Proposed Project 1 Investment Fund RFP Criteria for Round 3

Purpose: The goal is to improve teacher and principal skills and abilities to implement personalized learning environments in the Consortium high-needs schools. The emphasis of this fund is on scalable, high impact improvements in math, science and ELL instruction as well as teacher/principal leadership.

Guiding Principles for all Investment projects for final Round (Round 3):
- Investment strategies should be based on *data* **-** what we know about our impact so far
- We have more work to do to measure our impact, and we must know the impact before investing in Round 3
- Investments should emphasize *sustainability.* This is our last round of investments, so we need to put systems in place to ensure student outcomes will outlast RTT.
- RTT is about moving the *entire region forward*. This could result in more targeted investments in certain districts, subgroups or strategy areas.

Requirements:
- Support focuses on High-Need Schools **identified as eligible in RTTT**.
- Shows evidence of support from district's Education Association.
- Project implementation begins or continues during **the 2016-2017 school year and may extend through August, 2017.**
- Proposal aligns with Learning Forward Standards (www.learningforward.org)
- When appropriate, shows evidence of involvement of, resource sharing with and support for communities of color and other groups representing students the strategy intends to serve.

Priorities:
1. Project design/plan is intentional, guided by a clear systems-level theory of action based on disaggregated data, demonstrating strong leadership and ensuring coherence with current district priorities.

2. Well-defined project targets include formative, interim and summative evidence allowing frequent (more than annual) progress monitoring and course correction. **Leading indicators of change in adult practice are included for projects focusing on professional learning.**
3. Strategies designed to build teacher practice and principal leadership by building content and pedagogical content knowledge and skill (**application**) with a priority to ELL, math & science.
4. Personalized and culturally competent approaches promote a culture of high-learning expectations designed specifically to meet the needs of students of color, students who are English Language Learners (ELL), and students receiving Special Education services.
5. Measurable results in RTT-D goal areas and performance measures project a strong return on investment.
6. Job-embedded professional learning where educators engage in inquiry, reflection and receive ongoing feedback.
7. Plans for sustainability of district capacity to deliver program beyond the period of the grant.
8. Project is likely to inform future programs with other districts and districts agree to share learning about best and promising practices.

Other:
- Assurances: Commitment to implementation of Common Core, Smarter Balanced Assessments, and TPEP
- Budget

NOTE: Text in "**bold**" represents draft changes to criteria from Round 2.

Proposed Project 1 Investment Fund Scoring Rubric for Round 3

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND CRITERIA

Requirements	Rating Scale Descriptors	Points Awarded
Project focuses on High-Needs Schools identified as eligible in RTTT (e.g., approved list)	_Meets Standard (YES)_ The project focuses on underserved students with funds **solely allocated specifically on the RTT high-needs schools. Occasional inclusion of students or staff outside of the identified schools is only incidental at best.** _Does Not Meet Standard (NO)_ Does not focus on high-needs school(s) **and/or uses project resources for schools outside of RTTT eligible schools in ways that are more than incidental**. (Proposal does not advance)	Y/N
Requirements	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	**Points Awarded**
Evidence of Education Association involvement with signatures of local superintendent & local Association president.	_Meets Standard (YES_) Proposal is signed by Education Association president(s) and the proposal includes evidence that the proposal was planned collaboratively. _Does Not Meet Standard (NO_) No evidence of support from the Education Association (Proposal does not advance)	Y/N
Requirements	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	**Points Awarded**
Project implementation begins or continues during the **2016-**	Meet Standard (YES) Project implementation begins or continues during the **2016-2017 school year, and may extend through August 2017.**	Y/N

2017 school year and may extend through August of 2017.	Does Not Meet Standard (NO) Project implementation does not begin or continue during the 2016-2017 school year.	
Requirements	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	**Points Awarded**
When appropriate, shows evidence of involvement of, resource sharing with and support for communities of color and other groups representing students the strategy intends to serve.	*Exceeds Standard (4-5 points)* Includes evidence that districts intentionally plan to share resources and have gathered support from communities of color and other groups representing students to inform program development, activities, outcomes and budget. ("Share resources" means sharing **funding** with communities of color and other groups that represent students) *Meets Standard (2-3 points)* Includes evidence that districts plan some resource sharing and/or have gathered support from some groups representing students to form program development, activities, outcomes and budget. *Below Standard (0-1 point)* Includes little or no evidence that districts plan to share resources or have gathered support form groups representing students to form program development, activities, outcomes and budget.	5
Priorities/Criteria	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	**Points Awarded**
1. Project plan/design is intentional, guided by a clear systems-level theory of action based on disaggregated data,	Exceeds Standard (10-15 points) The problems cited are clearly and specifically linked to students in opportunity gap through disaggregated data. Articulates a baseline measure of teaching and learning capacities and shows a clear connection to the district's newly adopted instructional and leadership frame.	15

| demonstrating strong leadership and ensuring coherence with current district priorities. | Clear rationale effectively shows the link between teacher and/or leader capacity and student learning.

Theory of action is clear and explicitly related how actions will lead to change in student performance measures or goal areas. The district keeps the change process in mind as it designs its work.

Describes work the district has already completed to lay the foundation for this investment and makes a clear and compelling case that additional funding will significantly advance the region.

<u>Meets Standard (3-9 points)</u>
Problems cited are generally linked to students in the opportunity gap through disaggregated data.

Articulates a baseline measure of teaching and leading capacities.

Rationale shows a link between teacher and/or leader capacity and student learning.

Describes work the district has already completed to lay the foundation for this investment, and makes a clear and compelling case that additional funding is needed to achieve the goals of the project.

<u>Below Standard (0-2 points)</u>
Problems cited are weakly linked to students in the gap or do not connect to disaggregated data.

Weak articulation of a baseline measure of teaching and leading capacities.

Weak rationale: does not connect teacher and/or capacity building and student | |

Priorities/Criteria	Rating Scale Descriptors	
	learning. It is unclear what work the district has already completed to lay the foundation for this investment (or very little planning has taken place).	
Priorities/Criteria	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	
2. Well-defined project targets include formative interim and summative evidence allowing frequent (more than annual) progress monitoring and course correction. **Leading indicators of change in adult practice are included for projects focusing on professional learning.**	*Exceeds Standard (14-20 points)* Identifies goals and outcomes in alignment with RTT, district, and school initiatives. Project identifies the specific numbers of students who will meet RTT targets by subgroup*. (* **Realizing the complexity and timing of results from Smarter Balanced assessments, support will be given to district leaders to set the next RTTT achievement targets**). Targets are clear, ambitious and realistic. Clearly states instruments/assessments used to track formative and summative evidence, including how often the evidence will be gathered and how it will be used for course correction. **Districts identify means/tools to gather qualitative evidence of impact of professional development in terms of adult practices and use for course correction. When possible, districts find ways to include student voice on how new practices aide their learning.** *Continuing projects*: Explicitly describes formative evidence collected, lessons learned and possible course corrections based on evidence. Initial evidence shows positive impact on goals set in Round 2.	20

	Meets Standard (7-13 points) Identifies the specific numbers of students who will meet RTT targets, by subgroup. (* See note above) Targets are clear, ambitious, and realistic **Districts identify means/tools to gather qualitative evidence of impact of professional development in terms of adult practices.** Describes instruments/assessments used to track formative and summative evidence, and includes a plan for evidence. *Continuing projects*: Describes and summarizes the project's impact based on formative evidence collected so far; initial evidence shows positive impact related to RTT P1 goals, or sound course corrections are proposed. *Below Standard (0-6 points)* Measures for student learning and reduction of achievement gaps are not addressed, nor linked, to the project's focus. RTT measures are not used. **Little or no evidence of qualitative tools for evidence gathering on impact of professional development in terms of adult practices.** *Continuing projects*: Formative evidence collected is not described, or, initial evidence shows little or no impact on P1 RTT goals **and** no sound course corrections are proposed.	

Priorities/Criteria	Rating Scale Descriptors	Points Awarded
3. Strategies within project are designed to build teacher practice and principal leadership by building content and pedagogical content knowledge with a priority to ELL, math and science.	*Exceeds Standard (10-15 points*) The proposal includes strategies designed to build teacher practice **and** principal leadership by building **both** content and pedagogical knowledge and application with a priority on ELL, math or science. *Meets Standard (2-9 points*) The proposal includes strategies designed to build teacher **or** principal leadership by building content **or** pedagogical knowledge and application with a priority on ELL, math or science. *Below Standard (0-1 point*) The proposal does not include strategies for content or pedagogical knowledge.	15

Criteria	Rating Scale Descriptors	Points Awarded
4. Personalized and culturally competent approaches ensure a culture of high learning expectations deigned specifically to meet the needs of students of color, students who are English Language Learners (ELL), and students receiving Special	*Exceeds Standard (10-15 points)* Actions build capacity for personalized and culturally competent approaches designed specifically to meet the needs of students of color, students who are ELL, **and** students receiving SPED services in the district high-needs schools and result in expanded systemic opportunities for specific student subgroups. Proposal shows evidence that culturally relevant approaches have been informed by stakeholders **such as District Leads (ELL, Special Ed, Family Engagement) families and community partners and align with the district's equity plan and/or district equity efforts.** *Continuing projects*: Clearly describes that capacity has been built during Round 2 for personalized and culturally competent approaches, how continued investment would expand opportunities for specific subgroups, and proposed course-corrections if necessary.	15

Education services.		
	Meets Standard (2-9 points) Actions build capacity and personalized and culturally competent approaches designed specifically to meet the needs of students of color, students who are ELL, **or** students receiving SPED services in the district's high-needs schools and results in expanded systemic opportunities for special student subgroups. **A rationale is given to explain the student subgroup selected, backed by data.** Proposal shows evidence that culturally relevant approaches have been informed by stakeholders **including District Leads (ELL, Special Ed, family engagement) and align with district's equity plan or district equity efforts.** _Continuing projects_: Describes the progress toward capacity that has been made during round 2 for personalized and culturally competent approaches, and proposes course-corrections. _Below Standard (0-1 point_) Actions do not demonstrate capacity building for personalized and culturally competent approaches designed specifically to meet the needs of students of color, students who are ELL, or students receiving SPED services in the district high-needs schools. _Continuing projects_: Progress toward building capacity in Round 2 is not described **or** very little progress as been made **and** sound course-corrections are not provided.	
Criteria	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	**Points Awarded**

| 5. Project identifies strong return on investment for project funds and impacts long-term student success. | *Exceeds Standard (14-20 points)*
The requested budget represents a high return on investment when compared with the numbers of students in high-needs schools who will meet RTT targets as a result of the project. Targets are realistic and ambitious.

Project strategies are likely to have impacts on long-term success.
Project is scalable/replicable.

Continuing projects:
Describes initial evidence showing positive impact on goals set in Round 2 and describes the added return on investment for the Round 3 request.

Continuing projects:
Round 2 funds have been expended as planned, and includes a budget for any anticipated underspend. Underspend is leveraged in the Round 3 requested budget.

Meets Standard (7-13 points)
The requested budget represents a fair return on investment when compared with the numbers of students in high-needs schools who will meet RTT targets as a result of the project. Targets are realistic and ambitious.

Continuing projects:
Round 2 funds have been expended as planned, and includes a budget for any anticipated underspend. Underspend is leveraged in the Round 3 requested budget.

Continuing projects:
Initial evidence shows positive impact related to RTT P1 goals, **or** sound course corrections are proposed describing the intended impact on RTT outcomes. | 20 |

	Below Standard (0-6 points) Represents a low return on investment and/or is based on targets that are unrealistic. Continuing projects: Initial evidence shows little or no impact on P1 RTT goals and no sound course corrections are proposed.	
Criteria	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	**Points Awarded**
6. The investment aligns to Learning Forward standards by providing job-embedded professional learning where educators engage in inquiry, reflection and receive ongoing feedback.	*Exceeds Standard (4-5 points)* Aligns with Learning Forward Standards by including job-embedded professional learning where educators engage in inquiry, reflection and receive ongoing feedback; plan also connects to the district's framework for teacher evaluation (instructional framework). *Meets Standard (2-3 points)* Aligns with Learning Forward Standards by including job-embedded professional learning where educators engage in inquiry, reflection and receive ongoing feedback. *Below Standard (0-1 point)* Not aligned with Learning Forward Standards. (Proposal does not advance)	**5**
Criteria	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	**Points Awarded**
7. Project has an	*Exceeds Standard (12-15 points)*	15

Priority/Criteria	Rating Scale Descriptors	Points Awarded
sustainability plan to promote key project components, long-term partnerships, and funding	**Addresses how key components of the proposal, roles, and/or structures will continue after the life of the proposal in order to sustain progress when the grant ends**. Clearly outlines how funding is leveraged within the district. Identifies specific funding sources to carry forward the work after the term of the grant. Includes a succession plan that can be sustained if/when leadership changes. *Continuing projects*: **An in-depth plan and timeline are described to fully sustain the impact of the project after this round. Budget shows evidence of increased leveraged funding from Round 2.** *Meets Standard (6-11 points)* **Addresses sustainability of key program components and leveraging of funds within district. General timeline is included**. Mentions potential funding sources to carry forward the work after the term of this grant. *Continuing projects*: Budget shows evidence of increased leveraged funding from Round 2. *Below Standard (0-5 points)* Does not address sustainability.	
Priority/Criteria	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	**Points Awarded**
8. Project is likely	*Exceeds Standard (4-5 points*)	

to inform future programs with other districts and districts agree to share learning about best and promising practices.	Includes a plan for documenting and promoting shared learning about effective and promising investments. Shows potential for replication or findings relevant to other districts. _Meets Standard (1-3 points_) Project partners describe plans to participate in a share learning community with other RTT P1 projects. Below Standard (0 points) Does not mention shared learning	**5**
Assurances	_**Rating Scale Descriptors**_	**Points Awarded**
Project supports RTTT assurances and commitments	_Meets Standard (Yes)_ The proposal shows commitment to alignment with and implementation of Common Core, Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA), and Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP). _Does not meet Standard (0-1 point_) The proposal does not show a commitment to implementation of Common Core, SBA and/or TPEP.	**Y/N**
Other Items	**Rating Scale Descriptors**	**Points Awarded**
Budget	_Exceeds Standard (10-15 points_) The amounts requested for each budget line item are clearly described, aligned with the proposal and show evidence of effective, appropriate and efficient use of funds. _Continuing projects_: Anticipated underspend from Round 2 is not significant and is leveraged in the Round 3 request. Budget narrative explains reasons for anticipated underspend and describes a clear plan to mitigate underspend in Round 3.	15

Meets Standard (4-9 points) The amounts requested for each budget line item are aligned with the proposal and show evidence of effective, appropriate and efficient use of funds within the narrative. *Continuing project*: Anticipated underspend from Round 2 is leveraged in the Round 3 request. Budget narrative explains reasons for anticipated underspend and described a plan to mitigate underspend in Round 3. Below Standard (0-3 points) Provides insufficient detail and/or does not align with the project description. *Continuing projects*: Anticipated underspend from Round 2 is not addresses or is not leveraged.	

Scoring Category	Possible Points	Awarded Points
Criteria	**115**	
Budget	**15**	
Total Possible	**130**	

Additional Notes (Strengths, Areas of Concern, Questions):