

Race to the Top- Project 1 RFP Round 3 Letter of Intent (LOI)

Response ID:32 Data

2. RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply

1. Please select the district that is submitting this Letter of Intent.

Seattle Public Schools

2. Please list any involved partners.

Seattle Public Schools; Alliance for Education (administrative home of Seattle Teacher Residency); University of Washington College of Education; Seattle Education Association.

3. Please use the table below to fill out contact information for your district(s) including full names of contact person/people, title(s), email(s), telephone number(s), and name of lead applicant(s).

	Full Name	District	Title	Email	Telephone Number
Lead Applicant	Clover Codd	Seattle Public Schools	Executive Director, Strategic Planning & Partnerships	clcodd@seattleschools.org	(206) 478-9948
Contact Person 1	Marisa Bier	Seattle (Alliance for Education)	Program Director, Seattle Teacher Residency	marisa@alliance4ed.org	206-205-0338
Contact Person 2	Mark Taylor	Seattle (Alliance for Education)	Alliance for Education Grants Director	mark@alliance4ed.org	206-205-0342
Contact Person 3	Chris Drape	Seattle Public Schools	SPS STAR Mentor & STR Program Manager	cjdrape@seattleschools.org	206-261-4017
Contact Person 4					
Contact Person 5					
Contact Person 6					
Contact Person 7					

3. Summary of Proposal

4. The application will be for a:

Continuing Project of a Round 2 Project ending in 2015

4. Summary of Proposal

5. Please provide the name of your project.

Seattle Teacher Residency

5. Summary of Proposal

Please provide a description of the project.

6. Please describe any changes or course corrections made from your Round 2 Project.

The following section describes activities that are more in the nature of program enhancements than "course corrections."

CURRICULUM REDESIGN

UW College of Education graduate level coursework is a core element of the 14-month STR program for Residents.

Previously, most coursework had been conducted as distinct and separate classes. However, we began to realize that there was opportunity for greater coherency and integration not only across the courses, but also with the apprenticeships in which the Residents are engaged in the high-need classrooms. Consequently STR committed to redesigning the curriculum to better complement the clinical-rich STR experience. By improving integration of the coursework with Residents' classroom experiences, STR will better support their developing practices.

In short, the instructional team has reorganized the courses to more fully integrate math and literacy content into the training on instructional practices for ELL and SPED students. The new curriculum does this by presenting the "Methods" courses much like the context of a series of Studio Day events.

Studio Days were begun in the spring of 2014 and expanded in 2014-15 primarily to enable Residents to meet the needs of SPED and ELL students in math and literacy. A Studio Day involves a team of Residents and STR instructors who begin by planning a lesson for a challenging context (e.g., math for ELL students). Then one of the Residents delivers the lesson; afterwards the group debriefs and adjusts the lesson consistent with the debriefing. Next, another Resident delivers the modified lesson to another group of students. In 2014-15, College of Education and STR instructors co-facilitated six of these practice-based events in which Residents gained experience in developing, delivering and refining lessons to meet the needs of special populations. Studio Days were also an element in STR's strategy to leverage the program's best practices and expand the program's impact beyond the STR schools by inviting teachers from other high-need schools to observe. Overall, Studio Days provided rich learning opportunities.

In the adapting the Studio Day approach to the Methods courses, the principle change is that Methods will be taught with a consistent and ongoing focus on math and literacy content organized to meet the needs of English language learners (ELL) and students who receive special education services (SPED). Essentially, STR instructors across courses will be collaborating and participating in each others' courses. For example, the UW ELL instructor will work closely with the UW literacy instructor and the SPS host teacher to identify and prepare a lesson that will meet the needs of ELL students in the host's classroom.

In undertaking curriculum redesign, the team:

- o Created a calendar of all coursework throughout the year with a common focus and core assignments within each quarter;
- o Integrated ELL and SPED into math and literacy coursework in fall quarter so the "Methods" courses are conducted collaboratively;
- o Designated 4 Studio Days in winter quarter, specifically in Math for ELL and Literacy for SPED students;
- o Scheduled full-day Social Studies and Science course sessions early in the year so that Residents could more meaningfully apply learning into practice
- o Explicitly highlighted and identified where edTPA and Core Practices are addressed in coursework (the edTPA - Educator Teacher Performance Assessment - is a performance-based, subject-specific assessment that each Resident is required to pass in order to be certified by the state);
- o Intentionally designed course assignments and Gateways to complement each other and aligned them with STR's Gradual Release policy. (Gateways are the performance benchmarks along a continuum of professional development for Residents. Gateways must be successfully completed in order to meet the criteria for completing the Residency program and receive credit for the field practicum course each quarter.)

The redesigned curriculum also improves the integration of the coursework with Residents' classroom apprenticeships. We believe this strengthens the program, improves teacher preparation, and increases the likelihood the Residents will become

highly qualified teachers who make a significant difference in the lives of students in high-need schools.

STR GRADUATE INDUCTION AND THE STAR MENTOR PROGRAM

SPS assigns to every new teacher, including STR graduates, a STAR Mentor to provide support during the critical first year of teaching. (STAR is an acronym for "Staff Training Assistance & Reflection".) The STAR program came about through the collective bargaining agreement with the Seattle Education Association (SEA) in 1992. STAR mentors coach, assist, collaborate, and provide feedback on classroom instruction. Teachers who are deemed "Distinguished" in their practice apply, interview, and are approved to become STAR mentors. Each works with up to 15 new teachers every year. STAR mentors are relieved of classroom duties for the time they are serving as mentors (which is a maximum of 4 years). In 2015-16, some STAR mentoring support will be available to second-year teachers for the first time.

STR provides additional induction support to residency graduates to augment STAR program services. In addition, STR extends induction support for two additional years for a total of three years of support. There was an obvious need to coordinate the two programs. Accordingly, SPS' STAR Program Manager and STR's Induction Coordinator work together to layer support so that the programs augment and complement each other, rather than overlap, conflict or duplicate.

By providing induction services for three years, STR gains a deeper understanding of the experiences that our early career teachers are having and we use those findings to further improve the program. We also are able to assess the extent to which STR's induction support adds value to the support new teachers receive through the STAR program. By extending support, we are also able to stay connected with the Graduates and their needs. We help them maintain connections with their own cohort and foster new connections with the cohorts that precede and follow them.

To manage these services, STR employs a Curriculum and Induction Coordinator whose role includes:

- Visiting each Graduate's classroom to check-in and observe their experience;
- Connecting with the STAR Mentors assigned to STR graduates each month to learn what they view as strengths and gaps in the former Residents' preparation;
- Convening cohort Graduates outside of school hours to foster connections, provide support, and create opportunities to learn from each other.
- Surveying STR Graduates to learn (a) the areas in which they feel the residency prepared them well and areas that need more focus; and (2) the areas in which they want continuing support;
- Surveying Principals to learn their views on the areas in which the residency prepared the Graduates well and areas that need more focus;
- Providing learning opportunities for Graduate induction support including:
 - (1) Video PLC's facilitated by University of Washington or STR "guest" instructors; each PLC has a different focus to address areas of need;
 - (2) "Learning Rotations" where Graduates visit host teachers to inform a specific area of their own practice;
 - (3) Studio Days in which Residents learn methods of providing access to math and literacy content for ELL and other students with special learning needs.

One example of the coordination between the STAR Mentor Program and STR's induction services was a series of workshops in which STR instructors provided STR Graduates with the opportunity to explore problems of practice such as improving classroom management and math instruction. STAR mentors and Career Ladder Teachers were invited to these sessions. Coordination of the two induction programs will continue and expand in 2015-16.

MENTOR SELECTION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD)

With financial support from the NEA (facilitated by the SEA), STR Mentor PD has evolved significantly from P1 in 2013-14 and became more robust in 2014-15. The program started with a 2-day workshop for STR Mentors in August, 2014. Then we facilitated monthly small and large group sessions from September through May, 2015. These sessions were led by instructional coaches, the STR program director, and other STR team members; each session provided rich collaboration opportunities for Mentors. Among other things, STR provided Mentors with opportunities to visit other STR classrooms to observe STR Residents who were being supported by other Mentors and observe how other Mentors co-teach with their Residents. Mentors also visited classrooms of STR Cohort One graduates who began serving as teachers of record in

September. These monthly classroom visits were structured with pre-determined goals and observation protocols. Afterwards, STR facilitated debriefings in order to reinforce lessons learned and guide Mentors in developing their own next steps to augment their support of Residents.

STR also made revisions to the Mentor selection process for the upcoming year in order to reinforce our focus on Mentor quality. Given the high standards we want to maintain, we are moving away from our earlier preference to cluster Residents in a relatively number of schools. Instead, the driver is to identify the highest quality Mentors at any number of high need schools. The upshot is that we now have a higher number of training sites, though with fewer Residents at each one. Yet we believe Mentor quality is the appropriate priority.

The STR team has identified teachers at Title I and RTTT high-need schools across the district that are deemed to have the potential to be Mentors per principals' recommendations and information from other district resources. The teachers who expressed interest were invited to complete an application; then a team member visited their classroom for an observation and interview. This enabled STR to closely examine classroom cultures and elements of the the teachers' instruction to ensure alignment with STR Core Practices. In conversations with the teachers, STR staff acquainted them with the responsibilities and expectations of the role.

Following these visits, the STR Field Director met with the principal at each school to discuss the potential STR-School partnership and describe what makes the relationship with the program and the training of the Resident successful. The parties also discussed the Mentor's strengths and areas for growth of each that school's potential mentors so we could be aware of how to best support those teachers in their potential mentorships of Residents.

With the pool of Mentors, STR organized a "meet and greet" for Mentors and the new Cohort Three Residents. Immediately after this event, Residents and Mentors informed STR staff of the counterparts with whom they feel they could work productively. STR staff then used that and other information to determine the most appropriate Resident-Mentor matches.

7. Please describe how this project will be expanded from the Round 2 Project.

Here is a summary of the number of teachers and teacher-candidates, by cohort, whom STR has worked with and, for the most part, is supporting in order to impact teaching and learning in Seattle's Title I and RTTT schools:

- o Cohort One (2013-14; RTTT P1 Round 1): 25 Residents, 20 of whom graduated including 13 who will soon begin their second year of teaching in RTTT schools.
- o Cohort Two (2014-15; RTTT P1 Round 2): 32 Residents, 28 of whom graduated including 12 who will soon begin their first year of teaching in RTTT schools.
- o Cohort Three (2015-16; RTTT P1 Round 3): 31 Residents who started their coursework in July, including at least seven who will do their year-long apprenticeships in RTTT schools.

There will be several new, expanded or enhanced components in STR in 2015-16.

CLASSIFIED-TO-CERTIFICATED PATHWAY

Recruitment and availability of prospective teachers who have the experience, commitment and character to be highly effective educators is extremely important for STR. An element of the collective bargaining agreement between SPS and SEA provides that funds are made available to SPS paraprofessionals (e.g., Instructional Assistants) to pursue a teacher certification program. Through the "Class-to-Cert" pathway, STR can tap into a pipeline of talented Instructional Assistants who have significant background in high-need classrooms and experience with families and community organizations that support and serve students. SEA and SPS enthusiastically support this pathway into teaching for qualified Instructional Assistants.

GROUP INDUCTION SUPPORT FOR COHORT TWO GRADUATES

As part of our expanded induction support, STR will increase the number of group sessions for 2015 STR graduates who will begin their service as teachers of record in Seattle's high-need schools in September (while maintaining the same level of

individual support).

We start with a series of summer sessions in which the 28 STR Cohort Two Graduates will receive support with planning the beginning of their year, including setting up the classroom and establishing classroom management strategies. Then throughout the school year, STR instructors and district representatives will be facilitating topics and sessions suggested by graduates of the two cohorts that have graduated to date. STR Graduates will participate in learning rotations visiting other classrooms as well as Video PLCs focused on a variety of topics including classroom management, differentiation, and teaching literacy and math. The STR Induction Coordinator will engage individually with each Graduate throughout the year to provide support, resources and assure their needs as first year teachers are being met as completely as possible.

SPED PATHWAY

Given the ongoing critical need for SPED teachers at SPS, STR will continue to prioritize recruitment of candidates with an interest in training to be a SPED-qualified educator. The number of SPED-focused Residents has grown from 6 in Cohort Two (2014-15) to 9 in cohort Three (2015-16). In addition, the Program Director will be consulting with the SPS Director of Special Education to determine highest areas of need within the field. Long-range planning will take place for supporting the district's need in special education.

STR MENTOR PD PLAN 2015-2016

Guided by a thorough assessment of our mentors' interests, strengths, and needs, as well as feedback from mentors themselves, the STR team clarified goals and modified both the structure and the content of the PD sessions. In the 2015-2016 school year, we will orient mentors to "how we work" in STR, reflecting our values related to collaboration, inquiry, and social justice teaching and learning practices. We have structured sessions to be relevant and job-embedded, supporting mentors to work with peers to develop understanding of and apply new mentoring, teaching, and leadership practices. These sessions will also engage mentors in meaningful discussion around equity, policy, and the school system and for provide opportunities to connect with program staff to provide timely information to mentors regarding program elements. To accomplish these ambitious goals, our plan utilizes both full group and small group sessions.

In the beginning months of the school year, mentors meet as a full group in sessions designed to support them in building a successful learning partnership with residents. Topics include:

- o Introducing the resident to the classroom, school, and community context
- o Positioning the resident as a competent, contributing teacher
- o Calibrating expectations for resident performance at various times within the school year
- o Co-planning
- o Developing an understanding of residents' year-long learning trajectory

These sessions are led or co-led by veteran mentors, with support from the STR team, as a means of cultivating leadership practices and facilitation skills. Throughout the school year, mentors also lead full group ongoing, structured discussions addressing equity problems of practice, and education policy and politics.

As the school year progresses, the focus of Mentor PD shifts towards honing mentoring skills and teaching practices. Half-day morning sessions take place in small grade-level groups in schools with an STR coach. Each mentor hosts the group at his or her school and takes responsibility for co-planning one session. Sessions focus directly on applying mentoring practices, including:

- o Conducting observations of the resident
- o Giving the resident feedback
- o "Coaching in" during instruction, i.e., "real-time coaching" where Residents are getting feedback in the moment while they are teaching
- o Gradually releasing responsibility for resident learning

During the second half of the day, mentors participate in sessions to develop instructional skills. Mentors will work with STR course instructors to learn and apply content-area teaching practices, mirroring learning opportunities that STR provides for residents. This may include:

- o Literacy
- o Mathematics
- o Management
- o Instructional planning and tracking systems
- o Differentiation, ELL or SpEd strategies

The intention is to offer mentors choices so that they can target areas in which they are most interested or have greatest need for improvement.

TO CLARIFY AND SUMMARIZE RESPONSE TO THE NEXT QUESTION REGARDING SCHOOLS:

At this time, we anticipate selecting five RTTT high-need schools to be the ones we identify as "RTTT Impact Schools" for measuring the impact of this Round 3 project. Four of these five schools are ones in which Cohort Three (C3) Residents will be doing their apprenticeships in 2015-16. We are also selecting one RTTT school (Highland Park) where there will be no C3 Residents but where two Cohort Two (C2) Graduates will be teaching. The five schools are:

- Dearborn Park (1 C3 Resident and 3 STR Grads);
- Highland Park (2 STR Grads).
- Madrona (3 C3 Residents and 1 STR Grad);
- Van Asselt (1 C3 Resident and 10 STR Grad); and
- West Seattle (2 C3 Residents).

Collectively, these five RTTT schools will have 7 Residents and 16 STR Graduates working in them in 2015-16 – a combined total of 23.

6. Summary of Proposal

Please name the high-needs school(s) involved. (For reference, click the following link to see the list of high-needs schools [RTT High Need Schools List](#)) Note: Round 3 proposal funds are to be requested for RTTT eligible high-needs schools only.

8. Will the project continue with the same high-needs school(s) involved in Round 2? If not, please list the high-needs schools involved in the text boxes below. (For reference, click the following link to see the list of high-needs schools: [RTT High Need Schools List](#)) Note: Round 3 proposal funds are to be requested for RTTT eligible high-needs schools only.

- 1 : Dearborn Park (1 C3 Resident & 3 STR Grads)
- 2 : Madrona K8 (3 C3 Residents & 1 STR Grad)
- 3 : Van Asselt ES (1 C3 Resident & 10 STR Grads)
- 4 : West Seattle ES (2 C3 Residents)
- 5 : Highland Park (2 STR Grads)

7. Summary of Proposal

9. Check all groups that are relevant.

- English Language Learners (ELL)
- Low-Income

10. Check all grade levels that are relevant.

4th-8th

8. Summary of Proposal

Describe the proposed project leadership structure.

9. Summary of Proposal

11. Check no more than two from list of relevant RTTT-D Goal Area or Performance Measure.

Washington State Math Assessment (Smarter Balanced) Year 1/Year 2 EOC

Students with Highly Effective Teacher and Principal on New Evaluation System (i.e., Rating Level 4)

Students with Effective Teacher and Principal on New Evaluation System (i.e., Rating Level 3)

12. Identify the school years when the proposed P1 district project is expected to impact student targets in the identified goals areas or performance measures identified above :

Please check all that apply-

2015-2016

2016-2017

2017-2018

10. Summary of Proposal

Please describe the intended goal areas for students and a theory of action about how the project activities will impact outcomes.

(Please click here to access RTT Goal Areas and Performance Measures: [RTTGoalAreasPerformanceMeasures.pdf](#))

Note: As a reminder, this investment fund is focused on Math, Science and ELL Instruction for underserved populations in high-needs schools.

13. Please describe any changes to the Round 2 project concerning the goal areas for students and the theory of action that articulates how the project activities will impact outcomes.

(Please click here to access RTT Goal Areas and Performance Measures: [RTTGoalAreasPerformanceMeasures.pdf](#))

To clarify the response to the question above, the impact years that align with our various cohorts are as follows:

o 2015-16 would be the first impact year for the Cohort Two Graduates who are just completing their 14-month training and who begin their teaching career in September. We also will continue to monitor the impact of Cohort One Graduates who will

begin their second year of teaching in September.

- o 2016-2017 would be the first impact year for the Cohort Three Graduates who are just starting their 14-month training and who begin their teaching career in September, 2016. We also will continue to monitor the impact of Cohort One and Two Graduates as they continue their careers in high-need schools.

- o STR will continue to monitor the impact of all cohorts in 2017-2018 and beyond.

GOAL AREAS:

We will continue to use the two prior goal areas related to teacher performance evaluations and will add a third:

- o The percentages of students with EFFECTIVE teachers per the new evaluation scale (Level 3)
- o The percentages of students with HIGHLY EFFECTIVE Teachers (Level 4); and
- o The percentage of students achieving proficiency per the Washington State Smarter Balanced Math Assessment.

THEORY OF ACTION:

There are no changes to the Seattle Teacher Residency's theory of action. As stated in last year's proposal, "The theory of action is that a rigorous, district-specific, classroom-based apprenticeship and graduate school program that embeds the work of teacher preparation directly into practice at high-need schools, and which focuses specifically on the needs of ELL, low income, SPED and other students will improve academic achievement and narrow the opportunity gap."

While the theory of action will not change, other changes are expanding the program's impact.

- o 13 Cohort One (C1, 2013-14) graduates just completed their first year of teaching at five RTTT schools (this represents 65% of the 20 C1 graduates teaching at 9 Title I schools overall);

- o 11 Cohort Two (C2) Residents trained at 5 RTTT schools in 2014-15 (this represents 37% of the 30 Residents who apprenticed at 14 Title I schools overall);

- o To date, 12 C2 graduates have been hired at 7 RTTT schools (this represents 57% of the 21 hired for Title I schools overall); we expect all 28 C2 graduates to be hired in local Title I schools by September (though not necessarily all at RTTT schools).

In 2015-16, the third year of the project, STR will be impacting 12 RTTT schools. Four of these are schools where Cohort Three Residents will be trained (some of which are served by STR Graduates), and eight are schools where there are STR graduates in the teaching corps (but which will not be training sites for Residents this year).

The impact understandably will vary depending on several factors, but particularly the number of STR Graduates or Residents in the particular school; as such, for purposes of identifying impact schools in number 8 above, we are limiting the schools to the four Cohort Three Training Schools (four of which have also hired STR graduates) and one additional school (Highland Park) which has hired two STR Graduates but is not among the schools training Residents in the coming year.

The RTTT high-need schools where STR graduates and residents will be teaching or training in 2015-16 are the following (all are elementary unless otherwise indicated):

Dearborn Park: 3 STR Grads and 1 Cohort Three Resident

Concord: 1 STR Grad

Emerson: 2 STR Grads

Highland Park: 2 STR Grads

Madrona K-8: 1 STR Grad and 3 Cohort Three Residents

Hawthorne: 1 STR Grad

Northgate: 1 STR Grad

Rainier Beach HS: 1 STR Grad

Roxhill: 1 STR Grad

Van Asselt: 10 STR Grads and 1 Cohort Three Resident
West Seattle: 2 Cohort Three Residents
Wing Luke: 2 STR Grads

EXPANDING IMPACT

In September, there will be a total of 48 graduates of Cohorts One and Two teaching in 22 of Seattle's Title I schools. This includes 25 STR Graduates teaching in 13 RTTT schools. In addition, six of the 14 Cohort Three (C3) training sites are schools which have not hosted Residents in the past.

While all Residents are trained at Title I schools, not all of the training sites are considered RTTT high-need schools. However, the majority of schools that hire STR Graduates ARE considered RTTT high-need schools.

o Of the five Title One schools where Cohort One (C1) Residents were trained in 2013-14, only two (40%) were RTTT schools. Yet, six of the nine schools that hired the 20 C1 Graduates ARE RTTT schools. Collectively, the six RTTT schools hired 13 STR C1 Graduates.

o Of the ten Title I schools where Cohort Two (C2) Residents were trained in 2014-15, only five (50%) were RTTT schools. Yet, seven of the 13 schools (54%) that hired the 28 C2 Graduates ARE RTTT schools. Collectively, these seven RTTT schools (a few of which had hired C1 Graduates) hired 12 C2 Graduates.

The practices that the increasing number of STR Graduates learned as Residents are being applied in their own classrooms and being shared among grade-level teams. In many cases, multiple graduates are being hired by individual schools (e.g., Dearborn Park, Highland Park, Wing Luke). This creates a context in which the STR Graduates can continue to collaborate and share their practices, ideas and enthusiasm with other teachers. As such, the opportunity to impact the schools' learning cultures is magnified. Moreover, the program can more efficiently provide resources to support them and stay connected in order to understand their successes and challenges. To further influence these schools, we are exploring opportunities to work with other master teachers at these schools to host learning rotations and future Residents.

As described above, all first year SPS teachers, including STR graduates, benefit from the district's STAR Mentoring Program in which every new teacher is assigned a Mentor. This support is augmented for STR graduates with another level of induction support provided by STR. (We are strategic in coordinating this support with the STAR program as described in an earlier answer). In 2015-16, the number of STR-trained teachers in Seattle's Title I schools will more than double from 20 in 2014-15 to 48. This includes 25 in RTTT schools (up from 13). Overall, these STR-trained teachers will be serving students in 19 Title I schools including 11 RTTT schools. As such, STR's induction services will increase considerably.

This also increases the number of STAR Mentors who will be supporting STR Graduates, and therefore, the number of STAR Mentors with whom the STR Induction Coordinator will be coordinating. Accordingly, plans for 2015-16 include developing relationships, offering resources, and maintaining regular communication with what will be a larger group of STAR Mentors than in 2014-15.

We will keep the STAR mentors who are matched with STR graduates current in their knowledge about the STR curriculum and clinical training; we expect that this will inform and customize the guidance and support they provide to STR Grads. We also do this so they are aware that what they observe in STR Graduates may be different than what they see in other new teachers they are mentoring.

Since each STAR Mentor is matched with up to 15 new teachers overall, the STAR Mentors will most likely also be mentoring teachers trained in other college of education programs (whether at UW or other universities). Thus the learnings from sessions we offer to STAR Mentors supporting STR Grads (e.g., "Math Night") will also enrich the Mentors' support of the other new teachers with whom they are working.

Another way that we are expanding STR's influence is that we will invite the STAR mentors, and at times the career ladder teachers, to our own induction activities including Video PLC's content workshops, learning rotations, and Studio Days. This is

another way that STR is leveraging its impact to influence teacher practice at schools beyond those at which Residents are training and at which Graduates are teaching.

11. Summary of Proposal

Please describe how your strategies are culturally responsive and how they align with your district's equity plan or equity efforts. Note: the rubric also asks that district leads (e.g., ELL, Special Ed., family engagement) and families/other community groups that represent the needs of student subgroups be consulted on these practices.

14. Please describe how your strategies are culturally responsive if different from your Round 2 Application and how they align with your district equity plan or equity efforts. Note: the rubric also asks that district leads (e.g., ELL, Special Ed., family engagement) and families/other community groups that represent the needs of student subgroups be consulted on these practices.

In August 2012, the Seattle School Board adopted School Board Policy No. 0030, "Ensuring Educational and Racial Equity." This historic and foundational policy serves as a guide for collective efforts to close the opportunity gap and organize Seattle Public Schools to deliver on the promise in the mission statement of ensuring that all students are prepared for success in college, career and life. This policy was referenced and re-committed to in SPS' 2013-18 Strategic Plan. The plan "supports and fosters a culture of organizational excellence and high expectations, and provides the strategies necessary for nurturing equity and excellence. Implementing systemic change to enable all students to be successful, regardless of circumstance, is a fundamental belief inherent in this plan." Page 4 of SPS Strategic Plan at http://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/Migration/How%20do%20I/Strategic_Plan_2013_2018.pdf

Subsequently, SPS developed a race and equity toolkit that provides board and staff with a race and equity lens through which to review decisions and actions. The Tool asks decision-makers to answer questions in 4 different steps.

- Step 1 asks if all the data, whether it is academic or anecdotal, pertaining to the decision has been collected and analyzed.
- Step 2 asks if all the stakeholders impacted by the decision are present and involved in the conversation.
- Step 3 asks what steps the group is going to take to ensure that historically marginalized groups are benefiting from the decision.
- Step 4 asks how the group will evaluate the impact of the decision and how the group process will be made transparent to the stakeholders.

STR's strategy is culturally responsive and congruent with SPS' overarching strategic plan and specifically Policy # 0030. This is demonstrated by the driving goal of the program, which is to improve student outcomes at high-need, Title I schools (including RTTT schools). We focus our resources on high-need schools with high populations of low income, students of color and ELL students. The student population served by each of STR's three cohorts is as follows:

- Cohort One Residents were trained in 5 Title One schools in 2013-14; then in 2014-15, 20 Cohort One graduates taught in 9 low income schools (including 6 RTTT schools) where average enrollment is 77% FRL-eligible and where 64% are "opportunity gap" students (i.e., American Indian/AK Native, Black, Hispanic, Pacific Islander and mixed race).
- 30 Cohort Two Residents trained in 11 Title One schools in 2014-15; more than two-thirds 30 have been offered jobs in 13 schools to date (including 7 RTTT schools) where average enrollment is 72% FRL-eligible and 57% are "opportunity gap" students (by September we expect all 30 to be offered positions).
- Cohort Three Residents (2015-16) will be trained at 12 schools (including at least 4 RTTT schools) where average

enrollment is 67% FRL and 60% "opportunity gap" students.

STR's alignment with the SPS equity plan is further demonstrated by specific focus on developing Residents' ability to know their culturally, racially and linguistically diverse students, families and communities in a context that fosters their deep connection with each, and seeing every student from a perspective of strengths, not deficits. This aligns in particular with the district's focus on addressing the experience and achievement of African American males.

Other examples of STR's alignment with the district's equity plan are as follows:

- STR Residents take a year-long strand of coursework called "Working in Schools" (WIS) which focuses on equity as it relates to race, culture, language, gender identity, and socio-economic status (see below for detail about WIS).
- The STR program director and STR's district liaison have an ongoing relationship with Veronica Gallardo, Director, ELL and International Programs. Veronica has contributed to STR by supporting bilingual Residents, advocating for placement of Residents in paraprofessional positions to complete program requirements, and collaborating on positional ELL training opportunities. In addition, Veronica will contribute content to the full proposal due in August.
- STR also has a relationship with Anita Morales, an Equity and Race Relation Specialist with SPS. Anita is a co-instructor of the "Working in Schools" course. She also facilitates key experiences throughout the year such as our initial orientation activity that builds a foundation for Residents to help them develop their identity as a teacher. Anita serves on STR's Advisory Council as well. She is a great support and mentor to our Residents of color.
- The SPS "Classified to Certificated" program positively impacted diversity of STR Cohort Three - 45% of the cohort is comprised of people of color. The district's "Class to Cert" program provides financial and other assistance to paraprofessionals who have not previously had the resources to pursue a graduate degree from the UW College of Education; this has a significant impact on equity because it provides opportunities for career advancement for paraprofessionals, a high percentage of whom are people of color.
- A specific focus of STR's Recruitment activities is communities where high needs schools are located; outreach in these areas has enabled STR to connect with potential candidates who not only have a desire to teach, but also understand and relate to the families and communities which those schools serve.
- STR integrates the SPS-evolution of the Motivational Framework (Ginsberg, M.B. & Wlodkowski, R.J. (1995). A Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching. Educational Leadership, 53(1)p 17-21.) in which Residents consider their work with students through 4 lenses: Relationships, Relevance, Rigor, and Results. STR's Core Practices are explicitly grounded in the assumption that students, families and communities are competent in the work.

"WORKING IN SCHOOLS" (WIS)

WIS is a course in the STR curriculum that explores multiple and interrelated factors of teaching practice, including the experiences of students in urban schools and classrooms, and the role and identity as public school teachers. These factors are set within different, often conflicting, political, historical, and social contexts concerning the education of racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse students - between what historian of education David Labaree argues, "political ideals and economic realities."

In the course, Residents explore fundamental and complex questions related to their own identities and how it shaped them and how others see them. They also engage in work that focuses on developing understandings of students, families, and communities and the role of schooling as it relates to the diversity of the school context. Specifically, Residents:

- o Explore where they come from and what perspectives they bring to the work of teaching that influence how they see themselves as teachers and the students with whom they work.
- o Begin to think about how they engage and teach racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse students as they explore the purpose of school and role of "teacher."

- o Examine some of the social, political, and historical foundations of our work in schools using Seattle as a case study (historically and contemporarily).
- o Craft a first-round personal statement regarding their role as a teacher in a Seattle Public Schools classroom.
- o Initiate the work of reflection, individually and collaboratively.

The "Working in Schools" strand builds understanding developed during the summer coursework ("Who am I - Who are my students & families - Purpose of Education and My Role as Teacher"), and extends it into the specific work of the classroom and school community. The course uses the experience of working with a particular group of students in a particular school as the context for exploring what working toward equity looks like in practice. The course is co-taught by 3 experienced educators from SPS who represent a breadth of background and perspective.

STR has engaged SPS' Director of School and Community Partnerships who will contribute content to the full proposal.

Please describe your approach to ensuring sustainability of the project after the life of the grant.

15. Please describe your approach to ensuring sustainability of the project after the life of the grant. What key components would you keep/maintain and how would they continue to provide the impact you desire?

The sustainability of the project has been a priority since its inception in 2011. The long range goal, established in 2012, is to create a sustainable pipeline of teaching talent that by 2019 is preparing up to 60 teachers annually who are specifically trained to improve outcomes for students in Seattle's high-need schools. STR has been built to maintain – and hopefully expand – all key program components and resources that support that goal (rather than adjust program offerings based on funding flow).

The STR model was built on the premise of public-private partnership, both operationally and financially. Private funds capitalized the project in its early days, with a plan to increase support from public sources, and this has happened. For example, in 2014-15 the distribution of support for STR's expenses was as follows:

Private Philanthropic Support (generated by Alliance for Education)...	\$856,965 (59%)
Allocation of RTTT dollars to STR by PSESD and SPS	\$355,635 (25%)
Other District dollars allocated by SPS	\$230,000 (16%)
TOTAL 2014-15 ACTUAL EXPENSES (Projected)	\$1,442,600 (100%)

Each of the four project partners is very grateful for the RTTT support and the productive relationship with PSESD. We understand that upon completion of this funding, we will need to replace these funds with other sources, and we are already engaged in that task.

Private support is currently comprised of 18 different donors (corporation, foundations and major individual contributors) who have made commitments from one to three years. Interest remains strong and there are more donors in the pipeline.

Viable public sources that we are pursuing include the Department of Education's Teacher Quality Partnership grant program and AmeriCorps. The STR team has begun building relationships in pursuit of those funds. For example, we have already established a very promising relationship with the state agency now known as ServeWashington (<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/serveva/>); this agency is the state's representative for the Corporation for National Community Service (CNCS) which is the federal funding source for AmeriCorps. The state agency's Director and Deputy Director have conducted a site visit to STR, plan another one in September, and are strongly encouraging us to submit a large proposal this fall.

U.S. Senator Patty Murray visited an STR classroom at Madrona K8 School this past spring and she expressed strong support for this work. In conjunction with her office, we are looking for opportunities that may be part of the pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Staff of the Alliance for Education (the administrative home of the program and subgrantee of RTTT funds) routinely conducts funding research and reaches out to other potential individual and institutional supporters. Urban Teacher Residencies

United (UTRU), the national network of urban teacher residency programs of which we are one of 22 members, helps in this regard by keeping STR and other UTRU members apprised of emerging federal opportunities.

While maintaining and developing the resources needed to sustain and grow the program is challenging, the facts that STR is achieving its targets for its initial three years, that every year more principals seek to hire more program graduates, and that we are viewed by UTRU as a model residency to which they send emerging programs for learning tours motivates our efforts and reinforces our belief that the program is sustainable over the long term.

12. Summary of Proposal

16. How has the education association been involved in the planning of your proposed project?

The Seattle Education Association (SEA) is one of the project's four core partners (the others are SPS, the UW College of Education and the Alliance for Education with whom SPS contracts to provide the administrative home for the project). STR is proud to be the first (and still only) urban teacher residency in the UTRU national network of 22 programs to include an education association in its governing body.

The SEA President is an active member of the project's governing body (steering committee). As the voice of classroom teachers, SEA's president actively participates in that and other key committees. Governing body agendas include policy, planning, oversight, problem-solving, and resource development among other things. In addition, SEA's President also contributes to several aspects of the program including (but not limited to):

- o STR's Leveraging Impact strategy
- o LOIs, proposals and report content
- o Submission of grant applications to NEA the last two years to support professional development activities for STR mentors (who are SEA members)
- o Thought partnership, informal problem-solving and strategic consultation with STR management as needed

In addition, SEA members are part of STR teams responsible for designing and implementing the program. This includes the Implementation Team, Advisory Council, and instructional teams. Feedback from teacher-mentors (who are SEA members) continually informs program implementation and the plans for Round 3, which is coincidentally STR's third year.

13. Summary of Proposal

17. Please describe your estimated budget in the text box below.

The TOTAL Cohort Three (C3) STR budget is \$1,515,300. This overall program budget will support the Cohort Three Residents and Cohort One and Two Graduates in the Title I schools where they serve (including the RTTT schools). The budget reflects no change in the STR staffing structure and an increase of only 5% over 2014-15 projected actual of \$1,442,600. It will support:

- o The training of 31 new Residents in 2015-16 and professional development and other support for their 31 STR Mentors (14 to 16 of these Residents and Mentors will be in RTTT schools);
- o Induction support for the 50 STR graduates of Cohorts 1 and 2 who are now teachers of record at 25 Title I Seattle schools (including 25 STR Grads now teaching in 13 RTTT schools); and
- o Recruitment, screening and selection of candidates for STR Cohort Four which will start in July, 2016.

The Round Two RTTT grant of \$355,000 funded about 25% of 2014-15 projected actual expenses. The Round Two funds supported the eleven C2 Residents (37% of the full cohort) who were trained at five RTTT schools in 2014-15: Concord, Emerson, Hawthorne, Madrona and Van Asselt.

Our Round 3 RTTT request is \$338,650, a slight decrease from Round Two. The request amounts to 22% of STR's TOTAL 2015-16 program budget. Round 3 RTTT funds will support:

- o An estimated 25% of the Cohort Three Residents and Mentors, i.e., the ones assigned to RTTT schools in 2015-16 (as of this date, 7 of the 31 Residents have been assigned to 7 Mentors at 4 RTTT schools: Dearborn Park ES, Madrona K8, Van Asselt ES and West Seattle ES; however three of the 31 C3 Residents are yet to be assigned so the number of RTTT Residents and Mentors at RTTT schools is expected to increase);
- o First year induction support to 12 Cohort Two graduates who have been hired so far by seven RTTT schools: Dearborn Park, Highland Park, Madrona K8, Rainier Beach HS, Roxhill, Van Asselt, and Wing Luke (this too will likely increase as we expect the remaining C2 graduates to be hired by September, though not necessarily all by RTTT schools); and
- o Continuing induction support for 13 Cohort One (2013-14) Graduates who will begin their second year of teaching at six RTTT schools in September: Concord, Emerson, Hawthorne, Northgate, Van Asselt and Wing Luke.

In earlier rounds, STR has budgeted and billed via a pro rata percentage derived by dividing the number of STR Residents who are being trained at RTTT high-need schools divided by all STR Residents (example: if there were 28 STR Residents at all Title I schools and 7 of these were at RTTT schools, we would bill 25% of the identified line items to the RTTT contract).

Staff of the Alliance for Education (the contractor and sponsoring agency of STR) spoke with PSESD fiscal staff in June about how that pro rata percentage changes whenever a Resident is reassigned into or out of a RTTT school and the uncertainty and administrative and budgeting burden this creates. Accordingly, we propose establishing a pro rata percentage for Round 3 that would be fixed at then beginning of the contract year and remain constant throughout the year. Under the proposed approach, budgeting and billing would be based on the ratio of C1, C2 and C3 participants (i.e., prior STR Graduates and current STR Residents) in RTTT schools to the C1, C2 and C3 participants in all the Title I schools which the program serves. For example, given current assignments for 2015-16, there are a total of 25 C1 and C2 graduates, and at least 7 C3 residents, working in RTTT schools as teachers or residents. This is a total of 32 Graduates and Residents whom the program will be supporting with Round Three funds in 2015-16. This represents 40% of the 81 total STR C1 and C2 Graduates and C3 Residents working in Seattle's Title I schools that the program is serving. This pro rata percentage would be applied to the expenses and line items identified in STR's RTTT budget.

As to specific line items in the project's RTTT budget, here is the anticipated percentage distribution of any Round Three RTTT funds that PSESD might allocate to STR (subject to modification in the budget we present in August). Also, please note that the actual budget has several more line items (e.g., travel, professional development, and more) which we do not charge to the RTTT grant; we minimize the line items to keep the RTTT budget and billing process as streamlined as possible.

DRAFT STR BUDGET FOR RTTT:

Salaries.....	\$124,430 (36% of request)
Benefits (at 29%).....	\$ 36,080 (11% of request)
Resident Stipend.....	\$145,200 (42% of request)
Occupancy (Facilities, phones, printing, IT, etc.)....	\$ 26,937 (8% of request)
Induction Support for C1 & C2 Graduates.....	\$ 6,000 (2% of request)
TOTAL RTTT REQUEST.....	\$338,650 (100% of request)

The staffing structure supported by the Salaries and Benefits line items is as follows (the FTE reflects the FTE in the program, not just RTTT):

- o Program Director: 1.0 FTE
- o Curriculum & Induction Coordinator: 0.75 FTE
- o Field Director : 1.0 FTE
- o Recruitment Manager: 1.0 FTE
- o Program Research and Data Analysis: 0.3 FTE
- o Resource Development & Communications: 2 different people totaling 0.25 FTE
- o Admin Support: 0.1 FTE

Response ID: 32

Survey Submitted:	Jul 10, 2015 7:37 PM
IP Address:	75.151.127.209
Language:	English (en-US)
User Agent:	Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; WOW64; Trident/7.0; rv:11.0) like Gecko
Http Referrer:	
URL Variable: snc	1433204140_556cf5ac196ae3.94773555
Page Path:	1 : Introduction (SKU: 8) 2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1) 3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14) 4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3) 5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15) 4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3) 3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14) 2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1) 3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14) 4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3) 5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15) 4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3) 5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15) 6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10) 7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13) 8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11) 9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7) 10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6) 11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4) 12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5) 13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12) 12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5) 11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4) 10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6) 9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7) 8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11) 7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13) 6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10) 5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15) 4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3) 3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14) 2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1) 3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14) 4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3) 5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15) 6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10) 7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13) 8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11) 9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7) 10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6) 11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)

12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
1 : Introduction (SKU: 8)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)

5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
1 : Introduction (SKU: 8)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
1 : Introduction (SKU: 8)

1 : Introduction (SKU: 8)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
1 : Introduction (SKU: 8)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)

3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
1 : Introduction (SKU: 8)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
2 : RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply (SKU: 1)
3 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 14)
4 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 3)
5 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 15)
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)
13 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)
14 : Thank You! (SKU: 2)

SessionID:

1433204140_556cf5ac196ae3.94773555