Centers ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem-Based Learning Network ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEA ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sisters of Providence ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sound Mental Health ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Seattle Education Coalition ★ ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAF ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers Development Group ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Learner First ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiny Tots ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Way ★ ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley Cities Mental Health ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce Development Council ★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YMCA ★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizations that only have committee involvement**

- Arts Corps ★
- Arts Impact ★
- Auburn Food Bank ★
- Auburn YMCA ★
- Auburn Youth Resources ★
- Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession ★
- City of Renton ★
- City of Tukwila ★
- Communities in Schools ★
- Friends of Renton Schools ★
- High Impact Educational Consultants ★
- Illinois Mathematics & Science Academy ★
- King County Housing Authority ★
- King County Library Systems ★
- National Coalition of Certification Centers ★
- Problem-Based Learning Network ★
- SEA ★
- Sisters of Providence ★
- Sound Mental Health ★
- Southeast Seattle Education Coalition ★ ★
- TAF ★
- Teachers Development Group ★
- The Learner First ★
- Tiny Tots ★
- United Way ★ ★
- Valley Cities Mental Health ★
- Workforce Development Council ★
- YMCA ★
Note: the number in parentheses represents the number of people from that organization who is involved in at least one committee.

Auburn School District (2)
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (5)
CCER (5)
City of Seattle Office for Education (3)
College Success Foundation (2)
Community Center for Education Results (3)
Federal Public Schools (10)
Green River Community College (3)
Highline Public Schools (4)
League of Education Voters (6)
OneAmerica (5)
Puget Sound Educational Service District (16)
Renton School District (6)
Safe Futures Youth Center (1)
Seattle Community College ()
Seattle Public Schools (5)
Seattle University Youth Initiative (1)
SOAR (2)
South King Council of Human Services (2)
The Seattle Foundation (2)
Treehouse (3)
Tukwila School District (5)
United Way of King County (4)
University of Washington (4)
White Center Community Development Association (3)
Youth Development Executives of King County (2)
YouthCare (1)
Center on Reinventing Public Education (1)
Children’s Home Society of Washington (1)
College Spark Washington (1)
College Board
Communities & Parents for Public Schools (1)
East African Community Services (1)
Eastside Pathways (1)
formerlly College Success Foundation ()
Girl Scouts of Western Washington (1)
Global to Local (1)
King County Youth Advisory Council/SOAR (3)
Leading Edge Advisors (1)
Office of King County Executive ()
Open Doors for Multicultural Families (1)
Reach Out and Read (1)
Seattle College Access Network (1)
Seattle Education Access (1)
Seattle Foundation Neighbor to Neighbor Fund (1)
Seattle Jobs Initiative (1)
Seattle/King County Workforce Development Council (1)
SkillUp Washington (1)
South King County College Access Network (1)
Team Read (1)
Technology Access Foundation (1)
Urban League of Metropolitan Seattle (1)
Win/Win Network (1)
Year Up (1)
YMCA of Greater Seattle (1)
Community member and former Federal Way School Board member (1)
Barbara Grant Consulting ()
Community Volunteer / Consultant ()
Education Northwest (2)
ELL consultant ()
ID Mendoza Consulting ()
City of Seattle Human Services Dept (1)
Department of Social and Health Services – Research and Data Analysis (1)
King County Community Services Division (1)
King County Housing Authority (1)
King County Library System (1)
King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office (1)
King County Public Health (1)
Community Day School Association & Seattle Elementary Alignment Team (1)
Kent / East Hill Community Network Council ()
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (3)
Office of the Education Ombudsman ()
Professional Educator Standards Board (1)
WA State Commission on Hispanic Affairs (1)
WA State Professional Educator Standards Board (1)
Washington State Commission on Hispanic Affairs (1)
Washington State Oral Histories Project/UW Bothell (1)
Washington State School Directors’ Association (1)
Georgetown/South Seattle Community College (1)
Highline Community College (2)
Renton Technical College (1)
Seattle Central Community College (1)
Appendix B: DRAFT Allocation of resources in the RTTT-D project

Table B-1 and Figures B-1 through B-3 are examples of how we might begin to show how resources have been distributed in the RTTT-D project. Table 1 shows the allocation of funds from investment projects to each district. Please note that these data are only an example of how we could present information and the actual raw data has not been reviewed.

**Table 1: Allocation of Investment Fund Resources by Participating District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auburn</th>
<th>Federal Way</th>
<th>Highline</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Renton</th>
<th>Seattle</th>
<th>Tukwila</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1: Teaching and Leading</strong></td>
<td>184,317</td>
<td>470,945</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>231,597 and 260,928</td>
<td>374,120</td>
<td>225,455</td>
<td>7,561,179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2: Regional Data Portal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,105,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Dive 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,212,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,194,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,827,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>START STRONG ($8,000,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A: High Functioning K-3 System Wide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,242,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3B: PreK-3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Strategies and Systems</strong></td>
<td>222,365</td>
<td>109,693</td>
<td>207,542</td>
<td>100,724</td>
<td>167,854</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>121,380</td>
<td>3,979,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Dive 1</td>
<td>895,529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Dive 2</td>
<td>1,148,966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM STRONG ($6,400,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4: Digital STEM Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,232,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5: Career Awareness and Exploration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,199,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAY STRONG ($10,300,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6: Advising</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,030,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7: College and Career Readiness Pathway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,245,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8: College and Career Readiness</strong></td>
<td>200,880</td>
<td>199,672</td>
<td>2500,000</td>
<td>220,754</td>
<td>170,640</td>
<td>251,552</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>4,090,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B-1 through B-3 are examples of how RTI could display resource allocation. These sample data are incomplete, as the figures only include investment fund resources and data do not include the breakdown of the specific schools targeted by the investment funds. RTI will conduct a thorough analysis of these data. Figure B-1 is a quick breakdown of those resources divided by the total number of schools in each district, Figure B-2 is the breakdown by the number of high needs school in the district, and Figure B-3 is the breakdown by the number of students in the district.

**Figures B-1: Allocation of Investment Fund Resources by Number of Schools in Each District**

**Figures B-2: Allocation of Investment Fund Resources by Number of High Needs Schools in Each District**

**Figures B-3: Allocation of Investment Fund Resources by Number of Students in Each District**
Appendix C: Data Elements Schedule

Table C-1: RTTT-D data elements schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTT Goal Areas and Performance Measures/Indicators</th>
<th>How RTI would like this data element reported</th>
<th>How the data can be reported to RTI&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>When can the data be reported to RTI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)(4)(a): Performance on Summative State Assessments – Reading, Grades 3-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(4)(a): Performance on Summative State Assessments – Math, Grades 3-9, Grade 10 EOC (End of Course)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(4)(b): Achievement Gaps in Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(4)(b): Achievement Gaps in Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(4)(c): 5-year HS graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(4)(d): College Enrollment Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(4)(e): Postsecondary Degree Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (E)(3)(Grades PreK-3)(a) – 3rd Grade Reading: Washington State 3rd Grade Reading Assessment  
  •Percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the statewide assessment | | | |
| (E)(3) (Grades PreK-3)(b) – WaKIDS: % of students ‘ready to succeed in school by kindergarten (WAKIDS)  
  •Percent of students meeting standard for "ready to succeed in school by kindergarten" on the statewide assessment Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS) | | | |

<sup>16</sup> PSESD will consult and work with CCER to provide response to the last two columns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTT Goal Areas and Performance Measures/Indicators</th>
<th>How RTI would like this data element reported</th>
<th>How the data can be reported to RTI</th>
<th>When can the data be reported to RTI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (E)(3)(Grades 4-8)(a) – 8th Grade Algebra: 8th grade enrollment in Algebra or higher  
  • Percent of all 8th grade students enrolled in at least one math class designated as Algebra 1 or higher.  
  (Algebra, Geometry, Algebra 2, Pre-calculus, Statistics or any higher level or college level class) | | | |
| (E)(3)(Grades 4-8)(b) – Math State Assessment: Washington State Math Assessment (4th-8th grade)  
  • Percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the statewide assessment (Grades 4 to 8) | | | |
| (E)(3)(Grades 4-8)(c) – Student Motivation & Engagement Survey  
  • Percent of participating students who report non-cognitive skills on the Youth Success Skills and Disposition Survey and received an average score of 4 (agree) or higher | | | |
  • Percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the statewide assessment for Science (5th & 8th grades) | | | |
| (E)(3)(Grades 9-12)(a1): % submitted FAFSA  
  • The number and percentage of graduating students, by district, who submitted the FAFSA. | | | |
| (E)(3)(Grades 9-12)(a2): % completed FAFSA  
  • The number and percentage of graduating students, by district, who completed | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTT Goal Areas and Performance Measures/Indicators</th>
<th>How RTI would like this data element reported</th>
<th>How the data can be reported to RTI</th>
<th>When can the data be reported to RTI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(E)(3)(Grades 9-12)(b): WSAC Minimum college requirements</td>
<td>• Percent of graduating students who met Washington Student Achievement Council's minimum graduation requirements for eligibility to apply to a 4-year postsecondary institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(3)(Grades 9-12)(c)/(A)(4)(c) : 5-year HS graduation rate</td>
<td>• 5-year adjusted actual cohort graduation rate (see (A)(4)(c) in Goal Areas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(3)(Grades 9-12)(d): AP or IB students</td>
<td>• Percent of 11th and 12th grade students enrolled in at least one course identified with an Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) state course code.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(3)(Grades 9-12)(e): 9th-grade suspensions &amp; expulsions</td>
<td>• Percent of students triggering EWI 2: 9th grade students with 1 or more suspension or expulsions during the school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(3)(Postsecondary)(a): Remediation Rate (2 &amp; 4 year institutions, Math &amp; English)</td>
<td>• Percent of first-year college students enrolled in pre-college coursework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(3) (All) (a) Achievement Index: Percentage of Students in Very Good or Exemplary Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(3) (All) (b) Students with Highly Effective Teacher and Principal on New Evaluation System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT Goal Areas and Performance Measures/Indicators</td>
<td>How RTI would like this data element reported</td>
<td>How the data can be reported to RTI</td>
<td>When can the data be reported to RTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., Rating Level 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(3) (All) (c) Students with Effective Teacher and Principal on New Evaluation System (i.e., Rating Level 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X)(6) Competitive Preference Priority Performance Measures: 3rd Grade Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X)(6) Competitive Preference Priority Performance Measures: 4th Grade Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAO–1: Annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAO–2: Annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep dive measure:</strong> Enrollment in early learning programs (Kent/East Hill 4-yr-olds, White Center &lt;5-yr-olds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep dive measure:</strong> Seeking out someone at school for help in supporting students' academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep dive measure:</strong> Representation at parent-teacher conference (Kent and White Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>