

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

Response ID:55 Data

## 2. RTT Project 1 RFP Letter of Intent to Apply

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

Tukwila School District

### 2. Please list any involved partners.

Discovery Education, Performance Fact, Inc., , Technical Education Services and Training, LLC

### 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	Dr. Gregory King	Tukwila School District	Executive Director of STEAM	kingg@tukwila.wednet.edu	2069018084
Contact Person 1					
Contact Person 2					
Contact Person 3					
Contact Person 4					
Contact Person 5					
Contact Person 6					
Contact Person 7					

## 3. Summary of Proposal

### 4. The application will be for a:

New Proposal

## 4. Summary of Proposal

### 5. Please provide the name of your project.

Job-Embedded Professional Development to Improve Teaching, Leading, and Learning.

## 5. Summary of Proposal

### 6. Please provide a description of the project.

Tukwila School District will implement lessons learned and wise practices from years 1 and 2 of the grant during this grant

period to ensure building administrators and teachers have access to contemporary professional development related to STEAM education. The Tukwila School District (TSD) has utilized P1 funds in year 1 and year 2 to enhance teachers, classified staffs, and administrators instructional and leadership capacities to improve English Language Learners (ELL) academic achievement. For the first two years of the P1 grant, TSD contracted with Heritage University to provide graduate course work towards ELL teaching endorsement, certification, master degree, and/or non-degree programs. A smaller number of teachers, classified staffs, and administrators availed themselves to these professional development opportunities than expected during rounds 1 and round 2. After gathering information through meetings with labor coalition and informal interviews to understand why there were a small number of participants, corrective-preventive action took place to adjust grant objectives. Employees from other labor groups were invited to participate and P1 grant funds were expended as planned. What we know now from rounds 1 and 2 is that our young teaching staffs were unable to commit to professional development opportunities on a consistent basis after school. What we also know is that the growing body of research on embedded professional development/in class coaching strongly recommends teacher professional development be included within work hours and integrated with staff daily job responsibilities to ensure implementation of wise practices. Moreover, research shows that by building technical and methodology skills in a contextual framework enhances teacher practice and student learning.

The return on investment in round 3 is an increase in the number of staff members participating in job-related professional development in an integrated delivery mode; thus, more training yields better prepared employees. Technical Education Services and Training (T.E.S.T.), LLC will oversee evaluation of P1 professional learning initiatives. The primary goal of P1 is to collect evidence that job-embedded learning converts to new instructional and leadership practices that positively impact student learning in personalized learning environments. In order to sustain organizational change to support continuous improvement and learning over time, T.E.S.T., LLC will also assist TSD with analyzing student, educator, and system data. T.E.S.T. will further guide TSD to prioritize human, fiscal, material, technology, and time resources to ensure professional learning becomes embedded new instructional and leadership practices overtime. And finally, T.E.S.T., LLC will seek additional grants to expand P1 initiatives for a third year and beyond.

TSD's new plan will greatly impact the classroom by enhancing teacher instructional and principal leadership abilities through job embedded-professional development, shared or distributed leadership among learning communities, and focused data analysis that is aligned with TSD's strategic plan and school improvement goals. Round three focuses on elementary teachers, district and school-based administrators, and high school teachers. Our theory of action recognizes the need to differentiate job embedded professional development for elementary and high school teachers. Given that our middle school is a focused school, we are closely working with OSPI to provide additional guidance and support; hence the reason round three will only include middle school administrators in year 1. However, in year 2, the Van Andel Institute will train middle school teachers to align with high school teachers.

Round three differs from rounds 1 and 2. For one a smaller, manageable pool of teachers from Tukwila, Cascade View, and Thorndyke will participate in training as teacher leaders. Next, high school teachers had an integral role identifying the professional content and provider. The Teacher Education Association past and current presidents suggested that professional development should allow flexibility and equitable opportunity for teacher participation; less time away from classroom, and more in-class support (job embedded). Similarly, administrators want instructional training to improve teaching and learning. It is clear that administrators desire to have a model of professional development that aligns with strategic plan and school improvement goals, progress monitoring, measureable student outcomes, improved teaching practices, and data analysis. Ultimately, improved student achievement is expected. Therefore, the new TSD project will incorporate aforementioned strategies, which we believe, are aligned to professional learning standards and culturally responsive practices. As a direct result, we believe teachers and administrators content knowledge will create personalized learning environments. With this said, technology is vital to creating personalized learning environments. TSD students will implement 1:1 technology in all schools and incorporate digital learning materials or techbooks to meet diverse student learning needs. Teachers and administrators will benefit from 1:1 technology. The TSD community has provided tech levy funds and we believe our commitment to 1:1 deployment will only enhance our round three proposal. Most importantly, personalized learning environments can only happen with technology and job embedded professional development.

To sum up, TSD round 3 theory of action is intended to vertically align science content knowledge and instructional and leadership practices through STEAM Formation, Van Andel Education Institute Science Academy, and Performance Fact,

Inc.'s Discipline Instructional Implementation, Professional Development and Leadership results. STEAM Formation led by Discovery Education addresses content and personalized learning environments for elementary schools. The VAEI Science Academy develops a community of practice for high school science teachers and administrators. Over arching is Performance Fact, Inc. that develops instructional leadership, progress monitoring, and data analysis that includes interpretation and action plans based on formative and summative data. All three solutions will be evaluated and can be sustained beyond P1 funding through federal grants.

---

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

---

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

---

## 6. Summary of Proposal

---

**7. 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.**

Thorndyke, Cascade View, Tukwila, Showalter (administrators year 1 and teachers year 2), and Foster High School are the schools involved.

Which student group's academic achievement is your district's highest priority for support and impact? All TSD students scored fifty-nine percent on the 5th grade state science assessment. Comparatively, Pacific Islanders and Limited English students scored 36% and 26% respectively. There is an achievement/opportunity gap that ranges from 2% to 40% among White students and low socio-economic, students of color. For middle school, TSD scored 47% on the eighth grade science assessment. The opportunity gap/achievement gap between White, students of color, and low socio-economic ranged from 15% to 59%. Limited English students scored only 5% on the same assessment. As an added illustration, on the math assessment, TSD 6th, 7th, and 8th grade scored 42%, 39%, and 29% respectively. Similarly, only 20% of TSD students are on track to college and career readiness. In contrast, only 2% of Limited English students are on track to college and career readiness.

---

**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.**

---

## 7. Summary of Proposal

---

**8. Check all groups that are relevant.**

English Language Learners (ELL)  
Special Education  
Low-Income  
White  
Pacific Islander  
Hispanic  
Black  
Asian  
American Indian

---

## 9. Check all grade levels that are relevant.

6/7th-12th (middle and high)

K-8th

## 8. Summary of Proposal

---

### 10. Describe the proposed project leadership structure.

Dr. Gregory King will lead the project. District Administrators, school-based administrators, and teachers will share leadership. Also, Dr. Judith Berry will oversee all initiatives on a contracted basis to ensure resources are appropriately expended to meet our intended goals of improving student achievement in math and science.

## 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

Washington State Science Assessment

### 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-**

2016-2017

2017-2018

## 10. Summary of Proposal

---

### 13. 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.**

The intended goal areas are science and math. If teachers and administrators receive research-based professional learning and leadership training that transforms learning environments that foster student engagement, inquiry, critical thinking, problem solving, personalized learning, and creativity, elementary and high school students' science as well as math achievement scores will increase.

(A)(4)(a) : Performance on Summative State Assessments –Math, Grades 3-9, Grade 10 EOC

(A)(4)(b): Achievement Gaps in Math

(E)(3)(Grades 4-8)(d) – Science State Assessment: Washington State Science Assessment (5th & 8th grades)

Percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the statewide assessment for Science

(E)(3)(Grades 9-12)(d): AP or IB students

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.

**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](#))**

## 11. Summary of Proposal

---

**14. 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.**

Tukwila School District's year 3 proposal is distinctly different from years 1 and year 2 proposals. Tukwila School District is more intentional about involving parents and community members in our collective professional learning. Not only is this approach culturally responsive, it helps sustain the theory of action over time. Parent involvement is essential to improving student learning. We also would argue that it is vital to improving teaching and leading. Further, Year 3 proposal addresses equity in opportunity for college, career, and work force readiness. By focusing on science and math through project-based or inquiry learning, more students of color, parents, and females develop an awareness of STEM/STEAM careers. And TSD students will demonstrate more success in science and math that are precursors for success in college, career, and work force STEM/STEAM fields. Currently, students of color and women are underrepresented in STEM jobs. Washington ranks 4th in the country in STEM jobs. STEM jobs are projected to grow over the next few years. In order for students of color and women to have gainful employment in STEM fields, strong backgrounds in math and science are vitally important. Hence, you can negate poverty levels in diverse communities by improving economic conditions through employment.

**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.**

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

The Year 3 proposal is a two-year plan of action using current P1 funding from 2015 – 2016 through 2016 - 2017. In the third year of the action plan (2017 – 2018), federal funding such as Title 1, Title 2, and Title 3 sustained and expanded to more teachers (new or experienced) and administrators. Also, we will seek additional NSF grants.

**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?**

## 12. Summary of Proposal

---

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

I presented the proposal to the current and past Teacher Education Association presidents for input and feedback. Based upon feedback from the current TEA president, I included this in the proposal to best meet the needs of teachers. The high school department chairperson was instrumental in securing all science teacher buy-in with the Van Andel Institute during the 2014 - 2015 school year. We are expanding the work that has already started and will include middle school teachers in year 2 for vertical alignment. We will work collaboratively on implementation and evaluation.

## 13. Summary of Proposal

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

The estimated budget for two years is \$680,000. The budget includes extra pay for elementary, middle (year 2), and high school teachers and school-based administrators (including benefits); substitute for release days (will align with early release days to save costs on teacher and administrator salaries); extended learning for approximately 125 students, 5 teachers, and 1 coordinator; digital materials; 3D printers; online tools; contractual services for job-embedded professional development, and evaluation services.

## Response ID: 55

<b>Survey Submitted:</b>	Jul 10, 2015 3:44 PM
<b>IP Address:</b>	152.157.4.41
<b>Language:</b>	English (en-US,en;q=0.8)
<b>User Agent:</b>	Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; WOW64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/38.0.2125.122 Safari/537.36
<b>Http Referrer:</b>	http://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/2154991/Race-to-the-Top-Project-1-RFP-Round-3-Letter-of-Intent-LOI
<b>URL Variable: snc</b>	(no value)

**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)  
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)  
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)  
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 9)  
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)  
6 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 10)  
7 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 13)  
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 9)  
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)  
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)  
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)  
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)  
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)  
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)  
13 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)  
14 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)  
13 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)  
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)  
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)  
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)  
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)  
8 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 9)  
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: 9)  
9 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 11)  
10 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 7)  
11 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 6)  
12 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 4)  
13 : Summary of Proposal (SKU: 5)  
14 : Review Submission (SKU: 12)  
15 : Thank You! (SKU: 2)

**SessionID:**

1436555317\_55a018358a85c8.11409093