



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0218TN-1 for Claiborne County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides ample information to show the proposed project is aligned with the Race to The Top District grants. The grant is the result of a collaborative effort among the Claiborne County School District (CCSD), educators and other stakeholders. The overarching goals of project is to provide leadership and collaboration opportunities to teachers and leaders to develop effective, data-driven instructional strategies and educational experiences that will create high achieving schools and prepare students for college and careers. This process is clearly aligned with the Race to the Top District grant as the standards and assessments are designed to prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and build an effective data system that will measure student growth and success, while providing teachers and principals the data they can use to improve instruction.</p> <p>The applicant provides goals that are aligned with the districts Common Core Standards and the Race to the Top District initiative. The goals presented are clearly designed to accelerate student learning and deepen the learning experience by providing personalized learning environments for students. Furthermore, goals include implementing programs and strategies in grades K-12 to better prepare students for post-secondary education and/or a career; utilizing effective data systems and increase academic rigor in Reading/Language Arts and Math to improve scores and meet state-required targets with all subgroups while decreasing achievement gaps on state-mandated assessments. Teachers will administer assessments three times a year to each student in the district to determine progress towards benchmark attainment. These assessments feature new tools, content, and interactive reports so teachers can bridge assessment and instruction to drive individualized student practice and learning.</p> <p>Classroom instruction will include program content that will help teachers to provide individual instruction, instructional planning, screening, progress monitoring and common core state standards reports amongst other instructional strategies. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) at the district and school levels comprised leaders and teachers will successfully support the project. PLCs operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous, jobembedded learning for educators. The use of school level PLCs is a logical approach because they will meet regularly and make specific decisions that will meet the individual school and student needs. The applicant proposes to provide professional development for teachers so that they will be trained to implement the project. For example, high quality professional development will be provided to teachers in differentiation instructing, creating an environment that supports learning. Instructional coaches will work closely with teachers to assure incorporation of various instructional technique in all classrooms. Teachers and students will learn to work together to collaborate and share responsibility for learning. The incorporation of teaching and learning technology will positively support the district and state plan to increase enrollment in post-secondary education. For example, the applicant proposes to use online assessments that will support Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) instruction, college and career prep courses and other will be used. All of the strategies presented by the applicant will provide a full range of instructional opportunities for youth and teachers.</p> <p>The applicant presents a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. The incorporation of Differentiated Instruction is a viable approach to address the needs of students based on their academic skills and diversity they bring into the classroom. The approach is inclusive of various aspects of critical thinking, interdisciplinary instruction and accommodates a range of readiness levels, learning styles and interest. This process is a appropriate as it will give teachers a clear and credible approach to increasing student achievement, increasing equity and deepening the learning experience through personalized student support.</p> <p>The applicant does not describe the what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. Therefore, a score of 8 was given.</p> | | |

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The process for the selection of the schools who will be served by the project are clearly defined. The applicant has chosen to provide services to all schools within the district. The applicant states that the schools were selected based upon the participate and eligibility of students grades K-12 were determined based upon those allowable under eligibility guidelines defined by the Race to The Top District. The information provided clearly indicates that there is a need for the proposed services, as well over 50 percent of the participating students are in rural LEA's in state. The applicant provides the list of schools to be served by the proposed project and the educators are also listed. The information provided clearly shows that there are high numbers of low income students (over 3200) and a large number of high needs students (4500) who need support within the targeted area.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents information which support strategies that will provide opportunities to scale up project activities. The use of Professional Learning communities (PLCs) in each school a viable approach to gauge the effectiveness of principals and teachers as determined by TEAM Evaluation data used by the district. This logical approach will ensure regular feedback as PLCs meet regularly to examine data, define school and individual needs. They are also responsible for providing mentoring to less effective teachers and provide strategies that support personalized learning. The applicant provides ample information to show teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities to successfully implement the project. some strategies include differentiated Instruction in all classrooms, college and career-ready standards and STEM Vertical Integration will align STEM curriculum from elementary school into post-secondary education. The use of trained counselors is an effective hands on approach because they will offer classroom supports in behavior management, careers and providing post-secondary education to students. The coordination of community and family partnerships is a viable approach to provide holistic activities will further support the scale up process. The applicant's plan will establish strong and strategically focused partnerships amongst parents, students, teachers and colleges to leverage resources all of which will increase the quality of instruction and access to postsecondary educational opportunities. The applicant organization will offer resources for the development of a college-going culture, through promotion of students academic preparation for college, empowered and informed post-secondary education choices. This is another viable scale up approach.

The applicant does not present the key goal, timelines or activities associated with the strategies presented. Therefore a score of 8 was given for this selection criteria.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The vision the applicant presents is based upon a needs assessment done at the district level whereby "five "gaps" were identified and indicated that students within the targeted schools are underrepresented to pursue post secondary options, students require remedial or developmental post-secondary courses, poverty limits financial and economic resources to students and students are not given a platform to excel in post-secondary environments.

The applicant proposes to use assessment tools that are utilized by the district to perform summative assessments. The use of the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) tool is viable which will provide a statistical analysis of achievement data that will reveal academic growth over time for students and groups of students, such as those in a grade level or in a school. The use of this tool is logical as it will allow for feedback to school leaders and teachers on student progress and assess the influence of schooling on that progress. The applicant provides information to show the plan to reduce the achievement gap for all subgroups of students is defined. The applicant proposes to reduce the rate by 3% per year throughout the duration of the grant project. The applicant has also indicated that there will be an increase in the graduation rate overall for all students. The rate for for students with disabilities is very ambitious as the applicant proposes an increase from 57.1% to 70.4% in the first year of the proposed project. The college attainment rate is also presented by the applicant and it indicates a 3% increase for all of the student populations. These measures aligned with the College and Career Ready Policy Institute (CCRPI) benchmarks as adopted by the Board and the Commission.

The applicant has omitted he baseline data for Reading in grades 3-8 in the charts presented. Therefore, a score of 9 was given for this selection criteria.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 12 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides information that clearly indicates there is a record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement within the targeted area. It is noted by the applicant that the district has been engaged in ongoing efforts to increase student achievement throughout the district. Their efforts included the use of vertically integration STEM learning within grades K-12. The use of Vertical Integration teams and instructional kits whereby lesson plans and materials supported the student achievement progress noted by the applicant. The school district was also awarded for their achievement.</p> <p>There is ample information provided by the applicant to show these stakeholders have access to student and school data. The use of data teams was a logical approach because the team is charged with informing achievement progress to students, educators, and parents in improving instruction. Data teams in each school are lead by the District Data Coach and are becoming more autonomous at the school level. Other strategies that were successful are also presented by the applicant and they included: Parent/teacher conference to inform parents of student progress and the use of a parent involvement coordinator that arranges and documents parent events at each school. Additionally, all schools and the district have a webpage for parents, students and the community to keep up with the activities at the schools.</p> <p>The applicant does not present four years of data on college enrollment. The applicant does not describe how the strategies over the last four years have led to ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools. Therefore a score of 12 was given for this selection criteria.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is detailed evidence presented to show there is some transparency regarding most of the LEA processes, practices and investments. Information regarding all programs, practices, procedures, fiscal management and investments is made available to all stakeholders. All information is documented on the district's public website. Salaries are listed in general context and is based upon years experience and different levels of education attainment (Bachelors, Masters, Education Specialist, and Doctorate degree). As further support, the applicant states there are links to district documents that include annual financial reports, comprehensive annual financial reports and financial budgets, annual reports, organizational chart, job descriptions, historic budget data, accounting structure, monthly financial reports, monthly check registers and monthly financial reports.</p> <p>This selection criteria was given a score of 3 as the applicant states that specific, detailed salaries associated with schools, personnel and non-personnel is not listed on the District's website. The information must be obtained by going to the Claiborne County School Finance Office for inspection and is not a feasible process. This information indicates there is a no transparency process related to salaries be made accessible at all times.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents adequate information to show the level of autonomy within the district and locally. All legal, statutory, and regulatory are under the operations of the county board which meets monthly to transact all school system related business and policies. The Director of Schools oversees the daily operation of the school systems budgets and fiscal duties. The overall management of the district is handled by the Director of Claiborne County School District along with the district supervisory staff, principals and teachers who have full authority to make curriculum changes, adopt and implement progressive programs for education.</p> <p>This selection criteria was given a score of 9. The applicant does not describe in detail the conditions by which the district has autonomy to implement personalized learning environments as there are no specifics given.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 8 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has indicated that there was solicitation for support from public service providers and concerned citizens who will devote the personal time to the project. There are letters of support provided by some of the stakeholders. Educators and stake holders have worked collaboratively to seek funding for the district's vision on how to improve on current educational practices.</p> <p>There is no evidence presented to show representation of LEAs with collective bargaining representation, evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools. There is no evidence presented to show representation of LEAs without collective bargaining representation, at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools. Due to the lack of specific information regarding the representation of the collective bargaining a score of 8 was given for this section of the criteria.</p> | | |

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

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

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Their efforts will also include a holistic approach whereby they will be able to include families in the learning process by providing program and personalized learning input. This approach is logical as students will be placed in an environment where they will be comfortable and are able to enjoy their learning experience. The plan to identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards is clearly defined by the applicant and will support the goals of the project. For example, students and parents will be actively involved the development of their personalize learning plan. The development of the plan is a logical approach as the six year plan allows students, parents and stakeholders to explore various career paths, postsecondary training and allows for adjustments if needed. Some additional activities include online research of college requirements; informational sessions by school personnel; a series of standardized testing from ACT for grades 8, 10, and 11; dual credit opportunities and college financial planning. Transitional and Engagement activities will provide opportunities for role modeling and building of networks among students, their families, potential role models, personal mentors, and advisors to better demystify milestone transitions including those from grade to grade. This is a logical approach to further support students as freshmen will have the opportunity to attend transitional programs. The transitional programs will be hosted in the summer prior to high school and activities include common planning time for faculty of the 5th grade and core academic freshmen courses with two to four meetings per month to monitor student progress and achievement, and an advisory program by faculty for students. The incorporation of transitional programs will promote the self confidence needed to increase students' learning experience.</p> <p>The use of surveys is a logical approach to gain academic and personal input from students so that programs can be tailored to their interest and culture. Specific categories that will be addressed by the survey include curriculum, facilities, safety, discipline, and teachers/counselors. The students personalized work plan will then identify between ten to fifteen transitional activities to address student's economic diversity and education. The process will also students to gain the skills they need to master academic content. Several feasible strategies include providing summer and Saturday academies and after school programs to offer additional academic support and to help students to develop skills and traits such as goal setting, team work, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity and problem solving. There are also plans to provide programming that will ensure college rigor and readiness through the use of science, technology, engineering/English, and mathematics (STEM) curriculum bases, math and science coaches. The strategies presented are sufficient and will support the overall goals of the project. The goals to provide digital learning opportunities for students are defined and will support the teaching and learning process. For example, hands on digital learning will be offered through summer camps and professional development collaboration between training of teachers and students in classroom lab environments. Additional instructional tools include the use of e-books, online interactive learning modules, pod casting which will allow students to work at their on pace. The use of online classes to provide opportunities for credit recovery is an innovative approach to provide students the means to complete their coursework. This process also provides students further opportunities to utilize their personalized learning skills by gaining credit outside the classroom. Access to mobile labs and DVDs for encouraging the completion of college and technical school applications as well as financial aid and scholarship opportunities logically supports students outside of school.</p> <p>The applicant has not addressed how the proposed project will lead to parents, educators and all students understand that what they are learning is the key to their success in accomplishing their goals. There is no discussion as to how the project</p> | | |
|---|--|--|

will allow students access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. Despite the information presented regarding the proposed strategies to be used activities there are none mentioned that clearly describes how personalized learning process. The plan presented to ensure ongoing and regular feedback regarding student data and personalized learning is lacking as the applicant will plans to use 9 weeks report cards, 9 weeks progress reports and online assessments 3 times per year. This method is not conducive of an ongoing or frequent process. This section was given a score of 10 as much of the criteria is not specifically addressed.

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

20

17

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is information provided by the applicant to show that efforts will be made to provide educators with training to support personalized learning experiences for students. The district will provide support through professional development and assistive technology and the creation of Professional Learning Community (PLC) so that teachers can receive all their technology is a reasonable approach to providing training for teachers. Currently the majority of teachers are online strategies targeting the child centered classroom, self efficacy, continuous improvement, and classroom planning techniques for the diversified learner. The Tennessee Value Added Assessment (TVAAS) website that assist teachers in identifying students who need that extra push. The various TVAAS reports assist teachers by identifying demographic sub groups to help meet district and schools Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).

There is sufficient evidence provided by the applicant to show additional teaching strategies will be made available for use by teachers that will allow for students to adapt content and instruction. For example, the applicant proposes to contract a service provider to provide training to teachers and the Teacher Learning Community will assist with 1000+ hours of self-paced and interactive online learning programs from novice to advanced level that can be utilized 24/7. The use webinars is reasonable as there will be live and recorded sessions with experts/educators sharing their knowledge, experience, and best practices. Opportunities for teachers to share information and classroom strategies will help to establish their own personal learning network and with others to discuss trends and issues important to a 21st century classroom. Trainings will include: Internet training on safety, cyber bullying, health safety, SPED/assistive technology, Common Core, Tech Integration, Virtual Learning, Web Tools, Personal Enrichment, Differentiated Learning, and Prescriptive and Blended Learning and Technology Training for Teachers that may be utilized in curriculum plans to engage students ready to use technology. The applicant states that there will be online training through a college prep website and there will be some professional development provided. The applicant proposes to use the website collegefortn.org for the creation of lesson planning for all students in grades seven through twelve. The free online offers portals of career, high school, college, and financial planning information. Students develop an individual portfolio that contains personal data and preferences regarding the research they do at collegefortn.org. This supplemental tool promotes college and/or career readiness.

There is a viable evaluation system currently in place as indicated by the information presented by the applicant. The Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluation system is designed to improve teacher effectiveness and provides a plan to achieve instructional excellence. The system focuses on frequent observations, both formal and informal, followed by constructive and one-on-one interactions between teachers and school leaders. The credibility of the system is evident as it is designed to combine self-reflection, observation, input of school staff and student data to create a complete picture of the administrator's performance. The effectiveness rating is calculated using a formula that is 50% qualitative and 50% quantitative and the combined rating is evaluated based on findings. The evaluation process helps leaders and teachers identify and use strategies to effectively differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each individual student. The applicant proposes to identify optimal learning approaches through the Renaissance Learning data which will be used to provide educators information to provide personalized learning environments. Students' strengths and weaknesses will be collected through Renaissance Learning reports and used to create differentiated learning plans for all students K-12. To ensure there will be opportunities high-quality learning resources that aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and tools to create new resources the applicant proposes to continue providing on-going professional development for teachers to provide individualized instructional strategies through a three-phase approach that includes: training teachers, administrators and coaches; building school level capacity and district capacity to establish priorities and develop a long-term plan and extension plan based on the individual and district needs to identify problems that may occur during initial phases. Contracted services will provide specialized programming to seven of the lowest performing schools. This is an ample approach as there are other program components that will ensure this strategy will work that include the use of a service contractor who will support the efforts.

The process tools presented by the applicant includes the use of the Renaissance Learning program which will be used to create personalized learning folders to track ongoing student progress and interventions for all students and schools. The plan to provide additional Focus Time (30 minutes) for every child to receive intervention and enrichment through small group instruction with trained personnel is a logical approach to personalized learning. Tools to aid school and district leaders in implementing the new system are also provided through Race to The Top District on-line professional development sessions to ensure teachers and observers are able to complete the evaluation cycle, and benefit from

meaningful feedback discussions and plans for development.

The applicant provides a comprehensive to steps to improve take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate. The applicant will hire four coaches to implement the curriculum in ELA, math, science and literacy throughout the district and may also teach a particular content area teachers. Several effective instructional strategies are presented and will further support the goals of the project. For example, in while coaches may be used to train teachers to use a particular approach they may work to improve general instructional practices or to promote a more reflective, collaborative, and professional culture. The use of teacher evaluations which are aligned with student progress is a logical approach as the process will allow for teacher instructional improvement and student achievement. Various instructional systems to improve school progress have been identified by the applicant and include a summer instituted, extended instruction and personalized training. The use of STEM Vertical Integration is a significant focus to ensure academic success and college and career readiness for all students. STEM teachers will participate in targeted professional development opportunities in mathematics, life science, and physical science which are designed to enhance their familiarity and understanding with respect to these STEM standards with an emphasis placed on the identified areas of concern. This series of training events will culminate in an intensive mathematics, life science, and physical science.

The information provided by the applicant to show there will be training to measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements is not detailed. The information to show there will be ways to help educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests is not detailed. While there are viable strategies presented by the applicant, there is no coherent approach to implementing personalized learning programs for students as the applicant is relying on the Renaissance Learning program as the only viable source of implementation and no rationale is provided. Additionally, there are no timelines, specific activities are provided. This selection criteria is given a score of 17 based upon the the omission of some information to further support the project. There is no information provided to show how the plan will increase the number of students who instruction from highly effective teachers and principals in hard to staff schools, subject and special education.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 14 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In order to fully integrate the personalized learning experience, data management and use, and equity considerations to close achievement gaps, the applicant proposes to collaborate across district departments. The plan is reasonable in that the process will allow the project to gain support and provide resources to help reach the goals intended. An organizational chart shows supervisory support provided to all participating schools. The Director of Schools employs central office staff to perform duties based on the needs of the school system to successfully implement all programs within schools. The Director of Schools is responsible for implementing board policies and for interpreting them to staff, students and the public. This is an effective approach to ensure stakeholder engagement. The process also ensures that stakeholders are informed and input is sought to develop administrative procedures as necessary to implement board policies or initiatives deemed necessary for the efficient operation of the schools. Within the policies and regulations of the Board and the Director of Schools, the principals are authorized to establish rules and procedures for the staff and students of their schools. The Director of Schools establishes and maintains an orderly plan for preserving and making accessible to all employees the administrative procedures.

The applicant states that School leadership teams have some flexibility and autonomy over certain factors. Currently the schools collaborate with the Claiborne County Education Association to make collaborative decisions such as school calendars and some teacher decisions. The detailed information indicates that schools have extended learning programs and all schedules, school personnel decisions, and staffing models are left to the discretion of the principals and building administrators. Schools are responsible for their own budgets and general funds which they maintain and determine expenditures. Principals are also responsible for all school personnel decisions, placement, and roles and responsibilities. There is ample information provided to show leadership teams are in place. For example, Data Teams, are present and meet regularly and are responsible for academic data to drive classroom instruction and meet individual student needs. At the district level, a “Data Coach” participates in these meetings and provides support services and any information needed to make decisions. Each school also has an organized School Improvement Team to lead the implementation of improvement and other initiatives at the school. This team is comprised of the Principal, teachers, support staff such as teacher assistants and custodians, parents, and other community members who are stakeholders.

The applicant provides details of the credit recovery process that is currently in place. The process presented is reasonable as it will support students in need and who may be in danger of not graduating and allow them the opportunity to do classwork outside of the normal school setting at their convenience. This process is also reasonable as students will be motivated to learn without classroom distractions. The process includes the use of PLATO Learning, which allows students to regain the educational ground lost. PLATO Learning is a proven, effective credit recovery solution and focuses on curriculum closes the knowledge gaps and supports personalized learning experiences. For example, exempting pretests enable learners to demonstrate mastery of previously learned concepts and to focus just on the content they still need to learn. With this program, students are given the opportunity to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic.

There is detailed information indicating that there will be opportunities whereby students will be able to demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. Students will have the opportunity to enroll in dual credit courses for both high school and college credit: General Psychology; Lifespan Psychology; U.S. History; Computer Applications; General Biology; English Comp 1; English Comp 2; Speech; Music Appreciation; College Experience; Finite Math; and Probability and Statistics. They will also be able to acquire 4 new CTE dual credit courses in which students who meet prerequisites will be able to earn credit towards a technical degree. These courses are: Industrial Processes; Machine Tool Technology; Electrical Circuits w/Lab; and Engineering Graphics. This is an effective way to get students actively engaged in their learning experience and gain skills in areas they may not be familiar with. The use of data assessments is reasonable and includes the use of TCAP data yearly to identify students who are At- Risk.

The applicant does not provide any detailed information to show how the plan will provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. The score of was given for this selection criteria based on the omission of information.

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
|---|-----------|----------|

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence to show there are ample resources provided for parents, students, educators and other stakeholders inside and outside of school. For example, a district level Parent Involvement Supervisor will be available to assists all schools with increasing parent involvement. In addition, parents and other stakeholders are included as members on all School Improvement Planning teams who meet regularly. To ensure that needs are addressed, a needs assessment is conducted at each school and then services are provided based upon the needs identified. This is a logical approach to ensure that stakeholders have input so they will be properly served. Regular stakeholder meetings are hosted to discuss various concerns and to inform of resources and program related issues. To further ensure stakeholder participation the applicant proposes to create an Advisory Board in each school to become members of the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to ensure the support and implementation of this proposal.

The applicant presents information regarding accessibility to technical support for all stakeholders. For example, free computer classes are offered to students through After-School Programs. Libraries and computer labs remain available after-school hours and during school events for parents and community members to access. To accommodate parents to ensure they have accessibility to support evening programs are provided at the district level regularly to educate them on the growing field of technology and its benefits and dangers to children. A post-secondary mobile lab equipped with videos and personal guides to show the FASFA application process is provided for students and families who cannot meet in public due to limitation or barriers. Teachers are trained to provide quality instruction through the use of mobile labs, ipads, SmartBoards, and other devises of technology. Plans to completely upgrade technology currently in place will include up-to-date wired network cabling and switch infrastructures in all schools, and Enterprise grade wireless networks providing density for wireless devices.

The applicant describes the process by which technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format. The process includes accessibility to the districts and state education website parents, students, and employees. More specifically, a Parent Involvement link offers online resources to promote student achievement, promote adult education, seek services for low-income families, among others. Parents are also provided a link to the Tennessee Department of Education's yearly report card issued for every school in Tennessee. Other accessible data include achievement test data, school demographics, safety score, and parent involvement score. Additionally, teachers may elect to provide individual and class reports through the use of electronic grade books. Engrade, a service provider is currently the most popular according to informal surveys between teachers and supervisors. Excell grade sheets make transfer of data to and from Renaissance Learning Student in family friendly discussions.

The applicant successfully provides ample information provided to show there are some technology systems in place throughout the district. For example, uses Renaissance Learning Student data base system to enter and track student attendance, create school and student schedules, enter student grades and generate grade reports for parents and other pertinent information for use by teachers, parents and other stakeholders. Further systems include Education Information

System (EIS) to transfer data among district, school, staff, and students, RANDA Solutions which is a service provider responsible for technical services related to the processing of state assessments and teacher evaluations from central office data repositories to the Tennessee Department of Education and Career & Technical Education (CTE) an online data collecting system that provides information regarding special education teachers and other records.

While there is some technology offered, there is a lack of technical support to assist users. There are no details provided regarding the training process for students to make sure they are properly trained to use the technology resources made available. It is not clear how students/parents residing in rural areas will have accessibility to pertinent program data information. The systems presented by the applicant are not connected therefore there is not an interoperable system in place. This selection criteria was given a score of 6 based due to the omission of the information.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 6 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The use of the district’s TEAM instructional observation tool and data collected is a reasonable approach for feedback from instructional leaders to teachers as they will use learning guides, student engagement in the lesson, and the use of formative assessment to verify that students are meeting learning targets during the lesson. Classroom observation is also a logical approach as they will help to provide feedback regarding instructional and other professional interactions of teachers. The TEAM model will also be used to evaluate principals and administrators.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide any goals, timelines or activities to support this selection criteria. There is no clear governing body presented and it is not clear how the applicant proposes to meet outcomes. There is no clear plan presented to show a rigorous continuous improvement process that will be implemented to provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections. Furthermore there is no discussion regarding improvements during and after the term of the grant. The plan does not address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff. This selection criteria was given a score of 6 as much of the criteria is not specifically addressed.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders is provided by the applicant and show there are appropriate for the project. The district provides continual feedback through the use of its data systems and by gathering feedback through parent satisfaction surveys and teacher surveys. Counselors and instructional coaches are also an integral part of the communication process as this group will be working to share information and develop outreach programs between the schools, community and institutions of higher education. The school and the district will post quarterly reports on its website that will visually describe the targets and levels of success for the project. Strategies to further include external stakeholders is evident and include the development of quarterly reports through the use of Renaissance Learning Universal Screener that will identify student performance and professional practice data that define project implementation and student performance.</p> <p>The applicant has presented strategies to implement a plan but no specific plan for revisions during implementation is provided. The applicant does not present a timeline, rationale or specific activities provided. This selection criteria was given a score of 2 based on the lack of information.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant identifies 12 performance measures for student groups including all students, pre-K-3, 4-8 and 8-12 grade levels. The applicant proposes a 3.3% increase in student achievement each year throughout the duration of the grant. The proposed increase is logical based upon the baseline data presented pertaining to each subgroup indicating the current proficiency levels of students attending the targeted schools.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to use the states comprehensive assessment program (TCAP) and end of course assessments</p> | | |

(EOC) to measure progress.

The applicant does not define the rationale for the performance measures presented. The plans to measure program progress and provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action is not detailed and based upon the lack of information presented it is not clear if there is a plan in place. The applicant does not address how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. Additionally, there are no grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicators provided for any of the subgroups listed and no specific information provided regarding 9-12th students who will complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form;

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents strategies to evaluate professional development activities. For example, guidance counselors will monitor and evaluate whether students are prepared for post-secondary education and/or a careers through the use of school College and Career Readiness Curriculum and classroom behavior management. High school counselors will also exam results of dual credit enrollment and graduation data. The use of the Renaissance Learning assessment will be used in addition to instructional coaches who will support teachers in the classroom setting. The use of the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and TEAM evaluation is feasible as the process will allow for analysis of data and feedback. The PLC will recommend instructional strategies for both the classroom and intervention and work to mentor less effective teachers. PLCs will receive high quality professional development from ASCD.

The information the applicant presents is not detailed and provides little insight as to how the strategies presented will bring about the desired results. The applicant does not provide details to show how they will evaluate the effectiveness of technology. The applicant does not discuss present specific goals, timeline, specific deliverables regarding the strategies presented. This section was given a score of 2 due to the omission of information needed to fully address this selection criteria.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented a budget for the project. The applicant has provided a description of all of the funds (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds. The applicant has clearly identified the one time investments and those that will be ongoing to support the project.

Some of the budget items are unclear. For example, the applicant has indicated that they will hire an instructional interventionist for all 11 schools presented but only 4 are listed in the budget. The calculations in the budget do not match up with amount requested. The applicant is requesting 4 million dollars however the budget presented totals around 2.1 million. The applicant was given a score of 4 based upon the discrepancies presented in the budget.

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

10

5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided ample information to show there is a reasonable plan in place to sustain the project after funding has ended. Sustainability will be through the capacity building with the district and through the project activities. The applicant proposes proposing a sustainable plan to support rigorous ongoing initiatives centered around student mastery of academic content and personalized learning for students in preparation of college and career. The plan to sustain the project through partnerships that will support professional development is ample and includes working with various agencies such as the with Institutions of Higher Education. The content obtained from existing Professional Development using contracted sources insight regarding program progress and effectiveness of the strategies used. The use of Professional Learning Communities implemented throughout the district further supports the sustainability process as there will be consistent support provided to educators and stakeholders.

There are no specific goals, activities or timelines presented regarding the sustainability of the project. The applicant does not describe the plan to evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget. The applicant does not present an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions,

potential sources, and uses of funds. A score of 5 was given for this selection criteria.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 0 |
| Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not address this selection criteria. Therefore, no points were awarded. | | |

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |
| Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides ample information to show the proposed project is aligned with the Race to The Top District grants. The grant is the result of a collaborative effort among the Claiborne County School District (CCSD), educators and other stakeholders. The overarching goals of project is to provide leadership and collaboration opportunities to teachers and leaders to develop effective, data-driven instructional strategies and educational experiences that will create high achieving schools and prepare students for college and careers. The use of the district's TEAM instructional observation tool and data collected is a reasonable approach for feedback as instructional leaders will be able to view clear definitions of learning targets and use of learning guides, student engagement in the lesson, and the use of formative assessment to verify that students are meeting learning targets during the lesson. Classroom observation is also a logical approach as they will help to provide feedback regarding instructional and other professional interactions of teachers. When the data demonstrates that the instructional practices are not at the appropriate level teachers will receive intense professional support from the administrator and instructional coaches. This professional development will come in the form of direct instruction, model lessons, coaching and feedback. The TEAM model will also be used to evaluate principals and administrators. | | |

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 135 |
|--------------|------------|------------|



Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0218TN-2 for Claiborne County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: a) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Claiborne County School District (CCSD) has adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and will be able | | |

to fully implement them in all district schools through the RTTD grant. Teachers and paraprofessionals will be trained in best practices to engage students. Performance indicators to determine if achievement targets are met will be evaluated through classroom observations, lesson plans and teacher evaluations. Additional technology will be needed for schools, teachers and students for the PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers) online assessments which all districts in Tennessee will begin using as the state-wide achievement measure in 2014-15. These standards and assessment should prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and compete in the global economy which meets the goal for this assurance area.

- The applicant has an appropriate goal of using effective data systems and increasing academic rigor in Reading/Language Arts and Math to improve scores to meet rising state-required targets with all subgroups and decrease achievement gaps on state-mandated assessments through use of Renaissance Learning's STAR Math and STAR Reading assessments administered three times each year to all district students to determine progress toward benchmarks. These assessments feature new tools, content, and interactive reports so teachers can bridge assessment and instruction to drive individualized student practice and learning. The New Core Progress learning progressions and New Growth Percentile measurement will also be used. This program is highly rated by the National Center on Response to Intervention, and will assist the teacher in providing the specific type of intervention each student needs for success. Renaissance Learning will play an integral part in writing the "prescription" each student needs to personalize his/her learning environment. The grant will allow full implementation of the RTI² framework in the district, the state's adopted academic intervention process. The Data systems in use by the district appear to be cobbled together from a variety of commercial and state data systems for district purposes. The district does not appear to have a system built and customized to pull the elements together for easy access. There is no information to suggest there is a role-based, single sign-on system to provide personalized information in real-time. The system described appears to meet the requirements of the assurance area, however, some usability features for easy access to personalized information seem to be missing.
- Much of the district plan for recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals comes from elements of the State of Tennessee RTTT grant. The applicant cites the state's work in recent years to improve the quality of its teacher preparation institutions and create new high-quality alternative licensure paths to attract more talented individuals to teach. The state's data systems allow measures of teacher effectiveness aligned with RTTT guidelines. The applicant notes that higher education providers realigning goals to meet the state's teacher recruiting needs, particularly in math and science. The district plans to implement professional learning communities (PLCs) at the district and school levels comprised of leaders and teachers with high teacher effect scores (3-5) as determined by TEAM evaluation data to address individual school-wide needs, analyze data, and determine scheduling and effective instructional strategies for intervention and enrichment to personalize learning environments for students. The district has adopted the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) composed of evaluations for teachers and principals. Frequent observation, constructive feedback, student data and meaningful professional development, support educators so they can do their best work in the classroom. The applicant asserts that TEAM is an effective evaluation model that allows the district to identify, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals and use them where they are needed most. No description is provided of a system of rewards used by the district. Recruiting the most effective teaching candidates is enhanced by the TEAM evaluation model, according to the applicant, though there is no description of how that is accomplished. Overall, the strategies used by the district seem to meet the requirements of this assurance area.
- The district has identified three schools as "lowest-achieving" in the district. To provide added support to these schools, a needs analysis was conducted. The district will contract with Evans Newton Inc. (ENI) to turn around these schools. The district had 5 schools that were identified as "Focus Schools" during 2012 – 2013 by the Tennessee Department of Education. With RTTD funding, the district plans to assign a well-trained interventionist to all 3 of these lowest-achieving schools in the district who will use a research-based intervention program to work with students who fall in a Tier 2, 3, or 4 category as identified within RTI² framework. More information on the process for turning around these schools is found in section C of the RTTD application. The process adopted appears to meet the requirements for this assurance area.

b) The district's clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement and deepening student learning appears to be grounded in the implementation of the CCSSs in the district using grant funding to enhance implementation in district schools. Professional development for teachers in best practices to engage students and support from instructional coaches will be provided. Differentiation strategies will be implemented to increase equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks based on student academic interests. Differentiation has been a traditional approach widely used in schools to meet the needs of diverse learners, a means of accommodating the range of readiness levels, learning styles and interests of heterogeneous schools and classrooms. The key to true personalization through differentiation strategies is in the implementation process. The district is appropriately providing high quality professional development to teachers in differentiation instruction, creating an environment that supports learning. Four

well-trained instructional coaches will work closely with teachers to ensure incorporation of this technique in all classrooms, a key element for a successful implementation. Teachers should be able to promote positive communication with students and provide positive feedback on their growth and progress. This approach meets the requirements for this section.

c) The applicant gives some description of classroom personalized environments, however, a detailed description of a standard classroom is missing. Though the applicant mentions differentiation of instruction as a strategy for personalization and there is mention of some technology tool availability such as iPads, interactive whiteboards, mobile labs and a variety of online assets such as IXL Math and Plato Learning, a complete picture of a personalized classroom experience is missing.

The score for this section is at the lower end of the highest range due to the fact that all elements of a reform vision are here and some level of detail is missing.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a & b) All schools in the district were selected to participate in the RTTD grant and meet eligibility requirements. According to the applicant, achievement and/or gap closure deficits are significant in all schools in all grades. A list of participating schools and an organizational chart is provided in the application. The requirements for these sections are met.

c) The total number of participating students from low income families, participating students who are high-need and participating educators are included in a table provided in this section of the application to meet the requirements for this section. Percentages of subgroup populations compared to school and district totals are also provided indicating high percentages of low income, high-need students.

The score for this section is at the highest level due to the fact that all information required has been provided.

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

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district application documents the participation of all district schools in the RTTD grant. The application narrative and the Thematic Clustering of Planned Activities chart covering the 4-year grant window provide the required key goals, activities to be undertaken, rationale for the activities, a timeline by year of the grant, deliverables and parties responsible for implementing activities. The applicant plan for improving student outcomes is dependent upon educator PLCs, RTI² intervention and enrichment strategies, an achievement and progress monitoring tool from Renaissance Learning, professional learning on implementation of differentiated instruction, implementation of CCSSs, STEM vertical integration, intervention from ENI in lowest performing schools, technology for PARCC assessments, and trained and effective counselors in all buildings. The information provided meets the requirements for this section.

The score in this section is at the highest level due to the quality of the information provided.

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

10

8

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant begins the response to this selection criteria with a discussion of the state of Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS) which provides a statistical analysis of achievement data that reveals academic growth over time. It is not clear whether the tables included in this section contain data from that system.

a) The tables with summative assessment information do not list the name of the assessment for which data are displayed, though elsewhere in the application there is a discussion of the state TCAP. A transition is planned to PARCC according to the narrative and it is not clear whether that transition figures into these data. Additionally, information is not provided on the method used to calculate growth targets. Reading/Language Arts for grades 3-8 has missing targets for African American students. The applicant's vision for improvement in regards to proficiency status and growth on summative assessments seems ambitious yet achievable based on the intervention processes and strategies employed. Use of RTI², the Tennessee Value Added Assessment (TVAAS) data reports to assist teachers in identifying students who need that extra push and contracting with intervention experts such as ENI, among other processes, are a reasonable approach to meeting this criteria. However, missing information on data tables is not responsive to the criteria for this section.

b) The tables on decreasing achievement gaps do not supply information on the methodology for determining achievement gaps specified for each assessed grade level in reading/language arts or math. The annual targets seem reasonable yet achievable based on the district plan for targeting students who are struggling with appropriate intervention strategies based on data.

c) The graduation rate table included in the application indicates that even though the district high school graduation requirements are compatible with the state public universities the overall group met the state requirement of 90% and has provided growth targets for continued progress. The students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup has a significant gap when compared to other subgroups. There is no mention of interventions to assist with decreasing those gaps.

The annual targets seem reasonable yet achievable based on the plan for intervention and implementation of personalized learning.

d) The college enrollment table provides ambitious but achievable annual targets due to the factors listed below:

- Increase in dual enrollment programs with Walter State Community College
- Dual enrollment students will be graduating with an average of 15 + college credits when they graduate from high school
- Walter State Community College Foundation Grants
- Dual Enrollment for career & technical education (CTE) courses in partnership with Walters State
- Participation in the TN Achieves Scholarship Program which provides mentors from the local business community and \$4000 scholarships

The score for this section is at the low end of the high range due to providing ambitious but achievable goals with some missing information on name of assessment for which data is used, what methodology is used to determine growth targets and achievement gaps and missing targets for African American students in grades 3-8.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 11 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1) Claiborne County was designated an "exemplary district" in August of 2012 by the Tennessee State Department of Education. Tennessee honored the top 15% of highly performing districts (only 19 of a total of 136 districts) which significantly closed gaps and exceeded targets set by the state RTTT grant.

a)The applicant has provided a clear record of achievement over the last four years in improving some student learning outcomes. Extensive tables are provided with data provided for proficiency and advanced levels at grades 3-8 and 9-12 in reading/language Arts and math for all subgroups and for the four year graduation rate. While some proficient and advanced percentages improved annually only to decline during the fourth year, some numbers declined annually and then reached a higher percentage by the fourth year. In the lowest performing schools there was evidence of improvement in numbers for all students. However, subgroup data was mixed with some groups showing little decrease in achievement gaps. Students with disabilities did not perform well as compared to the students without disabilities group. The use of the IXL online math program is credited with improvement of math scores. Overall, much evidence was provided to show steady improvement. The four year graduation rate went from 81.2 to 91 and met the state target in 2013, clear evidence that district efforts were successful. A credit recovery program and other interventions were initiated to work with high school students on courses not completed or failed. This helped boost the graduation rate. Though improvements have been made in college enrollments due to factors such as dual enrollment classes and mentorships, four years of data was not provided.

b) In the lowest performing schools there was evidence of improvement in numbers for all students. However, subgroup data was mixed with some groups showing improvement but little decrease in achievement gaps. For instance, at Claiborne High, a persistently low performing school, all students went from 29.4 to 40.6 percent proficiency in Algebra I over the four year period. During that same period in Algebra I students with disabilities went from 0 to 6.5 and the students without disabilities group went from 31.4 to 46.4. Economically disadvantaged students went from 22.5 to 36.7 and non-economically disadvantaged students went from 50.1 to 53. Ambitious and significant reforms were made in some areas in this and other low performing schools, apparently due to a focus on those schools and reform initiatives made possible through focus grants. However, these data do not reflect ambitious and significant reforms overall.

c) The district makes student performance data available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction and services. Some methods are:

- Open House nights for parents
- Provide student data from Renaissance Learning assessments after every administration
- Data teams provide information to improve instruction
- Report cards every nine weeks and progress reports every three weeks
- Every school has a parent involvement coordinator that arranges and documents parent events
- Yearly, summative assessment reports for SAT10 and TCAP are also used to communicate results to educators, students, and parents. District, school, individual student, and parent reports are released to provide information on student performance

These strategies meet the requirement for this criteria.

The score for this section is at the top of the middle range due to a clear record of success in proficiency gains in many areas and making student performance data available but a lack of four years of data on college enrollment and a lack of success in decreasing some achievement gaps.

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 4 |
|---|----------|----------|

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a-d) The applicant provided information on transparency in processes, practices and investments by citing online access to district teacher salaries by category, principal and director average salaries, district fiscal capacity information, and results of district teaching condition surveys. The state provides district information online in the form of a district report card and the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System online public site provides information on student assessment data. The applicant provided all school level salary expenditures by category required in this selection criteria in a table included in this section of the application. A statement followed, "All specific salary records, with the exception of confidential items, are available for public inspection at the Claiborne County School Finance Office." Though some access is provided to the public to salaries at the school level, it is not responsive to the high level of transparency requirements of this criteria for "making public" school level expenditures in all categories as listed.

The score for this section is in the low end of the high range due to the transparency of information provided but a lack of information to meet the high level of transparency requirements of this criteria in regards to making public salaries at the school level.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided information from state statutes to indicate sufficient autonomy exists to implement the personalized environments described in the district proposal. "The Director of CCSD along with the district supervisory staff, principals and teachers have full authority to make curriculum changes, adopt and implement progressive programs for education, Response to Intervention, and any other programs of study," is stated in the information provided. Evidence to support the stated information is missing.

The score for this section is at the low end of the high range due to the information provided but with missing supporting evidence.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 9 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a)

i & ii) The applicant states that educators have worked in PLCs to set the goals and vision for the RTTD grant competition. There is no mention of how student and families were involved in development of the proposal. Information is not included on a process to revise the application based on feedback. Evidence is missing to indicate the level of support for the complete proposal from teachers in district schools.

b) A few letters of support are provided, including from the district state legislator, a U. S. Senator, the county mayor, an assistant dean at Walters State Community College Claiborne campus, and the president of the Claiborne County Parent Teacher Organization. These letters mention support for the proposal and partnerships with businesses and higher education entities. The mayor commits to at least one yearly roundtable discussion and evaluation session. No letters are provided from student organizations, however the support mentioned in the letters seems to meet the criteria for this section.

The score for this section is in the middle range due to evidence of support from the community but sparse information on engagement and feedback on development of the proposal.

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

| | Available | Score |
|------------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 9 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) A plan is provided to meet the criteria for this section. The narrative includes a discussion of goals, rationales and deliverables. The tables included in this section of the application include timelines, activities and persons responsible for the activities. However, some activities are not described in enough detail or details provided do not meet the requirements for this selection criteria.

i) The applicant cites the challenge of schools in the Appalachian region, including Claiborne County, to convince students of educational relevance and points to program planning as a tool used to convey to students and parents the idea that continued learning is key to success. This is accomplished through a variety of strategies. A video has been created through collaboration with Lincoln Memorial University that includes a discussion of expectations for college. Parent and student one-on-one meetings with school representatives to discuss the student's educational plan are an option. Students complete multiple career interest inventories through the use of Explore, PLAN, Engage, and ACT exams and the use of programs such as collegefortn.org and the Kuder interest inventory. Community members visit classrooms to share information about their careers. This appears to be a feasible approach to meeting the criteria for this section.

ii) Students and parents engage in goal setting starting in the eighth grade. Six year plans are developed using course description manuals for students to select from areas of academic interest. Plans are updated annually with counselors partnered with local colleges to invite parents and students to participate in goal setting. Transition goals are reviewed/revised annually. In the vision section of the application a table is provided arranged in four numbered thematic clusters of planned activities over the 4-year grant window. The activities cited to encourage students to structure their learning to accomplish their goals are organized by topic in the four clusters. They are college and career exploration, academic rigor for college and career, college and financial aid readiness and access, and transition and engagement. Examples of these activities are, in cluster two, activities to provide students and their families opportunities to develop understanding of the academic requirements for various postsecondary options and careers. Some of these activities include student online research of college requirements, informational sessions by school personnel, a series of standardized testing from ACT for grades 8, 10, and 11, dual credit opportunities and the use of Renaissance Learning formative assessments throughout all grades. This plan meets the criteria for this section.

iii) The applicant cites a plan to use the GEAR UP tracking system of classifying struggling students to involve them in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. The tracking system provides identifying warning of students requiring interventions. The plan was established to keep students on track for graduation giving a heads up to reach high risk students in time to provide personal attention and create a personalized action plan. This is a proactive approach to meeting the criteria for this section.

iv) The information provided in the application does not address how all students will have exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning.

v) Though the applicant cites summer and Saturday academies offering critical academic content with curricular standards and activities developed by math and science coaches for focus on STEM, the information provided is not completely responsive to the criteria. The summer camps are described elsewhere in the application as hands-on, include digital learning content and allow credit recovery work. However, detail is lacking to describe how these academies will meet the requirements regarding development of skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving as mentioned in the narrative.

b)

i) The applicant asserts that sequencing activities are provided to students through the six year personal work and educational plan created beginning in 8th grade when students and parents engage in goal setting using course

th th th

description manuals for students to select from areas of academic interest. Mentoring at 5 , 9 and 13 grades milestone transitions and summer/Saturday camps, and the GEAR UP program among other opportunities. sparse detail is provided on these activities to ensure students will graduate college and career ready. It seems likely that the plan will meet the criteria for this section.

ii) The applicant lists professional development opportunities including techniques for engaging diversified learners, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students cultural diversification and tolerance. Surveys of students, parents, teachers and administrators will determine approaches to be incorporated in the program and increase the numbers of best practices. The response to instruction and intervention (RTI²) process used to close gaps and increase achievement is an additional approach to meet the criteria for this section. These approaches seem likely to meet the criteria for this section.

iii) The applicant does not provide a high quality plan for student access to high quality content, including digital learning content. Much of the information provided in the application describes digital content for credit recovery, remediation/acceleration, and preparing for college application. There is mention of most course work being available as e-books, online interactive learning modules, and pod casting but sparse detail to determine the extent and quality of the content. Using existing long distance learning labs for sustaining use of technology tools is not a best practice for infusing technology in personalized learning environments. A plan is in place to purchase mobile carts with tablet devices for student use, however, it is not clear what digital content will be available on these devices, whether they will have Internet connectivity for instructional purposes and how often students will have access to them. It is not clear what level of home computer/Internet use is available to provide home access to digital resources as cited in the application. The information provided does not meet the criteria for this section.

iv)

A) The applicant's response to the criteria for frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine mastery of college and career-ready standards cites the traditional mid-9 week and 9 week timeline for report cards. An important factor for determining mastery of standards is the practice of standards-based reporting. Students in grades K-2 are receiving new standards-based report cards, which is a checklist of specific skills that students have mastered at the desired benchmarks. The district has a goal to use standards-based report cards in all grades. The benchmark assessments provided three times a year are more detailed and give information on mastery of skills and objectives. There is no mention of a system with student and/or parent access that would provide more frequent feedback based on standards mastery and other criteria appropriate to a personalized learning environment. This response does not meet the criteria for this section due to a lack of provision for frequently updated student data.

B) Screening reports from the Renaissance Learning benchmark assessments mentioned above are provided to teachers and administrators and used to determine which students qualify for urgent intervention, intervention, on watch, or are at or above benchmarks. According to the applicant the teacher then assigns personalized practice. Hard copies of the student reports are sent home to parents. Instructional approaches and supports are mentioned regarding students with disabilities, who receive ninety minutes of uninterrupted Tier 1 differentiated instruction in reading and math. Though detail is sparse on these supports, especially what type of personalized practiced is implemented. This process appears to meet the criteria for this section.

v) Information provided throughout the application meets the criteria for accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-needs students. Differentiation, RTI², benchmark assessments and intervention based on results, mentoring, the GEAR UP program, increasing parent involvement and more meet the criteria for this section.

c) Though mobile carts of technological devices will be purchased for student use at every school, it is not clear what tools and resources are accessible to students and how often they are available. There is no explanation of mechanisms in place to train and support students on using tools and resources available to track and manage their learning. This is not responsive to the criteria for this section.

The score for this section is in the middle range due to meeting some criteria but sparse detail or non-responsive information regarding access to diverse cultures, frequent access to student data, high quality content including digital learning content, and training and support for students on tools and resources available to track and manage their learning.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)**20****19****(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

a) The applicant describes the creation of professional learning communities in the district allowing teachers to receive their professional learning on demand. The goal is to create a personalized teaching tool that will allow district staff to personalize the learning environments for students and teachers.

i) The applicant notes that the majority of teachers in the district use Battelle for Kids, a non-profit organization that promotes highly effective educator training offering online strategies targeting the child centered classroom, self efficacy, continuous improvement, and classroom planning techniques for the diverse learner. The Tennessee Value Added Assessment (TVAAS) web site has reports that assist teachers by identifying demographic subgroups to help meet district and schools annual measurable objectives (AMOs). Several TVAAS webinar sessions have been provided for teachers. The district plans to contract with Heidi Hayes Jacobs for professional training on PLCs and will lead school PLCs over a school year to increase knowledge, understanding and effectiveness of PLCs and to assure sustainability. These high quality professional learning resources in the district meet the criteria for this section.

ii) The district plans to contract with a professional learning service provider to assist in providing additional teaching strategies. The online teacher learning community will include over 1000 hours of self-paced, interactive programs from novice to advanced levels. Strengths of this program are webinars that are live and recorded sessions with experts/educators sharing their knowledge, experience, and best practices on current topics and space to add content and resources teachers will be creating into the teacher learning community in the school or district. The training described should meet this criteria by allowing teachers to adapt content and instruction to respond to student needs through their Internet training on safety, cyber bullying, health safety, SPED/assistive technology, CCSS, tech integration, virtual learning, web tools, personal enrichment, differentiated learning, prescriptive and blended learning and technology training for teachers.

iii & iv) The response provided in this section to this criteria details student use of the collegefortn.com portal for college readiness and professional learning for teachers on implementation of the portal with students. This is not responsive to the criteria for teachers to engage in training or PLCs to support their capacity to frequently measure student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards or college and career ready graduation requirements. However, information on the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluation system describes how this model engages teachers to manage lessons successfully and ensure that the entire class is prepared to move forward, relying on ongoing checks of student learning during each lesson and throughout the year. TEAM helps leaders and teachers identify and use strategies to effectively differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each individual student. It focuses on administrator and teacher evaluations to improve effectiveness and provides a plan to achieve instructional excellence, a process to guide reflection, and a common language to discuss strengths and areas for further development. Additionally, it allows school leaders to focus on specific professional development needs of staff. Administrators are evaluated by a model to build leadership skills and to encourage support techniques for their staff. The TEAM system implemented in the district meets the criteria for these sections.

b)

i, ii & iii) The applicant plans for the Renaissance Learning evaluation system to be the adopted tool for teachers to use to acquire data to provide personalized learning environments. Students' strengths and weaknesses will be collected through Renaissance Learning reports and used to create differentiated learning plans for all students K-12. Renaissance Learning will be used to create personalized learning folders to track ongoing student progress and will be used for tiered interventions for all students. Due to significant needs for teachers in all schools to provide individualized instructional strategies to help in the area of personalized reading for all students to close the gap between ED and Non-ED students the plan describes contracting with Kagan Professional Development to provide training and a support plan. Evans Newton Incorporated (ENI) would be contracted to serve the lowest achieving and/or focus schools. This company would provide continual assistance in curriculum alignment, instructional management, teacher lesson planning/fill the gap software program, ENI incremental tests and in-service training. Tools to aid school and district leaders are provided through the original RTTT on-line professional development sessions to ensure teachers and observers are able to complete the evaluation cycle, and benefit from meaningful feedback discussions and plans for development. The TEAM Observation Pacing Guide can also help school leadership teams plan for the number of observations that will be required through the year. In addition, the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) Best Practices Portal provides a broad range of information and tools that support training and individualized professional development. These initiatives and supports meet the criteria for these sections.

c)

i & ii) Information is available for school leaders and school leadership teams to have training, policies, tools, data and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment. The (TELL) Tennessee Teaching Leading and Learning survey is used for evaluating various categories including facilities and resources, student conduct, community involvement, principal and teacher leadership. These are used in principal education and school PLCs for continuous improvement. Tennessee's First to the Top plan leverages federal funds to create a new evaluation system for teachers and principals that uses student growth as one of multiple measures. The applicant describes the state's data system as the largest student and teacher level database ever assembled and notes that it provides actionable information administrators need. The applicant cites a plan to help educators improve their practice by engaging in regular, substantive coaching conversations based around student learning data and observation data. During the regular RTT-D program meetings targeting program improvement, TEAM evaluation components of best practice will be shared as many apply to program improvement. These coaching conversations can be a useful tool to guide conversations, whether about the classroom or program delivery services, with educators throughout the year. They are required of principals for teachers who previously scored a level 1 on their individual growth or overall effectiveness rating. A sound structure is in place through the state TEAM evaluation system to meet the criteria for this section. Resources in place to provide the information and supports needed to drive school progress toward increasing student performance and closing gaps include Renaissance Learning, TCAP, ENI, and Kagen. The information provided and the processes described in the plan meet the criteria for these sections.

d) The narrative provides a high quality plan for increasing the numbers of students who receive instruction from highly effective teachers and principals. The plan includes goals, activities, rationale for the activities, deliverables and parties responsible. Only general timelines are included. Timelines are not included for each activity. Highly effective teachers will be identified and trained as mentors for ineffective and new educators. A workshop would establish the goals and expectations of the program to target desired outcomes. To maintain and retain highly effective principals, a mentor program for potential administrators will be implemented each year. Participants will meet to discuss issues facing administrators today in data, evaluations, operations and personalized plans for school leadership. Teaching assistants that intend to further their education are encouraged to enter the areas of science, math and special education. District administrators are included in entrance and exit interviews for the education program at the local university as well as in observations of pre-service teachers in the classroom setting. It allows recruiting of students that are preparing to become certified teachers. The plan meets the criteria for this section.

The score for this section is in the high range based on the strength of the plan but missing specific timelines for activities described to increase numbers of students who receive instruction from highly effective teachers and principals.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 15 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a & b)

In the narrative the applicant addresses organizing the LEA central office to provide support and services to all participating schools. An organizational chart is included showing district hierarchy as being a top-down structure with principals and central office staff, with the exception of secretaries and some coordinators, all reporting directly to the director of schools (equivalent to a ceo or superintendent). According to the applicant the director of schools interprets board of education policies and will develop administrative procedures as necessary to implement board policies or initiatives deemed necessary for the efficient operation of the schools. Instructional coaches will provide key support to the RTTD grant initiatives. The district is small and should be nimble in responding to the needs of the schools. The narrative describes provision for school level leadership autonomy over certain factors excluding school calendars. Three school calendars are developed at the district level through a collaboration with the Claiborne County Education Association, teachers vote and one is selected. Otherwise, all schedules, school personnel decisions, and staffing models are left to the discretion of the principals and building administrators. Schools have their own general fund budgets with which they maintain and determine expenditures. They are also given federal program monies for which they are allowed to determine expenditures within federal guidelines. Principals are also responsible for all school personnel decisions, placement, and roles and responsibilities. Data teams meet regularly to use all available academic data to drive classroom instruction and meet individual student needs. A district level data coach participates in these meetings to provide support, services, and

pertinent information to make these decisions. Each school also has an organized School Improvement Team to lead the implementation of improvement and other initiatives at the school. This team is comprised of the Principal, teachers, support staff such as teacher assistants and custodians, parents, and other community members who are stakeholders. Additionally a system of PLCs, with professional consulting services provided to facilitate effectiveness, will be a key structure for the autonomy needed to achieve the goals of the RTTD project. Having school PLC leaders meeting regularly in a district PLC, with the director of schools, is a feasible plan. The factors described above meet the criteria for these sections.

(c) The district offers opportunities for students to progress and earn credit based on mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. The online credit recovery program using Plato Learning allows students to regain credit as they master the course modules regardless of time spent. Some directed studies courses are offered to students who meet the requirements, and a number of dual enrollment courses are offered with more approved by the state to be offered in 2014. These opportunities meet the requirement for this criteria.

d) The narrative provides a response to the requirement for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways by citing the use of analysis of TCAP results to identify at-risk students. Additionally, the Renaissance Learning benchmark assessment results are provided three times a year. The plan to implement standards-based report cards at 9-week intervals is another factor. Evidence of a plan to provide students opportunities to demonstrate mastery in a variety of ways is through teacher use of the BattelleforKids online resource through the state RTTT grant. Battelle is a resource for formative instructional practices that translate to gains in student achievement. Teachers become skilled in the effective implementation of the formal and informal ways that teachers and students gather and respond to evidence of student learning. The components of Battelle outline the process in which teachers use tools, strategies, and resources to determine what students know, identify possible gaps in understanding modify instruction, and actively engage students in their learning. Through RTT-D grant funding, the district will be able to provide professional development to implement Battelle with fidelity in all classrooms, equipping teachers to successfully adapt to the changes in the education environment and personalize learning for all students. These strategies meet the criteria for these sections.

e) The applicant describes a number of resources and instructional practices throughout the application for a RTTD grant. Many of these can be adapted and used to meet the needs of special populations. Resources are provided to the small number of ELL students in the district through services of a district coordinator and teacher. Students are identified using the home language survey form, approved by the Tennessee Department of Education. Once students are identified, the EL teacher assesses the student using the TELPA (Tennessee English Language Placement Assessment). TELPA determines the English language proficiency of the student and determines if services are needed. The district EL Program personalizes the EL curricula and instruction according to student need. The EL teacher reviews all student test data and collaborates closely with classroom teachers to plan individualized activities and learning goals for the EL student. To provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable to students with disabilities, Special Education Teachers will be participating in monthly TDOE reading courses. These classes will assist in delivering high quality, differentiated teaching strategies. Special education staff also participates in a range of other professional development opportunities in order to provide up-to-date Special Education Services which include training on CCSSs, assistive technology, STAR Renaissance Learning reading and math training, behavior intervention training and many others. These resources and instructional practices meet the criteria for this section.

The score for this section is at the highest level due to the response provided which meets the criteria for this section.

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 4 |
|---|-----------|----------|

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a) To ensure stakeholders have the necessary content, tools and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the proposal the applicant cites the following examples:

- A district level Parent Involvement Supervisor assists all schools with increasing parent involvement.
- Parents and other stakeholders are included as members on all School Improvement Planning team.
- CCSD schools hold regular events for parent participation such as meetings to familiarize parents with CCSSs.
- All teachers and faculty attended the meetings to educate parents about the relevancy of the career and college ready standards, answer questions and address concerns, and gather input and information from parents.
- PLC's use parent input to determine services and resources parents may need to become supporters and partners in the educational success of their child.
- Parents, other community stakeholders and members of the Advisory Board will also be selected in each school to become members of PLC's
- Allowable funds through Federal Programs provide low-income parents and students the opportunity

- to have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school.
- All schools in Claiborne County have Before- and After-School Programs which provide tutoring to students and educational programs to parents in a family friendly school setting

Providing these resources meets the requirements for this criteria.

b)It appears from the narrative provided in this section that parents and students may use technology within school facilities where technical support is available but do not have district supplied devices of their own and therefore would not need technical support. Libraries and computer labs remain available after-school hours and during school events for parents and community members to access. There is no mention of technical support for personally owned devices that students and parents may use to access instructional resources from home. It appears that technology infrastructure upgrades in the district are being implemented mainly to support the online PARCC assessment administration though the budget includes purchase of mobile carts of technological devices for student use at each school. The applicant mentions that teachers are trained to provide quality instruction through the use of mobile labs, iPads, SmartBoards, and other devices of technology. Having mobile labs for use by students is a positive step. However, it is not clear how often these labs are available whether they are connected to the Internet, and what resources are available for student use. Free computer classes are offered to students in after-school programs. Information is not provided on content covered in the classes. Evening programs are provided to parents at the district level regularly to educate them on the growing field of technology and its benefits and dangers to children. The information provided here is not sufficient to meet the criteria for this section.

c)The applicant notes that Renaissance Learning Student data system reports are provided either electronically or in hard copy. It appears that students and parents cannot export information in open data format through lack of access. It appears that someone else will provide an electronic copy but no information is provided on the format. The discussion of teachers “electing” to provide individual and class reports through the use of electronic grade books suggests there is not district adopted gradebook program and likely no online access to these gradebooks. The statement, “Excell (sic) grade sheets make transfer of data to and from Renaissance Learning Student in family friendly discussions,” is not clear. Information provided seems to suggest that this criteria is not met.

d) The information supplied by the applicant in response to this criteria reveals a number of data systems in use but it appears the interoperability capability allowing data to flow from one system to another for human resources data, student information data, budget data and instructional improvement system data is not available in the district. This is not responsive to the criteria for this section.

The score for this section is in the middle range due to lack of technical support, information on exporting information in open data format and lack of interoperable data systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 4 |
| (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>In the response to this section the applicant discusses the goals of the project and the implementation to meet the goals. Some elements of a high quality plan are provided, though some timelines and deliverables are missing and the plan does not provide a level of detail needed to understand exactly how the goals will be monitored for ongoing corrections and improvements. A high quality plan is not provided to implement a continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. There is no information on how the applicant will monitor, measure and publicly share information on the quality of its investments in professional development, technology and staff. The information provided is not responsive to the requirements for this section.</p> <p>The score for this section is at the low end of the middle range due to missing information.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The applicant plans to use parent satisfaction and teacher surveys to assist in project engagement. The district will develop quarterly reports through the use of Renaissance Learning Universal Screener that will identify student performance and professional practice data that define project implementation and student performance. These reports will be presented to parents. The counselors and instructional coaches will be working to share information and develop outreach programs</p> | | |

that will increase access between the schools, community and institutions of higher education. Information will be shared in multiple media venues including radio, internet and newspapers. The school and the district will post quarterly reports on its website that will visually describe the targets and levels of success for the project. However, components of a high quality plan, key goals, activities, rationale for activities, the timeline, the deliverables and parties responsible are missing.

The criteria for this section has not been met.

The score for this section is in the middle range due to missing components for a high quality plan and sparse descriptive information on components that are described in the narrative.

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
|---|----------|----------|

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a table with performance measures used in the district with grade level, name of assessment, and purpose of the assessment. No narrative is included except what is supplied within the tables.

Performance Measure tables are provided to meet the requirements for this section. The number of measures provided falls within the 12-14 range required. All required measures are provided with the exception of ALL a&b which do not reflect the requirement for participants. The data supplied is not responsive to the criteria in ways described below:

- Tables k2 a&b, have not provided baseline data and targets for subgroups with no explanation for the omission.
- Tables 3-8 a,b&c, 9-12 b,d & e have provided only ALL, SWD and ED subgroups
- Tables 3-8 b&c, 9-12 d&e have not provided a description of the performance measure used.
- Tables ALL a&b have used teachers and principals instead of students with highly effective and effective teachers and principals and schools as subgroups instead of student subgroups, which does not match the definition provided for subgroups.
- Table 9-12 c requires at least one measure of career readiness, though no information is provided to describe the measure or the methodology for calculating the measure with no explanation for the omission.
- Tables with baseline data have not provided a baseline year as required
- Tables for on-track readiness to college and careers do not provide the on-track indicator used with no explanation for the omission.
- The applicant-proposed measure of body mass index does not include:
 - o its rationale for selecting that measure
 - o how the measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern
 - o how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress

Though some targets supplied are ambitious yet achievable based on the low baseline data and the quality of the interventions, the response overall provided for this section does not meet the criteria due to the sparse information provided.

The score for this section is at the lowest level due to missing information in many areas and lack of a narrative description to provided rationale for applicant-proposed measures and reasons, if any, for omissions in tables.

| | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
|--|----------|----------|

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided three goals to evaluate the RTTD investments. The goals are:

- Better prepare students for post-secondary education and/or a career
- Increase academic rigor to meet state-required targets on state mandated assessments
- Implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

The goals, activities and persons responsible for the activities/deliverables described are provided, however, no timelines or

rationale for activities are included to describe a high-quality plan. Goal three cites the hiring of a district coordinator to oversee all other personnel employed by the grant and who will coordinate all professional development. There is no mention of the person responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of the grant or how the evaluation will be conducted. The plan provided is not responsive to the requirements of this criteria due to missing components of a rigorous evaluation.

The score for this section is at the middle level due to an incomplete plan.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| (F)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>a) The applicant provides a complete list of funds use to support the project. Funds include RTTD, general operating funds, RTTT Tennessee state funding, Title I, Special Education, and GEAR UP grant funds. This meets the criteria for this section.</p> <p>b) The budget appears to be reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal. Personnel and high-quality consultants as well as other expenses for professional development and support comprise a large part of the budget and figure broadly in the plan for improvement. This meets the criteria for this section.</p> <p>c)</p> <p>i) A description of all funds the applicant will use is provided, including total revenue from those sources.</p> <p>ii) All RTTD funds budgeted will be spread out over the years of the grant. There are no one-time funds included in the budget. Strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments is the use of consultants, coaches and grant funded support personnel to transfer knowledge to district and school personnel to gain expertise to sustain improvement through personalized learning in the future. The table describing sources of funding with descriptions and amounts lists four interventionists, four coaches and clerical support who will be hired with grant funds but retained after the grant with general operating funds. Additionally, a large portion of the universal screener and benchmark testing from Renaissance Learning will be continued after the grant period with general operating funds. Other information provided discusses 7 interventionists at one point and 9 intervention specialist/coaches at another. It is not clear exactly how many interventionists will be hired, especially since the total for the project level itemized cost table line item for the four interventionists is \$2,095,800 which far exceeds the annual salaries listed over four years but is equal to the line item for all personnel in the overall budget summary table. Budget numbers in the project-level itemized cost table, even with adjustments for the discrepancy in total salary for interventionists, are still not calculated correctly.</p> <p>The score for this section is at the low point of the high level based on budget justification aligned with project goals but inaccurate and confusing budget calculations and information regarding interventionists.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
| (F)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The applicant has provided a plan for sustainability which will be ongoing after the grant. The narrative includes goals, activities/deliverables, rationale and financial support information for some of these these ongoing initiatives after the grant ends, however no timelines, except that they are ongoing, are provided. Persons responsible are not named. The information provided in the plan is brief with little detail. No information is provided on support from state and local government for sustainability after the grant. However, ongoing investments from district funds for academic support personnel are a strength. Information is not provided on how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments. The manner in which grant evaluation services will be provided is not clear.</p> <p>The score for this section is in the mid range due to a plan which includes substantial supports from district funds after the grant ends but missing information and lack of detail for a high quality plan and missing evaluation information.</p> | | |

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 0 |
| Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: | | |
| The applicant did not address this section. | | |

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Absolute Priority 1

The applicant's plan is focused on the significant student achievement and subgroup gap closure deficits present in all schools in the district. Strategies aligning district resources supported by high-quality professional development and support from outside consultants and new personnel will be implemented during the grant term to effect gains and to build capacity to continue improvement beyond the end of the grant period. The applicant plan for improving student outcomes is dependent upon educator PLCs, RTI² intervention and enrichment strategies, an achievement and progress monitoring tool from Renaissance Learning, professional learning on implementation of differentiated instruction, implementation of CCSSs, STEM vertical integration, intervention from ENI in lowest performing schools, technology for PARCC assessments, and trained and effective counselors in all buildings.

To create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools and supports for students and educators the plan addresses the four core educational assurance areas as described below.

In adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy the district is on the path begun through district participation in Tennessee's RTTT grant, First to the Top. The Common Core State Standards have been adopted and implementation will be advanced throughout the district with robust training/professional development with the RTTD grant. State summative assessments (TCAP) are already in use in the district, however, the district is transitioning to the PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers) online assessment as the state-wide achievement measure, aligned with the CCSSs. Major technology upgrades to implement an online assessment will be enhanced by the RTTD grant. Some technology devices would be purchased for student use on mobile carts with RTTD grant funds, however it is not clear how much access students will have to these devices. Infusing more technology for student use would be a sound strategy for creating personalized instructional environments for improvement of learning outcomes.

Building data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction is another initiative that has been enhanced through participation in RTTT. The state has a robust student and teacher level data system in place, accessible to teachers and principals. The district has adopted the Renaissance Learning data system for more frequent assessments with reports provided to teachers, the district and local PLC teams. Additionally through the BattelleforKids resource from the state teachers have professional development on use of assessment for learning through more frequent progress checks as part of the instructional process. The Easy IEP system implemented by the state is another system that provides teachers supporting special education students in creating personalized plans a resource for enhancing the process. Though the district has a sound structure for accessing data to improve instruction, the systems are not integrated requiring access to multiple systems in multiple ways which complicates the process.

A system for recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals especially where they are needed most has been enhanced by the comprehensive Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). All schools in the district have significant needs and will benefit from the acquisition of effective and highly effective teachers and principals. Recruiting has been enhanced through district partnership with the local community college and through efforts to recruit district non-certified staff to access opportunities to certify in areas of need such as STEM and special education. An important measure to improve retention is a system of mentoring new and ineffective teachers by teachers with high

TEAM ratings and efforts of PLCs. The application does not describe efforts to reward teachers, an important way to increase retention.

Turning around lowest-achieving schools is a focus of the district and efforts will be enhanced through RTTD funds. The district plan includes employing Evans Newton, Inc. (ENI) to lead intensive efforts in 7 of 11 schools identified as lowest achieving and/or focus to target improvement. Additionally trained interventionists will be hired and deployed to those schools to assist and support in these efforts though it is not clear exactly how many interventionists will be on staff and how they will be deployed to the schools.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 137 |
|--------------|------------|------------|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0218TN-3 for Claiborne County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented a comprehensive proposal to implement a wide range of reforms designed to improve student performance. The reform vision set forth by the applicant does touch on the four core educational assurance areas. First, the applicant proposes to place a guidance counselor in each school who will be responsible for implementing a college and career readiness curriculum. In addition, the district also seeks to take steps toward deepening its implementation of curriculum and assessments that are aligned with Common Core standards by bringing instructional coaches into the classroom to help teachers adapt to the new curriculum and strategies. Second, the applicant intends to dedicate project resources to ensure faithful implementation of its Response to Intervention (RtI) initiatives. The applicant will utilize data driven instruction methods facilitated by teachers' use of the STAR Reading and STAR Math Assessments from Renaissance Learning and will hire instructional coaches who will help all teachers understand the data, differentiate learning and provide the appropriate interventions to students. Third, the applicant will implement Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) at the district and school levels. The PLCs will be led by teachers and leaders who are identified as effective educators by the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluation process. The TEAM process will also enable the appliance to find the most effective teachers and principals and place them in schools where they are most needed. Fourth, the applicant has identified three of its lowest achieving schools and plans to implement interventionist services for students at those schools.

However, the overall proposal lacks coherence and the applicant does not fully demonstrate how the various reforms will work together to create personalized learning experiences. The proposal mentions personalized learning, but does not appear to focus the deployment of project resources on the development of personalized learning. Without more specific information on whether and how students will be provided opportunities to generate individual learning goals and not only engage in data driven instruction, it is not clear that the applicant's approach will enable it to reach its goal of accelerating student achievement and deepening student learning through the use of personalized student support. In addition, it is not entirely clear from the proposal what the reformed classroom experience will be like for students and teachers and whether there will be personalized learning environments for all participating students.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The process that the applicant used to select schools has resulted in the inclusion of all district schools and students in the

project. All of the district's schools appear to meet the Absolute Priority 3 eligibility requirements. The project will serve over 4,500 students, the majority of whom are from low income families. The initiatives will be implemented in the each of the district's two high schools, two middle schools and seven elementary schools. The applicant has included a list of all the participating schools and detailed the total number of participating students and educators as well as the numbers of students who are from low income families and who are high-need students.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 4 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant sets forth a number of different strategies it intends to pursue in an effort to improve academic achievement and create a "college-going culture" in all of its schools. The applicant intends to include a variety of different elements, each of which may positively impact learning, but the proposal does not detail a high quality plan for implementation of the different elements throughout the district. The absence of a specific plan with key goals, defined activities and a timeline for action makes it difficult to understand how grant resources will be allocated in ways that will actually create the college-going culture and improve academic achievement. The proposal does not include a discussion of how the different programs will be scaled up and integrated at each school.

In addition, the discussion of the relationship between the RTT-D project and the Gear Up initiative lacks sufficient detail about the goals, source and implementation of the Gear Up program to enable the reader to understand how the two would work together to accomplish the goal of providing personalized learning for students. Further, while the Vision Chart 7 summarizes the planned activities over the course of the next four years, it lacks any explanation of the rationale for the chosen activities and does not include any specific goals, outcomes or timelines for action and does not identify who is responsible for implementing the different activities.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has established a set of performance targets that address student proficiency and growth in the areas of math and reading/language arts as measured by statewide assessments for elementary school students and in algebra and English as measured by classroom grades for high school students. The applicant also included performance targets for narrowing the achievement gap, increasing the graduation rate and the college enrollment rate. In most cases, the applicant includes targets for students overall and for all relevant subgroups with 2-3% growth annually. However, it appears to have neglected to established targets for African American students in elementary school reading proficiency. The applicant expects modest growth for students over the course of the contract period reflecting performance goals that are not particularly ambitious and are likely achievable given the significant number of resources that would be deployed in each participating school. Despite the lack of ambition with the majority of its goals, the applicant sets a high bar for post-secondary degree attainment. The plan includes a target that will see a 3% increase each year in the percentage of post-secondary graduates for the next 5 years.

The proposal does not include a sufficient discussion of the applicant's rationale for choosing the various measures and targets. Although the applicant references the state's value added assessments, it does not specify whether it will be using the assessments to measure student progress. In addition, the applicant does not explain why it relies on algebra and English course grades as indicators of proficiency and growth among high school students.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 13 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A review of the academic performance of the district's schools over the last four years, including some of the lowest achieving schools suggests that the applicant has had prior success implementing reforms that improve academic achievement at the elementary school level, but has been less successful in obtaining consistent improvement for high school students. Although the district has seen a substantial increase in its graduation rate, in recent years there have been notable dips in Algebra and English scores.

It is not clear from the proposal the extent to which the applicant's implementation of various reforms described can be credited with the improvements seen in academic performance over the last four years. Although it is clear from the

proposal that the applicant has had experience implementing different reform strategies, the applicant does not provide specific information as to what the target goals were for those strategies and whether the goals were met.

The applicant includes ample evidence demonstrating it has a clear record of providing students, parents and educators with the data and information necessary to assist students. The applicant deploys various resources to ensure that data about individual student performance and district wide policies and initiatives are shared with students, parents and other stakeholders. A sample of those resources include: Open House Night, where parents and community members learn about school rules, policies, and procedures and are provided with information about Common Core State Standards and Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTI); school level data teams who share data with students, educators and administrators to drive instruction and parent involvement coordinators, who work with families to support student learning.

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

5

4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant appears to make a significant amount of information with regard to its investments and performance available to the public. The applicant does not discuss in detail the extent to which documentation regarding the LEA's processes and practices is made publicly available. However, the proposal suggests that the public can access information about district and school level expenditures, including actual personnel salary information for teachers, instructional and other support staff. The applicant does not indicate that the specific expenditures at the school level are made available on the district or school websites, but instead indicates generally that expenditure data is available upon request.

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

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant refers to a number of Tennessee laws and rules appear to support the LEA's authority to implement its proposed plan. In addition, the applicant verifies that it is in good financial standing and has the requisite autonomy to move forward with its plan. Without more explanation as to whether there are any barriers to implementation posed by collective bargaining units or other regulatory challenges, it appears that the state context in which the applicant operates will facilitate implementation. The LEA is undertaking activities that are aligned with priorities at the state level and that should further the achievement of statewide improvement goals.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)

15

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant refers generally to a team of stakeholders, educators and developers who worked collaboratively to generate the proposal. However, the applicant does not specify which stakeholders were represented and what role the various individuals played in the development of the overall plan. Although it sounds as though some stakeholders played a meaningful role in providing insights into what the LEA needs to improve student learning and the district has demonstrated that it conducted various studies and assessments to identify specific school needs, the proposal does not provide a sufficient discussion of the way in which individuals were engaged to lead to the conclusion that engagement was meaningful. The proposal does include a limited number of letters of support, provided by local, state and federal public officials as well as some project partners like the Parent Teachers Organization and Walters State, which confirms outreach to certain stakeholders and also suggests some outside support for the plan.

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

| | Available | Score |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 12 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has identified a wide range of practices and strategies that it would like to implement in all of its schools to improve student performance and to personalize learning in some ways. However, the applicant has not developed a high quality plan to implement these strategies. There is no specific plan that details implementation goals. There is no timeline given, no deliverables and no identification who will be responsible for implementation. Nor has the applicant explained how the various programs and practices will work together to create a personalized learning experience for students. The proposal does not appear to be aimed primarily to create personalized learning environments for students. Instead, the applicant's proposal details a variety of different possible programs and initiatives that it expects schools will adopt in order

to drive improved performance. Although each program may be beneficial for students, the applicant has not explained how they fit together to further a coherent vision for personalized student learning.

Moreover, although the instructional approaches the applicant intends to use may be high quality and the content may be research based and in some cases digital, the plan does not suggest that the applicant will be providing students in all grades with access to a personalized sequence of content and skill development. Instead, students will pursue a common sequence of content and skill development that is adjusted based upon individual student level data and feedback. Students may receive supplemental instruction to assist them with acquisition of certain skills and mastery of content, but it does not seem that all students will receive the opportunity to set or achieve individual learning goals.

Although it is difficult to identify a coherent overall approach to learning, the various strategies the applicant intends to utilize do seem likely to accelerate learning. As examples:

- The applicant's plan to make STEM learning more accessible and to expand the use of the Renaissance Learning assessments to help students on statewide assessments are tied to the goal of implementing college and career-ready standards and are designed to enable students to explore areas of academic interest and learn critical academic content and skills.
- The plan to develop a six year plan starting in eighth grade, with annual updates and consultation with counselors to ensure that the student and parents have sufficient support to transition to high school and have exposure to college is evidence of a personalized sequence of learning designed to enable students to achieve individual learning goals.
- The plan to use digital learning in STEM activities, for credit recovery and summer school reflect the applicant's use of a variety of instructional approaches and use of digital learning content
- The plan to expand and fully implement RtI serves as evidence of the applicant's commitment to deploy individualized interventions based on frequently updated student data.

The applicant has identified outside resources that it intends to use to apply tailored interventions for students with special needs, students with high needs and low performing schools.

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

20

15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant intends to help educators improve instruction by bringing in a significant amount of professional development resources, including two different consultants and an online resource that will give teachers access to a wide array of courses and training materials. In addition, the applicant expects to hire a number of instructional coaches who will be deployed in schools throughout the district to ensure that teachers understand how to utilize data and have the content knowledge necessary to deliver instruction. Moreover, the applicant seeks to deepen teachers' content knowledge by giving them the opportunity to obtain college credit in certain subject areas and hosting a summer institute for math and science teachers that focuses on STEM content.

The applicant will also expand its use of the TEAM approach to evaluation and identification of effective educators and administrators. This research backed approach will be beneficial in helping the applicant reach its goal of recruiting and retaining effective educators.

All of these strategies, though not indicative of a single, coherent approach to teaching and leading, will likely lead to an improved core of effective teachers and administrators. Moreover, the resources that will be utilized increase teachers capacity to support student progress toward college and career ready standards, and some aspects of the plan will supply teachers with data and information that should enable them to respond to individual student needs. The focus on faithful implementation of RtI will likely enable all participating educators to learn to adapt content and instruction in response to academic needs and to student level data. The Renaissance Learning tools will allow the district to more regularly measure student progress and inform instruction. However, the proposal would be improved if the strategies were presented as part of a high quality plan. The applicant has not provided a detailed plan with specific implementation goals. There is no timeline given, no deliverables and no identification who will be responsible for implementation. Nor has the applicant explained how the various resources and programs will work together or be targeted efficiently. It is not clear that all educators will have the necessary actionable information or high quality learning resources they will need to be able to identify and satisfy the variety of student needs.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 14 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a traditional organizational structure in place to support implementation of its plans, as well as regular operations of the district. The Director of Schools, in consultation with principals and staff members, oversees all programs and policies in the schools and the applicant does not indicate that any other staff would be added to execute the various programs and contracts under its RTT-D proposal. Given the wide range of programs and outside consultants that will be utilized as part of the project, the proposal would benefit from consideration of additional management level staff who would be in a position to monitor the progress of the various programs and overall implementation.

The schools do appear to have sufficient autonomy and flexibility over administration and operations. The applicant has indicated that schools work with teaching staff to choose from one of three calendars and have autonomy to offer extended learning options to students. In addition, all student schedules, school personnel decisions, and staffing models are determined by principals and building administrators. Furthermore, schools have their own general fund budgets in which they maintain and determine expenditures. The school level data teams, school improvement teams and professional learning communities (PLCs) that will be developed at each site will be given substantial resources to drive changes at the classroom level.

The applicant has provided evidence that students in the district have opportunities to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, at multiple times and in multiple ways. First, some high school students are able to participate in credit recovery programs that are completed upon demonstration of mastery, not amount of time spent on a topic. Second, the district offers Directed Study courses where students also earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. Third, some students can earn dual credit through courses taken in partnership with Walters State Community College. Fourth, the district is establishing a new program where students will be given a 30 minute block of time daily to take an enrichment course in which accelerated curriculum in the form of project-based learning will be given.

The proposal could have benefitted from a more detailed discussion of how the applicant will provide additional resources to serve students with disabilities and ELL students. The applicant indicates that it has dedicated staff to work with these students, but did not demonstrate how any barriers to personalized learning would be addressed.

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

10

6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant appears to rely heavily on its Parental Involvement Supervisor and the various parents who will be involved in the School Improvement Planning Teams, Advisory Board and PLCs to ensure that parents and other stakeholders have access to the necessary learning resources to support implementation of the proposal. Given the challenges that the applicant has identified with certain subgroups and some of the cultural barriers that some families will have as the district seeks to establish a “college-going” culture in all schools, the proposal would benefit from a more detailed plan for action with regard to providing support to families in and outside of school. The proposal sets forth the personnel who will be available to support project implementation but that alone does not amount to a high quality plan in that it does provide for any outcomes or goals for establishment and maintenance of district support and there are no specified activities, no timeline for implementation and no deliverables.

The applicant has presented evidence that it will be making the necessary technological advances to ensure that the schools are equipped to provide students with technical support, digital learning and data driven instruction based on the Renaissance Learning Student Data System. It is less clear from the proposal whether the various data systems that the district and State uses to generate student and school level information are accessible to parents and educators in real-time, rather than in report form on the school, district and state websites, and whether the different data systems are interoperable.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 5 |

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has developed a series of separate continuous improvement plans for each goal of the proposal. This approach may enable the applicant to evaluate the progress of the individual components of its plan, but may not be the most efficient way to ensure continuous improvement. The applicant intends to rely heavily on the TEAM evaluation process as a means to ensure that it is hiring and retaining the most effective educators and administrators. However,

there does not appear to be a mechanism in place that will enable the applicant to assess the impact of using the TEAM process. In addition, the applicant will leverage the data generated by the Renaissance Learning system to evaluate student performance, track progress and make adjustments to teaching and learning strategies. However, there does not appear to be a plan to evaluate the value of the Renaissance Learning System itself, which is a significant part of the applicant's proposal. Thus, the plan is lacking any activities aimed at monitoring or measuring the quality of all of the investments that will be made if a grant is awarded. The applicant does not discuss how it would share information with the public about the quality of its investments either. Although the applicant identifies some members of the staff who will be responsible for monitoring different aspects of the plan, it fails to state any key goals, set forth the specific activities that will be undertaken, identify the desired deliverables or a timeline for action. Therefore, the applicant's plan for a continuous improvement process cannot be considered high quality.

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

5

2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant suggests that a strategy for ongoing communication and engagement of stakeholders has been developed but does not provide evidence of a plan for such communication and engagement. The applicant will rely on the PLCs it plans to develop as well as quarterly reports that will be generated by Renaissance Learning to keep parents informed about individual student performance. However, the applicant does not articulate a specific high quality plan for ensuring that various stakeholders understand how the various reform strategies under its proposal will be implemented, that they receive regular updates on progress and can offer meaningful feedback. Although the PLCs may provide the opportunity for meaningful engagement, it is unlikely that all parents or interested community members and stakeholders will be able to participate in a PLC or on one of the Advisory Boards or School Improvement Planning Teams. The applicant expresses a general commitment to ongoing communication and engagement but does not set any goals, plan any activities, identify any deliverables or establish a timeline for action.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes several ambitious, yet achievable performance measures that reflect the proposal's goal to improve student performance and ensure that students are meeting college and career ready standards as indicated by achievement on Tennessee value added assessments and the Stanford Achievement Test. In addition, the applicant's inclusion of a performance measure that reviews the number of students applying for federal student aid reflects the proposal's goal to increase the number of students prepared for and applying to college.

Although it appears that the proposal may include the requisite number of performance measures, the applicant fails to include performance targets for all required subgroups (specifically, African-American, Hispanic, ELL students) and does not provide an explanation or rationale for selecting certain measures, which leave questions as to how some performance measures relate to the goals of the applicant's proposal. Specifically, the applicant's decision to use Body Mass Index as an indicator of physical well-being is not explained. Nor does the applicant provide a rationale for seeking a decrease in the "number of students referred by half over 5 years." Without further explanation, the reader is left unable to connect these performance measures to the overall goals of the applicant's proposal.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Although the applicant indicates that it will hire a district coordinator to oversee all aspects of the grant, the applicant fails to articulate any plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the investments that it intends to make with RTT-D funds. Although the applicant identifies team members who will be responsible for implementation of certain activities that will be undertaken to reach project goals, the applicant has not indicated any plans to assign the district coordinator or someone else the task of reviewing the value added by a particular investment or the effectiveness of a strategy used or consultant that has been hired. In addition, the applicant does not identify a process by which it will set desired outcomes or goals that will result from the various purchases it intends to make under the proposal.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 6 |

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identifies the various expenditures that will be made in order to implement its proposal and the majority of the proposed costs fall in line with the proposal. The overall budget request appears to be reasonable and the district is making a significant investment of general operating funds to ensure implementation. The budget also reflects a significant investment in consultants and professional development teams and a relatively small allocation of funds to technology or other one-time costs. The applicant suggests that the investment of professional development will enable it to sustain the new strategies its teachers will use, which is consistent with its proposal goals.

However, there are some elements of the proposal which do not appear to be funded or to be reflected in the budget and those include the following:

- Although the proposal proposes to add guidance counselors in each school, the budget tables only suggest one counselor would be provided
- Although the proposal suggests that intervention specialists would be placed in all eleven schools, the budget calls for only four interventionists

There are some discrepancies in certain lines of the budgets that relate to the interventionists that may reflect some contribution from the district's general operating funds to pay for other interventionists, but the applicant does not explain the discrepancy or otherwise address how its plan to use intervention specialists to personalize learning can be realized with only four new positions. Specifically, when added up individually, the budgeted amount per year for interventionists does not equal the total \$2 million cost that the applicant has indicated it will incur for interventionists over the entire contract period. That discrepancy is not explained. By failing to provide an explanation for this substantial discrepancy and other items relating to costs referenced in the proposal but not reflected in the budget, the applicant creates serious questions about its rationale for the investments it proposes to make. Although the applicant tries to explain why it believes the investment in professional development would not be an ongoing operational cost, the proposal and its plan for implementation raise some doubts about that conclusion.

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

10

7

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not set out key goals or a set of activities and deliverables designed to ensure that it can reach its goal of sustaining the project after the contract period ends. Nor has it established a specific timeline for action. However, the applicant does have a sound plan for sustaining the project goals after the term of the grant. It has relied on a significant contribution of general operating funds from the district to cover a number of costs, including some of the intervention specialists and coaches. In addition, the applicant relies on the development of strong PLCs to ensure that teachers are effective and can prepare students to meet college and career ready standards. The one area which raises questions about the sustainability of the applicant's project goals is in professional development. A large portion of the project budget is dedicated to retention of consultants who will provide professional development around use of data to drive instruction and personalized learning and to deliver standards based instruction. The applicant intends to replace the professional development with assistance from local colleges and universities, but does not set forth a plan to cover the expense of any future professional development needs.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 0 |

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not submit any materials in response to the competitive preference item.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has developed a wide array of reform strategies it has begun to implement and seeks to expand in order to build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that effectively improve learning and teaching. The applicant's discussion of the strategies it intends to use is comprehensive, but does not provide a picture of a coherent approach to create personalized learning environments for students. Instead, the applicant has pulled together a number of different, research backed improvement practices that it will implement to meet individual student needs. The applicant will do so by using curriculum and assessments that are aligned to college and career ready standards and leveraging a data management system that will assess students regularly, provide data to teachers on individual student progress in ways that will enable a team of teachers to apply any necessary interventions. In addition, the applicant will endeavor to instill in students an interest in college and careers throughout their education and prepare them to succeed beyond high school.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 127 |
|--------------|------------|------------|