



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0198KY-1 for Corbin Independent Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, the reform vision is comprehensive and coherent because it is well aligned with the four RTTT assurances and they clearly outline their three primary initiatives.</li> <li>A-b criterion: they do clearly address two of the three goals (student achievement and student learning)</li> <li>It is noteworthy that their vision includes commitment to using strategies and interventions that are evidence-based and includes latest national research. They cite specific such evidence for several of the interventions.</li> <li>The plan to match some of the low performing partner schools with comparable high performing schools in professional learning communities/mentoring relationship is innovative and promising.</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A-b : They do not clearly address the “increasing equity” goal in this criterion</li> <li>It isn’t clear if their three primary initiatives are synonymous with their overall project goals (which are not clearly labeled as such).</li> <li>One of their two major reform initiatives is the MAP Assessment provided by NWEA. Little information is provided supporting the evidence and/or research validity of this system. Moreover, it appears to duplicate the existing Kentucky state assessment system.</li> <li>For several interventions, they do not cite any available evidence and/or research, such as the Anytime, Anywhere Digital Learning system. .</li> </ul>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approach to implementation includes clear description of how participating schools were selected using definitions of low performing, high needs, high poverty, etc. and the state Infinite Campus state informational student and teacher data base, criterion a</li> <li>A comprehensive student demographics table for each participating school is provided, criterion c</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the student demographic table (criterion A-2), there appears to be an error in the total columns D and E for numbers of total low income students in the LEA and participating schools. The totals are identical, but the entries in each row are different.</li> <li>For student demographic table, Crit. A.2, there is an error in the columns D and E totals for numbers of low income students. Totals are identical.</li> </ul>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p>		

- There is some brief information described as inputs and outputs for short term and long term outcomes; this is somewhat similar to how some of the reforms could be scaled up.

Weaknesses:

- A high quality plan (per USDE definition) is not presented that describes how the building and classroom reforms will be scaled up to support district-wide change.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths:

- Annual, achievable goals for student learning and performance are provided and appear to be equal to state ESEA targets.

Weaknesses:

- It is confusing why NWEA Map assessments are cited and not also the state assessments.
- It is unclear why an obesity health indicator is also included when there was no rationale in the Vision section

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
Strengths:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data demonstrating success the past 4 years was provided for ACT, graduation rate, dropout rate and some other examples of success.</li> </ul>		
Weaknesses:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No state student achievement performance assessment data was presented for past 4 years. This is a significant weakness because advancing student learning and achievement are major expectations of this criterion and closing achievement gaps are based on state assessments.</li> </ul>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
They provided LEA financial and budget level data. School level salary and expenditure data means each school building. Actual school-level data for the criteria was not located.		
Strengths:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District budgets were provided for all grant LEAs.</li> <li>• They state that all school personnel salaries at each school level are maintained and available through the state on-line data base.</li> </ul>		
Weaknesses:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No school level salary data is provided for each of the participating school buildings per instructional and support staff and all the roles specified in the criterion.</li> </ul>		
Summary: Because the criterion clearly refers to making specific school level financial data available for each school, the applicant's overall score is in the low range of medium.		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths

- The applicant provides a clear overview of the state legal, statutory and regulatory conditions that will contribute positively to the success of the Race project because they are well aligned with the USDE and Race reform and school improvement priorities. These Kentucky conditions include adopting the National Common Core Standards, implementation of the Kentucky Reform Act, the new state common assessment system that includes college-career readiness and state establishment of school-based decision making councils.

Weaknesses:

- None

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

15

13

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths:

- The description of stakeholder involvement at participating schools is thorough and complete because it included initial organizational meetings with each school representative, participating school board meetings, and weekly planning meetings of representatives.
- Since there are not unions at LEAs, teachers signed support petitions and these well-exceeded the Race minimum of at least 70 percent. Each petition clearly states that the teacher signatures support the grant proposal initiatives to implement personalized learning environments.
- Extensive support letters from a variety of area cities, fiscal court, and county judges are also furnished as evidence of broad stakeholder support.

Weaknesses:

- Support letters were not located from some other key stakeholders such as parents, students, and early learning program providers.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths:

- Some of the components of a high quality plan are presented and these are reasonable, such as: activities to be undertaken and some of the deliverables. Crit. C.1.
- Criteria a.iii and b. The proposed use of Project Based Learning strategy is appropriate because it has strong evidence base.
- Requiring individual learning plans for all students is an ambitious intervention, Criterion b.

Weaknesses:

- They propose using something called PLEs, Professionalized Learning Environments, to meet criterion a.ii. They state this is a nationally recognized program, but provide no evidence of such.
- Crit. a.ii: Applicant proposes to use Individual Learning Plans, ILPs, to meet college/career ready standards but no evidence is provided that ILPs are positively correlated with this outcome.
- Crit. b.ii: Applicant does not provide sufficient evidence that providing portable learning devices to every student is an effective example of high quality instructional approaches.
- A high quality plan with all the required components (as defined in the notice) was not located. These components are: clear timeline, plan goals, clear rationale and responsible parties
- The applicant proposes to recruit diverse mentors and form partnerships with some colleges to expose students to diverse cultures. However, these plans are too sparse and need greater detail and specificity. Criterion b.

- The fidelity of the Anywhere/Anytime Digital Learning strategy lacks sufficient detail and has little evidence/research to support it Criterion c.

In summary, the overall score is in the low-medium range because of the significant number of criteria weaknesses.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths:

- the personalized learning plan is comprehensive because it includes well-described self-assessment, exemplars of good practice, guides, mentoring partnerships, and frequent student progress measures
- Criterion c.2.c.i: The training to be provided is comprehensive and detailed
- Criterion c.2.a.ii. All of the participating educators will engage in extensive trainings such as professional development provided by national, quality partnerships and the SE/SCentral Education Cooperative
- C.2.a.iv: The incorporation the nationally respected Framework for Teaching Domains is appropriate and consistent with their stated Vision intent to use strategies that are research-based.
- C 2 b iii : One of the most promising tools to provide data about student progress and needs is the unique “Infinite Campus/CIITS (continuous instructional improvement technology” program because it will provide educators with instant access to student achievements and allow the educator to provide instant feedback.

Weaknesses:

- A high quality plan with thorough supports for all students to graduate college and/or be career ready was insufficient because it lacked all required components outlined in the Race notice. .

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths:

- D.1.b. Each school has a Leadership Team that meets the notice definition. These are school based decision making councils. One of the purposes is to establish more shared leadership.
- They have appropriate practices (i.e. Language Plans, IEPs and 504 Plans) in place that will provide learning resources and teaching practices that are fully accessible to all students, including special needs and ELL students. Crit. D.1.e.
- Criteria c (credit via mastery) is verified because they will permit students to demonstrate mastery and earn credit based on knowledge, not seat time and/or a credit flex plan.
- Criteria d (mastery multiple times/ways) is affirmed by their plan to demonstrate this in various comparable ways, such as their expanded learning opportunities, project based learning, individualized hybrid opportunity and school based enterprises.

Weaknesses:

- They do not have all the components of a high quality plan that clearly addresses how LEA policies and infrastructures will support the project implementation. These are missing and/or vague: goals, clear timeline, and specific and appropriate deliverables. This results in just a few points deducted from score because of the many other strengths described above.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
---	-----------	-----------

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths:

- D.2.a. several quality infrastructure supports are in place to support project implementation, such as: the state

internet system, student and staff emails, student assessment data, consistency of student information, and financial records.

- D.2.b. Extensive, comprehensive technical supports include highly trained technology staff, school-based technology initiatives, and local volunteer technology strategies.
- D.2.c and d: These are both clearly addressed by IT open data formats and the longitudinal, state-mandated student and teacher data system and the Infinite Campus system.

Weaknesses:

- None

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project Advisory Council and the consortium are collaborating with several state and national partners to provide support and technical assistance for specific continuous improvement tasks.</li> <li>• One of the most unique and innovative techniques is something called Infinite Campus, a state data collection system that daily collects student grades and behaviors, Criterion E.1</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough high quality plan for continuous improvement was lacking because these elements were unclear: parties responsible, clear, key goals, and specific timeline.</li> <li>• They do not provide a clear rationale for using the NWEA MAP assessment measures while the free state measures should provide comparable information without spending scarce grant resources on NWEA product. This do not sufficiently describe how they will evaluate and monitor the quality of this particular grant investment.</li> </ul>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed framework provides clear evidence of the multiple (N=9) and effective on-going project communication and engagement processes. Although this does not include every element of HQP, it consists of appropriate and convincing elements.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed table presents appropriate and clear student performance measures, such as: grades 9-12 reading and math. These are rigorous and timely because they seek to blend individual needs through by a gap analysis process and because they are norm referenced. Cr. b.</li> <li>• They clearly address college and career readiness measures as well as several other academic areas.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear why NWEA MAP measures and not state of Kentucky assessments are identified in the student performance measures chart.</li> </ul>		

- The performance measure includes a measure related to obesity and psychological distress; they do not provide a sufficient rationale for how or why these are related to their vision (Absolute Priority 1) to establish personalized learning environments related to the core assurance areas.
- Overall, their performance measures are achievable but not ambitious.
- Criterion c: They do not clearly describe how they will review and improve measures over time to better gauge implementation progress.

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

**5**

**3**

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths:

- A broad array of ambitious and sound strategies are presented that cover students, professional development, longitudinal data, and technology strategies. These include state longitudinal data, the state ESEA assessment, College Board Assessments and ACT.

Weaknesses:

- The strategies for evaluating the effectiveness of the Consortium Race plan do not include all of the Race high quality plan components, such as responsible party, timeline and deliverables.

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths:

- Crit. a: They clearly identify all funds that will support the project and why additional funds will be needed to fulfill the objectives and goals as the project is implemented; they proceed to identify several likely sources.

Weaknesses:

- The rationale for expending about \$11 million in the first year on \$500 electronic devices for nearly 24,000 students is vague and not clearly supported by evidence and/or research and effectiveness documentation.
- Rationale for nearly \$1 million for NWEA assessment system seems unreasonable since the state already appears to have comparable system.

Summary: Although they identify all funds to fulfill the goals, some of their costs seem unreasonable and not tightly aligned with their primary goals, my score is in the medium range.

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

**10**

**8**

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Strengths:

- They acknowledge that they need a self-sustaining capacity to support the project after the Race grant.
- They identify several possible sound sustainability sources, timeline, and how such post-grant funds may be used. Their plans include a technology donation program, entrepreneurship and business partnerships, and other grants.

Weaknesses:

- They do not describe a high quality plan with all the required Race definition components; these are absent: parties responsible, deliverables and clear goals. These are not significant weaknesses.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They include a comprehensive and thorough list of partner organizations, criteria 1 and 5.</li> <li>• They identify seven high quality population level desired results ranging from early learners to transition to postsecondary education, criterion 2.</li> <li>• The strategy to scale the model up is practical and doable because the plans include distributing resource guides, media and mentoring processes, criteria 3.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria 5e and 6: It is confusing why the NWEA MAP measures are included in the P-3 performance measures (p. 201) and not included in the routine assessments (Criterion 5e). Moreover, the state mandated ESEA standardized tests are in Criterion 5e, but not criterion 6.</li> <li>• Several specific measures are identified for the healthier learners and families outcome (criterion 2b), but in the achievable performance measures (criterion 6), includes only one measure for P-3: obesity.</li> </ul> <p>Overall: In balance, the strengths and weaknesses application is scored in the high-medium range.</p>		

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<p><b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>They meet the Absolute Priority because they provide convincing evidence in support of most of the criteria.</p> <p>For example, these criteria are especially well addressed: approach to implementation (A 2), state context for implementation (B 3), teaching and leading (C 2), LEA and school infrastructure (D 2), and continuous improvement process (E 1).</p>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>145</b>
--------------	------------	------------



**Race to the Top - District**

**Technical Review Form**

**Application #0198KY-3 for Corbin Independent Schools**

**A. Vision (40 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p>		

The applicant clearly states their intention to strategically target the four core education assurance areas which include adopting standards and assessments that help prepare students to succeed in college and beyond, build data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction, recruit, develop, reward and retain effective teachers and principals in the most needed lowest achieving schools.

The applicant provides a comprehensive vision for creating personalized learning environments as a focal point for the project. Their intent, as stated, is to move schools in the consortium from teacher-centered instructional strategies to learner centered approaches that target Assessment as Learning to demonstrate mastery of content. Included in this initiative is the creation of an Individualized Learning plan for each student that outlines personal goals for learning based upon student interests the necessary supports to achieve success. The applicant provides the supports during this reform transition time that comprises the use of Professional Learning Communities in collaboration with the Southeast/South Central Cooperative that works with all school districts in this proposal.

It is proposed that teachers will conduct assessment of daily learning target that will deepen both for the student and teacher of what they know and what students need to know. This strategy also, according to the applicant, helps to gage whole class growth and trend analysis. Information about student learning will be tracked through use of the open data format Infinite Campus modules and for class/grade level performance will be controlled by the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System. As presented, the applicant articulates a clear and credible approach a comprehensive reform vision

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

**10**

**10**

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal across all students within the districts' of the consortium support high quality LEA and school level implementation.

The applicant clearly provides a description of the process used to select schools to participate. This includes using student demographics, populations, achievement gaps and school district similarities. The proposal represents nine school districts within five counties with a total student population of 24,125 students. The applicant cites data to confirm that all schools have over forty percent free and reduced lunch and some having more than 90% in that category. In addition all schools have a Family Resource or Youth Services Center that assists students and families in need of health and human services. The applicant is to be commended for serving all students in the qualifying LEA's.

The applicant provides a detailed list of participating schools district by district. The applicant also details with appropriate data which categories the total number of participating students form low income families, students who are high need and participating educators. Out of the total student participants of 24,125, high need represent 23,020 and 15,596 are low income. Total educators participating are numbered at 1707.

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

**10**

**7**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

There are significant components of a high quality plan for system wide change. The applicant has chosen a norm referenced assessment tool while also meeting Kentucky's established standards for assessment under Senate Bill 1 reforms for ESEA. The applicant's use of NWEA MAP assessments as an additional academic indicator fits with the overall logic model for the uniform personalized learning model in the consortium which provides educators with the detailed information they need to build curriculum and meet their students' needs on an individual child basis.

The applicant defines its plan of how the reform proposal will be scaled up. Details include supports in the form of Professional Learning Communities of like content grade level teachers, a curriculum coach and an administrator weekly to ensure implemented curricula aligned with state and national standards which also includes social, economic and physical non cognitive development. The plan is also augmented by anytime, anywhere digital learning beyond the traditional school day time constraints. The grant project, according to the applicant, will allow participating schools to develop performance based learning projects through the PLC 's that are aligned with content standards and strategies what will motivate students. All LEA's will have a dedicated manager of the core components within the project. The applicant minimally talks about scaling up in the context of the approach will be conservative enough so that sustainability can be attained at the conclusion of the grant, but does not describe change beyond the participating schools.

The applicant does not provide the timeline, the goals and the parties responsible for implementing the activities as part of its development of a high quality plan.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides supports for its vision to improve student learning and performance and increase equity as demonstrated by achievable yet ambitious annual goals that are equal to or exceed state targets. The applicant's intent is track the change in achievement level represented by the percentage of students achieving proficiency to meet or exceed the Kentucky's Annual Measurable Objectives and established growth rates for state accountability. They indicate that in additional 10% decrease in the achievement gap is included for subpopulations which illustrates the applicant's commitment to this student populaton. Inherent in the success of the goals, is the creation of flexibility in students' schedules that are more personalized to allow students to demonstrate mastery in subject areas so they can concentrate their course work that offers more challenges with a focus on college and career readiness strategies that will target youth early in their school careers to prevent dropouts and promote graduation from high school.

The applicant plans to use performance measures for this proposal to raise rates for graduation and college enrollment. Performance measures will focus on college and career readiness strategies that will target youth early in their school careers to prevent dropouts, promote graduation from high school and transition to postsecondary and beyond. Contributing to these reforms, as stated by the applicant, is the need to create student schedules that are more personalized to allow students to demonstrate mastery in subject areas so that they can concentrate their studies that offer more challenges and allow them seek other courses of interest, possibly those that have a future career. The applicant provides specific growth goals for this project that include improved state assessment results to an average of 90% by 2017, to increase high school graduation rates, college enrollment and career ready students. The applicant's plan is likely to result in improved student learning and performance.

The applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides data to illustrate advances in student learning. Data provided shows that average ACT scores have risen over the past four years, the average freshman graduation rate has improved as well and dropout rates have declined with more students staying in school. Prevention programs are factors that relate to this improvement. The applicant provides several factors for the gains. Developmentally appropriate practices are teaching children based on their individual readiness for content and the expectation exists in the schools that children can succeed as they learn at different rates. Flexible grouping of students, professional teamwork, qualitative reporting of student performance data, creating extended school service learning opportunities, creating family resource centers and authentic assessments are provided in support of this criteria. The applicant indicates that two schools within the consortium in the past three years have improved from the category of Tier 3 state rating for schools not performing.

The applicant indicates that it made collective student performance data available for families in the community by publishing school and district report cards on paper on the school district websites. The applicant provides evidence of implementation of an open data format portal system granting parents and students online access to school performance data.

The applicant does not provide specific data results for schools within the consortium to actually visualize how progress has been made over the past four years. The reviewer does indicate, for example, how many schools in the project were listed in the category of Tier 3 state ratings for schools to understand the improvement in two schools mentioned above that in the past three years moved away from the Tier 3 designation.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
---	----------	----------

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides for all categories of personnel salaries requested in this section. The applicant provides this information in school district budget formats. The specific categories required above is provided within the MUNIS system, contracted with Tyler Technologies, a nationally recognized financial management accounting system. MUNIS is a statewide initiative provided through the Kentucky Department of Education. The system contains all personnel salaries at the school level for instructional and instructional support staff.

This information, a copy of, according to the applicant, can be found in each district's central office, but the project does not state specifically how the general public can access the data and how each project school's information listed above can be viewed by the public at large.

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

**10**

**10**

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant sufficiently details successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments. Under Kentucky's Senate Bill 1 Legislation of 2009, each district creates its own curriculum, maps, lessons, and activities. Districts within the consortium are not under any sanctions or penalties that would restrict their participation or meeting project goals. In addition, all school districts operate under locally elected officials who follow guidelines established by the Kentucky State Board. School based councils were established with the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 and the applicant indicates that these councils have contributed to parents and others in the community being involved at the local level in school decision making.

The applicant has successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under state legal authority to implement the personalized learning environment by permitting school districts to implement programs and services that permit the introduction of innovative approaches to education.

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

**15**

**15**

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides details for meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal. The initial organizational meeting, as described by the applicant was held with representatives from all nine school districts. From that vantage point, public notices were sent out to higher education, business, community agencies using radio, print, cable television and internet. The district provides supports in the form of all teachers in the participating districts of the consortium have included letters of support, which exceeds the 70% minimum requirement. The proposal garnered 99.2% of all teachers. (the 0.8% were out on leave). MOU's are on contained in the consortium application for participating districts. The applicant describes a unique aspect of this project in that each participating school has its own council that makes curriculum and budget decisions. Community agencies supporting this effort include the Bell County Chamber of Commerce, the Bell-Whitley Community Action Agency, Kiwanis Club of Pineville, the Pineville Lions Club, and letters of support from other organizations within the catchment area. State and National organizations are also listed. Key representatives involved with the preparation of the this proposal are listed by name, business community representative and title. The list is extensive and specific and represents meaningful involvement by a host of consortium supporters.

The applicant clearly demonstrates meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of this proposal.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant presents elements of a high quality plan to improve learning and teaching. The applicant proposes to use the nationally recognized PLE trainers McClaskey and Bray who who will train educators to implement PLE environments. This training includes modeling and teaching the skills of self-assessment for learners; guiding learners in setting goals and monitoring their progress, providing exemplars and models of good practice and quality work that reflect curriculum outcomes and provide regular and challenging opportunities to meet each student's academic needs. Uniquely, the applicant proposes to strengthen support of the PLE model by training parents/guardians, and business/community representatives in order to have a better understanding and buy-in to the project.

The Individual Learning Plan includes career inventory interests, academic history and goals to transition into postsecondary aligned with state and national standards and uses elementary Exploration and Discovery, middle school level ILP, Career Units and Shadowing and high school Career Academics, School Based Enterprise and other resources that are cited. In addition, there are mentoring opportunities in pairing students with business/community representatives with similar career interests.

The use of self directed projects, as stated by the applicant, will allow students to learn key academic content, practice 21st century skills including collaboration, communication and critical thinking, create high quality authentic products and presentations. Through partnerships with colleges, digital platforms and mentoring services students will have opportunities to interact with diverse cultures. The project emphasizes project based learning as a powerful method that deepens the personalized learning experience.

The applicant describes the use of high quality approaches and environments as part of its plan. Extended school time, expanded school services, flexible groupings, portable learning devices, online learning courses, E-learning courses and mentoring services are components of the project. Programs that align with college and careers include Project Lead the Way and Advanced Placement courses with the student's option of completing college career and career ready graduation requirements at their own pace as detailed in their ILP.

The applicant clearly defines in this section applications for ongoing and regular feedback for student data to determine mastery, personalized learning recommendations based on student's current knowledge and skills and accommodations and high quality strategies for high need students to ensure they are on track toward meeting college and career ready standards and graduation requirements. The use of digital assessments provide real-time feedback and the infinite campus portal allow quick access for progress monitoring at any time from any place are examples regular feedback to determine mastery. The evaluation measures for teachers considers student growth and subpopulations in measuring teaching effectiveness for all students.

The applicant also lists as part of their plan training and support for students so that they understand how to use tools and resources provided to them to track and manage their learning with ongoing workshops during the year and during summers and afterschool hours, the availability of technology resource teachers to assist students, training programs on DVD and online and trained mentors.

While there are elements of a high quality plan presented, the specific timeline, the deliverables and the parties responsible for implementing the activities are not fully described by the applicant. This entails providing timeline for mentoring services, career academics, ongoing workshops during the year, technology resource teachers for training and support and the specific deliverables.

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

**20**

**18**

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment and helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to help students toward meeting their educational goals. The applicant will use the strategies developed by McClaskey and Bray for this proposal. Their approach establishes the foundation, framework and direction in building personalized learning environments to transform learning by training teachers in using data to measure student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards, facilitating the process from any stage to the next by establishing a model that can be replicated, informing, training, and coaching teachers how to personalize learning for all learners by identifying optimal learning approaches and providing ways to personalize learning and meet Common Core State and National Standards. This, they assert, will be accomplished in three phases which they describe in detail.

The Buck Institute, being used by the applicant for professional development, places students in the center of the learning process to deepen understanding of content by obtaining content knowledge, acquiring skills, developing work habits and applying what they have learned through hands-on, real-world applications. Students will be engaged in multiple and diverse learning opportunities, students will direct and own their individual learning styles and engage in common and individual tasks tied to their academic needs and interests. The applicant also asserts that one of the most vital elements to engage students on an anytime, anywhere design is through the use of technology and online learning capacity and related professional development opportunities for educators.

In support of their project, the applicant measure student progress by utilizing assessments tools such as MAP, common assessment scores included in Infinite Campus and CIITS and to frequently measure student progress in meeting college and career standards. The applicant provides a SMART method diagram to analyze work and expand learner growth. Student interests will be identified through the ConnectEDU and ILP tools.

The applicant provides detailed information and multiple measures to improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness. These measures include observations, peer observation, professional growth, self-reflection, student voice tied into student growth which is aligned with state and national standards for teachers, measurement instruments and provisions of clear measures of competencies so that evaluations are consistent. The applicant adequately provides multiple measurements for leaders which include provision of clear measures of competencies so that evaluations are consistent.

The applicant clearly and in sufficient detail has provided information and a strong plan for the remaining items under this criteria. The deliverables are listed (e.g. personalized learning professional development and others,) the three phases for professional development and the activities of the plan. What is not specifically provided for in their plan are the timeline and the individuals responsible for the activities associated with this criteria.

The score is reflective of not providing in their high quality plan a timeline and the individuals responsible for the activities under this criteria.

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant provides for practices, policies and rules that facilitate personalized learning and project governance and organization. The project will be governed by a Consortium governing committee with a specific organizational structure composed of the nine Superintendents. a supervisor of instruction from each participating district, a special education director from each district, a community agency representative from each community represented in the five counties, one business rep from each of the five counties, one elected parent from a school based decision making council from each participating district and one elected student representative from each school district. This council will meet every four months working with the Southeastern KY RTTT staff members to evaluate data, instructional practices and progress in meeting the goals and objectives of the project and transparency of information to the public.</p> <p>The applicant in their narrative clearly describes the process for school based decision making at each school. These school based teams promote shared leadership among those who are closest to the students with autonomy to make personnel decisions by interviewing and hiring, creating school calendars and professional development calendars, identifying curriculum needs and course offerings and holding responsibility for their own school budget and decisions for using funds. This includes the ability of students to earn credit when they can demonstrate mastery of standards as they are aligned with state and national standards. High School students can earn college credit through the Advance Kentucky initiative. Students in the project will have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times through working with business/community partners in a variety of project based learning experiences, school based enterprises and Individual Hybrid Opportunities. SWD and ELL learners will be provided full access to the opportunities detailed in the project through modifications in student's IEP. The project proposes to seek the assistance of the Southeast/South Central Cooperative for this population.</p> <p>The applicant has provided a high quality plan to support implementation of the project within the consortium they have established for RTTT.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		

The applicant contains many important components of a high quality plan for project implementation. It does not, however, provide the specific timeline to carry out the activities associated with this criteria as well as identifying the specific parties responsible for carrying out all the activities.

The applicant, in support of this project provides detail specific information on how they will include all participating students, parents, educators and stakeholders, regardless of income, by providing access to necessary content, tools, training and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of this proposal. This includes the ability to create technology check out programs in schools, ensuring all students have equal access to high level technology, organizing a local technology assistance program, coordinated through a partnership with the Family Resource, Youth Services Centers and local technology groups to ensure families have access to technology beyond the school day and to develop community access areas where schools and community centers will serve as hubs of expanded learning opportunities beyond school hours.

The applicant in support of having appropriate levels of technical support available will offer online support for the open data format systems used by parents, students and educators as well as a Student Technology Leadership Initiative which allows students at the middle and high school levels to provide assistance for software and simple technology issues for other students and families in the community. In addition, each school district's technology staff will provide training and workshops for participants.

Inherent in this proposal to support personalized learning, the project utilizes open data formats for students and parents. Systems are user friendly and provide interoperable and working together of information and services of Google Docs and Dropbox will be available throughout the consortium. In addition, teachers will provide digital learning courses across the entire Consortium, allowing sharing of high quality teachers for content shortage areas. Supports are also found in Infinite Campus, the longitudinal state mandated data system that can track, for all schools in the consortium, academics, behavior, health and other demographic information on all students in the project. This also tracks professional development and instructor credentials and certifications.

The applicant provides support for this criteria, but also needed to provide the missing elements of a high quality plan listed in the beginning of this review.

### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant has provided several aspects of a high quality plan for continuous improvement. This includes localized ongoing and continuous assessment utilizing data of students struggling or failing by content area, analysis of college and career readiness delivery systems, analysis of standardized assessment results including EXPLORE, PLAN, ASPIRE and workKeys, professional development analysis and attendance rates are examples. The consortium plans to work with Southeastern Kentucky RTTT staff, Southeastern KY RTTT Advisory Council, School Based decision making councils and district school boards. There are other state and national partners such as Eastern KY University, University of KN P20 Innovation Lab and ConnectEDU. Specific implementation methods are detailed specific and include Measure of Academic Progress, K-PREP statewide ESEA required assessment and other listed with their scheduled use during the year.</p> <p>There are specific details listed that provide for the activity, a description of the activity and the implementation schedule for assessments. An example is represented by the K-PREP instrument that is a nationally normed assessment measuring core content areas, including reading/language arts and mathematics that is given one a year for comparison to the previous year's results.</p> <p>The applicant as part of a high quality plan did not provide all of the specific parties responsible for implementing the activities as well as the timelines and deliverables for continuous improvement, but does present a continuous process that provides for timely and regular feedback.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>Detail specific monitoring and public sharing of continuous improvement process are provided for the project. These</p>		

include Advisory Council, Consortium staff meetings, School Based Decision Making Councils meetings, School Board Meetings, Student Advisory Group meetings, Public Forums, Press Releases and Media Outlets, Dedicated Website, Electronic Newsletter and Printed Materials. The applicant provides the time frame for each of the sharing methods as well. Provisions for sharing also include being able to disseminate information for English Language Learners and those with disabilities.

The applicant presents a high quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides for 13 performance measures detailed with supporting data and required breakdown by grade level range. Performance measures were selected based on proposal requirements and the unique needs to the consortium as identified through gap analysis. Measures are norm referenced and meet Kentucky's established standards for assessment. Targeted goals are detailed for each measure through 2017 and include a provision to revise yearly growth targets in accordance with projections. Growth, according to the applicant, is calculated using Kentucky's growth factors with additional growth in subpopulations to reflect a reduction in the achievement gaps in correlation to project goals. Performance measures for Effective Teacher/Principal, Academics, Non Cognitive areas, College and Career Readiness and Career Readiness are provided consistent with the RTTT application. The applicant indicates that in addition to these performance measures, they will use the NWEA MAP assessment to be given in the fall, winter and spring will provide both the staff and evaluation team with a rigorous, state and nationally aligned adaptive test that accurately reflects the instructional level of each student and measures individual growth over time.

The response for this section represent ambitious yet achievable performances overall and by subgroup with annual targets for required and applicant proposed performance measures.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
--	----------	----------

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides a high quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of RTTT funded activities. This is supported by the use of assessments that are normed at national and state levels. The MAP norm referenced assessment will be given in the fall, winter, and spring to provide staff and evaluation team with a rigorous, state and nationally-aligned adaptive test that accurately reflects the instructional level of each student and measure individual growth over time. To this end, the applicant indicates that consortium staff will identify the skills and concepts individual students have learned, diagnosing individual instructional needs and identifying learning gaps, monitoring academic growth over time, making data-driven decisions at the the classroom, school and district levels and placing new students into appropriate educational programs. The use of digital learning options also provides instant feedback to assist with individual student goals and learning plans. For older students in the college and career readiness areas will be evaluated using the ACT. Data systems in place include those capable of monitoring grades, student attendance and behavior.

The applicant provides a high quality plan for this section.

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant clearly defines the funds that will support the project in addition to the RTTT award. Consortium LEA members will include access to general funds, allocations from the Kentucky Department of Education, local taxes to generate revenue for local education agencies. These include Extended School Services, Title 1, Family Resource/Youth Centers , and technology and other fund allotments. Broad categories of funding are listed from RTTT, LEA, State Funding, Federal Funds, Business Agency Support, and Local Government. The budget appears reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal. Positions within the grant are clearly detailed with cost assumptions listed for each year of the project. For example: LEA Program Manager for each individual school district lists the role function, the number, experience level and the rank with dollar amounts. Budget items are listed for one time investments within the budget and are indicated for example as year 1 expenditures for carts/charging stations, but not

found listed for the remaining years.

Sustainability is provided for in the ability of the district to use technology for staff professional development, to replicate successful models, train the trainer concept as well as the use of webinars. Savings comes in the future in the ability of schools to move away from traditional text books and print materials and rely on the technology for learning. The cost of technology the first year is detail specific and represents the cost for purchase as specified for districts within state contract bids. Inherent in this expenditure are monies to improve internet and wireless connections within the project's catchment areas.

The applicant provides a solid explanation for the budget in its support of the project and for sustainability.

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

**10**

**10**

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The RTTT funds, as discussed by the applicant, are designed to seed and develop the initial changes required for systemic change. These include the development of a technology donation program where businesses and individuals provide funding and equipment for student participants, the ongoing receiving of technology funds from the state, the establishment of a professional development service learning center and conference programs as well as self continuation in all districts through a combination of funding. The district adequately provides future years' funding mechanisms that include the support for salaries, fringe benefits, professional development for 2017 through 2020. The district uniquely indicates in support of the project in future years the establishment of a 501(c) 3 foundation established by a network of businesses to continue services. Another source also mentioned is the implementation of School-Based Enterprises to provide and sell needed services and products in the community. The applicant plans to promote and expand the Consortium's activities and meetings with its partners as well as allowing for weekly press releases and ongoing news coverage.

The applicant provides a solid response to this criteria and the sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant makes a conclusive case for this competitive preference priority. The applicant clearly defines the role of strategic partnerships and their commitments. Organizations involved with Public Health and Safety are listed and include Corbin Community Coalition and Cabinet for Families and Children. Before and After School and Summer resources are listed as 21st Century Community Learning Centers and the Corbin Family Literacy Program that is there for students in the summer, when school is not in session and before and after school. Businesses and community based organizations are listed and include Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, Kiwanis, Ossoli Clubs, Faith Based organizations, Youth Service Centers which provide mentoring for college and career readiness, career training programs and collaboration with the National Academy Foundation. There are also early learning centers in each of the five counties. Postsecondary institutions are listed that include the University of Kentucky, Union College, and University of the Cumberland.

The applicant includes seven population level desired results that support RTTT. These include early childhood learners will be prepared to succeed in school, learners will graduate college and be career ready, learners and their families are healthier, learners will have expanded learning opportunities beyond the school day, learners will access mentoring services and learners will transition successfully to postsecondary and complete degree or certificate programs.

The Infinite Campus System will track students and families which can report individual and aggregate data reports on academic progress, assessments, attendance, behavior, health along with creating specialized reports for sub populations as needed. Data will be used by the consortium to prioritize resources to permit participating students in subpopulations to receive equitable access to services in the proposal.

To scale the model beyond the participating students, the consortium will create reproducible resource guides, media programs and mentoring services between districts that can be used by districts not in the RTTT consortium.

The project addresses social-emotional and behavioral needs through integration of services. Through the partnerships with the Family Resource and Youth Centers in each school, counseling and health services are provided. These school

based agencies also refer out to others across the state to ensure students and families' barriers to learning are lessened. Services provided include preschool child care, after school and before school care, family training workshops, literacy services, substance abuse education and counseling and family crisis and mental health counseling.

Building capacity will be accomplished by coordinating policies and leadership, assigning staffing and infrastructure to coordinate, with informal and formal mechanisms for cooperation, and strategic issue management. The idea is to build a professional capacity in each targeted building. Assessments of needs and assets of participating students will be addressed through such means as local norm referenced assessment, family resource youth data, survey data, program review and Infinite Campus.CIITS data. The decision making process and infrastructure will consist of the following which include RTTT Consortium Staff, School Based Decision Making Councils and Southeastern Kentucky RTTT Advisory Council. Parent involvement is also detailed to maximize at many levels of this proposal including a dedicated website will be supported.

The annual performance measures for the proposed population level goals for the project are listed by population groups, collaboration factors and desired results for project participants. The desired outcomes for project participants are the same for the populations groups and include early childhood learners will be prepared to succeed in school, learners will perform at grade level in core content areas and learners will have expanded learning opportunities.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant meets and exceeds absolute priority one for personalized learning. The applicant clearly states that personalized learning recommendations will be based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college and career ready standards and available content. Approaches and supports will be provided and documented through the student's Individual Learning Plan in consultation with her/his mentor and educators. Each student and the parents will be able to contribute recommendations and to alter final decisions if the instructional resources are not providing sufficient progress. The applicant indicates that they will be using professional development of a high caliber to provide teachers with the foundation, framework and direction in building personalized learning environments that will transform learning and are sustainable over time. Teachers will be trained and coached in how to personalize learning for all learners by identifying optimal learning approaches. This includes providing way to personalize learning and meet Common Core State and National Standards.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>191</b>



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0198KY-2 for Corbin Independent Schools

**A. Vision (40 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's vision narrative presents a reform vision that will accommodate the needs of all students in the districts participating in this consortium. Unfortunately, the narrative does not specifically cite prior work in the four core educational assurance areas. Although there is no documented data to support any success, the applicant vision demonstrates the necessity to implement nationally recognized best practices that have yielded the consortium's desired results using the proposed transformational model. It was unclear if each participating LEA has adopted the state standards and how the supporting evidence to demonstrate improvements.</p> <p>The applicant's reform vision is to provide students with personalized learning environments by changing the classroom practice and implementing models of reform that support the needs of the students and community. The applicant demonstrates how the foundation of their ambitious yet achievable proposal is rooted in the implementation of initiatives embedded in the four core assurance areas.</p> <p>The goals consist of implementing personalized learning environments, adoption of state and national standards, multiple strategies to accelerate student achievement (e.g. ILPs, project based learning, learning guides) based on mastery rather than seat time, uniform assessments will allow teachers and principals to monitor continuous progress in order to adjust instruction, recruiting, developing and retaining effective teachers and principals.</p> <p>Overall, the extent to which the applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent vision of reform is unclear because the applicant failed to provide the information about the foundation that it is building from in the four core reform areas, did not provide sufficient rationale for the approach to personalized learning for their particular population of students, lacked depth of the classroom experience, outside of planned programming and activities. Although the applicant provides basic information meeting the criteria, the proposal lacks additional detail and explanation necessary to interpret the comprehensive reform vision, resulting in a low score.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's reform proposal is based on a selection of schools who share similar characteristics: - exist within low socioeconomic status, communities labeled "generations of under-educated", and a need to create a sustainable plan in order to address this cycle of failure. The students in this consortium attend schools that have been identified as having a large number of students classified as "at risk" (poverty, ELL, transient/mobility dropouts, academic failures). The consortium sees this proposal as an opportunity to persistent achievement gaps and increase student achievement by providing these targeted students with personalized learning environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 9 school districts identified in this application are apart of a consortium comprised of rural school districts who have identified schools that meet the eligibility criteria;</li> <li>• Participating LEAs identify as rural</li> <li>• Data submitted supports identified number of participating students and subgroups</li> <li>• 23,020 students have been identified as high needs and 15, 596 students have been as low income</li> <li>• Total of 24, 125 students will participate</li> <li>• 1,707 educators will participate</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of this proposal.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's reform proposal for LEA-wide reform and change presents a logic model framework that addresses the key components of RTTT but does not provide details to satisfy specific criteria for LEA-wide reform and change. This framework includes a model for personalized learning that provides supports to students from Pre-K to post-secondary. The applicant's narrative lacks details to support how this national model will be adapted in a rural area. The applicant acknowledges the vision for LEA-wide reform and change is aggressive and bold, however it would have been helpful to have had the following documentation to fully support this criteria:</p>		

- how will this plan will be scaled up across the LEAs
- identify or describe specific resources or best practices that have yielded success for student learning and can be replicated district-wide in order to support change beyond the participating schools
- specific details that demonstrate the successful support all students being served have received
- details of past or current best practices that have

It is unclear how the applicant's plan describing the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools, in order to reach its outcome goals.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's vision for LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes demonstrates a realistic approach in order to increase achievement. The applicant's data does not identify specific subgroups by race, ethnicity, gender or students with IEP's:

- The identified populations play a significant role in evaluating the effectiveness of plans that are designed to improve student achievement based on socioeconomics and regional demographics
- Although the applicant has projected low outcomes, they appear ambitious yet achievable. The applicant appears to have taken a realistic approach when establishing the goals in the context of the existing students needs and achievement gaps
- The baseline data for decreasing achievement gaps indicates the applicant's overall achievement percentages do not been represent significant gains, however, the documentation indicates growth whose increments may be small but are consistent
- Goals for increasing graduation rates do not appear to be ambitious based on the applicant's transformation plan. For example, using the baseline data, the overall graduation rate is 78.8% and at the end of the grant, the applicant's minimum goal is set at 82.8%, an overall increase of 4%. The state's graduation average is listed as 81.7% and the difference between the two will result in a net gain of 1.1%
- Goals for college enrollment are consistent with graduation rates.
- Goals for postsecondary attainment are reasonable

The applicant did not include the rationale for the low projections and what, if any, barriers exist that make these small gains significant. Overall, the goals are reasonable and achievable and likely to result in improved student outcomes.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The extent to which the applicant has demonstrated evidence for a a clear track record of success for each LEA is insufficient.

(a) In demonstrating a clear track record of success the applicant's narrative does not provide detailed academic gains but does cite and provides data to document positive growth in the areas of ACT scores and Freshmen graduation rate. The data provided by the applicant clearly demonstrates achievement in these two areas for students. It would have been helpful if the applicant had provided evidence to demonstrate how the targeted consortium student populations performed in these two areas. It would have been helpful if the applicant had provided ACT score data for all 9 school districts in this consortium.

(b) The applicant uses the Dropout data from 4 of the school districts to illustrate and document the applicant's success in this category. The data illustrates that drop out rates improved consistently and gains provided a detailed outline to the

specific strategies employed and their effectiveness. For example, Clay County's 2008 dropout rate was reported as 6.7% and as of 2011 had fallen off to 0.7%, representing a decrease of 6% over four years. The applicant did not provide the Dropout data for all 9 school districts in this consortium.

(c) Parents and students will have daily/weekly online access to an electronic personal learning profile that will host student performance through Infinite Campus Portal (open-data format).

Overall, the applicant has not provided additional details or documentation a clear track record of success toward for each LEA has advanced student learning and achievement over the past four years in order to establish a foundation from which each LEA has demonstrated the need for consistent and widespread reform.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
---	----------	----------

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

All nine districts use the MUNIS system, a statewide initiative through the Kentucky Department of Education. The information that is made public can be accessed from a link on the state's website and printed copies in each district's central office, public school board meetings and the Kentucky Department of Education's website.

- Personnel salaries for instructional staff, teachers, and school-level instructional support staff are available on state website
- Non-personnel expenditures
- District policies and procedures

Overall, the applicant has demonstrated evidence of high-level of public transparency in its LEA processes, practices and investments.

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's narrative states the LEAs in the consortium conditions for reform. have been demonstrated in that each LEA has autonomy to make decisions for their district and/or schools, through the implementation of the following milestones, that the demonstrate the consortium's ability to implement a personalize learning environment in order to meet this criteria as well as contribute to successful student learning experiences:

- Adoption of National Common Core State Standards for Mathematics and Language Arts
- Kentucky Education Reform Act and SB1
- School Based Decision Making Councils

The applicant also identified eight business and educational organization that provide support in its curriculum, regulations and school policies as evidence to support their continued capacity to provide autonomy in order to improve and on expand on the intended reforms.

Overall, the applicant has demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The criteria requires letters of support from the specified stakeholders, and the applicant has submitted letters of support from the following key stakeholders:

- LEAs
- 70% of Teachers
- Principals and Assistant Principals
- Student representatives
- Family Resource Centers/Youth Services Centers
- CTA, local community-based and civic organizations
- Institutions of Higher Learning

The applicant's narrative describes the process used to engage some of the key stakeholders who were involved in the

development and revision process of this application. The application does not include documentation to demonstrate the level of engagement or feedback experienced by: each LEAs parent groups, individual students, and Early Learning Centers. The success of this proposal will be determined by the buy-in from students and their families.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has presented a plan that demonstrates evidence for improving learning and teaching by personalized learning environments in order to provide that all students are college - and career-ready when they graduate is ambitious and achievable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusive plan addresses the measures being taken to ensure learners are given ownership of his/her learning. The use of technology will increase access and equity for students to engage in meaningful learning experiences that match their needs and interests.</li> <li>By implementing the Anytime/Anywhere digital learning students are given a learning option that focuses on mastery of content rather on traditional seat time, allowing them to learn at their own pace.</li> <li>Personalized learning environments will enhance the delivery of existing ILPs by ensuring students and parents have frequent and multiple opportunities to monitor progress as well as make adjustments based on feedback and student achievements.</li> <li>Using year-round marketing and promotion to all communities places an emphasis on the importance of parent and community involvement to ensure the student success.</li> <li>Research and evidence based instructional best practices to address all learners and learning styles             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan does not specifically mention how the Project Based Learning (PBL), College partnerships, digital platforms and mentoring services will be used to support students with who are defined as high needs and/or special needs (e.g. IEPs, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Accommodations and high quality instructional supports demonstrate deliberate and thoughtful consideration of the diverse needs of today's students , include in this plan high quality academic approaches and measures that all students will have access to instruction:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extended school time /Expanded services</li> <li>Flexible groupings for Project-Based Learning activities</li> <li>Online learning courses</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The applicant's narrative for this criteria places considerable emphasis on personalized learning environments in order to engage and empower students and their families that is appropriate. The plan does include the key goals, activities and details for learning but does not provide a timeline, deliverables and parties responsible in order to determine if this plan is of high-quality.</p>		

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>
--	-----------	-----------

<p><b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The extent to which the applicant has a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide students the supports to graduate college and career ready, has demonstrated that at best the applicant has addressed a majority of this criteria. The applicant's plan is to create a personalized learning program to be implemented in three phases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create and implement personalized learning environments with national collaborators.</li> <li>Using optimal learning approaches for Informing, training and coaching teachers on how to personalize learning for all learners.</li> <li>PLC meetings and digital platforms meetings between buildings to promote consistent sharing of information and training.</li> <li>Professional development through national partnerships (i.e. McClaskey/Bray, Buck Institute)</li> <li>Incorporating multiple methods to provide teachers and administrators with guidance and support (e.g. Virtual School Symposiums, leaderships webinars, teacher talk webinars, SNAP (student needs assessment program, diversity group initiatives)</li> <li>Frequent measuring of student data using assessment tools that measure student progress in meeting college- and</li> </ul>		
--	--	--

- career-readiness
- SMART goal process for student growth provides with the flexibility to monitor, assess, adjust differentiated instruction based on student performance and understanding.
- Evaluation system will be based on effectiveness feedback that will be used in decreasing achievement gaps and increasing student achievement .
- Working with educational partners to increase the numbers of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals at hard-to-staff schools, subjects and specialty staff.

The applicant provides key goals, an exhaustive list of activities, and the rationale to support this plan to improve teaching and leading, the proposal lacks the additional details of timelines , deliverables and parties responsible in order to assess and demonstate the implementation of this proposal is a plan of high-quality.

Overall, the applicant the applicant 's proposal has some of the information meeting the criteria, the proposal lacks all the additional details to demonstrate a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The extent to which the applicant has a high quality plan to support project implementation is acceptable, based on the agreements as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All LEAs agree to the consortium governance structure of The Southeastern Kentucky RTTT Consortium objectives, goals and visions</li> <li>• Each LEA will have its own RTTT Leadership Team/School-Based Decision Making (SBDM)Council to provide oversight of strategies and activities</li> <li>• Each LEA s SBDM council will maintain autonomy as it pertains to determining personnel decisions, creating school schedules, curriculum needs and school budget decisions for using funds</li> <li>• Personalized learning environments gives students multiple and flexible learning options to demonstrate topic mastery based on mastery rather than "seat time" by customizing learning based on their needs and interests.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant's proposal lacks details or descriptons to elaborate on how or what the impact these policies may have based on the existing supports and resources that are currently mandated by FERPA for students who have been identified as special education, English Language Learners and 504 plans.</p> <p>Overall, the applican's proposal to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed lacks the details of a high-quality plan. The proposal provides the rationale and key goals of the plan, identifies the activities, however, addiitonal details and explanation for the timeline, deliverables and parties responsible are necessary to score this proposal as a high-quality plan.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant's proposal places an emphasis on ensuring resources, technology, technical support and school data are accessible to students, parents, teachers beyond the classroom in order to support personalized learning. The consortium recognizes the many students do not have access to technology and the need to provide families with equitable access to these resources, tools and content.</p> <p>The existing infrastructure in place is able to support the much needed upgrade and the plan provides for an LEA technical coordinator and implement a volunteer technology program to ensure the technical support if available for students, parents, educators and other stakeholders. The promotion of school and community hubs provide students with access during after school hours.</p> <p>The Consortium's existing open data formats allows students and parents to export information that can be used in a</p>		

variety of electronic systems and will not be rendered useless by future overhauls. The system is supported at state, national and international levels. The LEAs currently have access to Infinite Campus, a longitudinal data program which tracks student demographic data, and offers other resources for teachers (e.g. certifications) and parents. The plan includes providing additional online platforms that can be accessed anytime or anywhere ,such as Blackboard and ConnectEDU, to promote college- and career-readiness skill development for students. These platforms will be customized to be accessible to students from grade PreK to 12.

The Consortium uses MUNIS system which houses all their financial information including personnel salaries, non-personnel expenditures .

The applicant's plan presents a logical and methodical approach to LEA and school infrastructure, however, it lacks a description for the timeline and deliverables for the LEA and school infrastructure necessary for the implementation of a high-quality plan.

### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant's continuous improvement process plan strategy is to create an ongoing system of checks and balances to with a focus on enabling leadership, communication, resources and processes in order to provide various elements of continuous improvement in order to establish a quality project that can be sustained. The applicant's plan employs the services of outside evaluators who will collaborate with applicant who will assist in the planning and monitoring of its goals. The methods employed meet expectations needed to insure a continuous improvement process. The applicant has demonstrated a high level of consideration to the high degree of required monitoring needed for a plan of this complex nature.</p> <p>It would have strengthened the application if the applicant had addressed the timeline, deliverables and parties responsible that is necessary to demonstrate this continuous improvement process to ensure that feedback is conducted on a regular and timely basis as it relates to meeting project goals, ongoing corrections and improvements during the term of the grant.</p> <p>Overall, the extent to which the applicant has presented a high-quality plan that has some good ideas, but don't have all the elements of a high-quality plan.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The extent to which the applicant presents a high quality plan with strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders has not been fully met. The applicant's timeline for continuous improvement in this criteria involves all key stakeholders and utilizes a variety of media to effectively engage, monitor and evaluate the plan's implementation. It would have been helpful if the applicant had provided details on how it would incorporate feedback from all stakeholders in order to insure the continuous improvement of plans with fidelity, and if the feedback opportunities with Student Advisory Groups is a two way or one way process but does not mention how or if opportunities for feedback will be afforded to the listed stakeholders. This opportunity for feedback is critical in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the process for ongoing communication and engagement with key stakeholders.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has met a majority of the criteria for this selection by demonstrating a high level of transparency in the continuous improvement process.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant's evidence to support the criteria for the selected performance measures in consistent with the criteria for this funding. The applicants performance measures were determined based upon the unique needs of each consortium member, the need to decrease the acheivement gap and increase student achievement for subgroups that have</p>		

consistently ranked low in achievement. This subgroup is comprised of students identified as low-income and special needs, which comprised 72% and 16% respectively, of the overall consortium population.

The applicant selected five categories for which they targeted performance measures were selected according to the needs identified in their gap analysis. It was noted the measures are in-line with the applicants logic model for personalized learning environments.

- Increase in the percentage of students from grades 3-12 who reach proficiency in reading and mathematics
- Identify and monitor non-cognitive behaviors (health/obesity and social emotional (depression/anxiety))
- Increase College- and Career- Readiness percentages for grades 12
- Increased access to all 6th-7th grade students to fully complete ILPs for career readiness

Overall, the applicant proposed performance measures and annual targets are ambitious yet achievable. All performance indicators are moving in an upward direction for improvement, resulting in a high score.

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

**5**

**5**

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's plan for evaluating effectiveness of investments is acceptable. The applicant has determined it will utilize norm-referenced assessment three times a year to provide staff and evaluators with the data that will be used to determine student growth over time. The applicant will utilize the NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress (norm referenced tests) to assist staff in order to determine the appropriate digital learning option learning to best suit the needs of students by:

- identification of skills
- diagnosing instructional needs and learning gaps
- Monitoring of growth
- Making data driven decisions
- appropriate placement in instructional programs

Overall, the applicant's plan includes ideas to demonstrate the goals and activities to evaluate the effectiveness of investments, however, the plan demonstrates a high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan.

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's budget narrative and tables demonstrates a prudent and thoughtful plan in order to implement a high quality plan for development and implementation of proposal. The budget outlines the two major areas of for which this budget will support. those areas are the nucleus to this projects success - technology and professional development for the delivery of Personalized Learning Environments through the Anytime/Anywhere learning concept, provide sufficient access to all students using computer or mobile devices. The budgets identifies how strategies and how they provide for long-term sustainability.

The budget includes one-time investments and plans on how those investments will be sustained after the life of this grant to ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

The applicant's plan details how funding from other sources will be used to support this projetc, such as Title I, Title II and Title III, however, it is not clear if these funds will be used to support the implementation of this proposal. The information is not reflected in the overall budget summary for:

- Identify the specific funds from other sources that will be used to support this project (e.g. Title I, II, III, existing grants)
- Details to support the proposals for expanding partnerships and contributions
- State monies for technology purchases
- Local community partnerships to build the infrastructure for connectivity
- Plan for students whose needs may exceed those of their counterparts (additional services, technological careers, and hands on learning)

Overall, the applicant's budget for the project demonstrates a thoughtful and rational plan for projecting funds needed for applicant's implementation of personalized learning environments, however,

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

**10**

**6**

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's plan sustainability of project goals after the term of the grant will be supported by state, local and private and public partnership funding sources in order to provide the ongoing support for salaries, fringe, professional development, materials and equipment.

- The Staggering integration of technology into budget reduces the impact of replacement costs
- Recurring expenses will be built into LEAs annual budgets utilizing state and federal funds, mini-grants and local business support
- Continuous communication in targeted communities to maintain support for this reform
- Strong professional developments build capacity and sustainability after the life of the grant
- Enhanced business and postsecondary programs to sustain college- and career- readiness through mentoring and real work experiences
- Recurring expenses have been factored into the budget

The plan's post budget clearly identifies the projects sustainability expenses, potential sources and use of funds, however, it lacks details to describe how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use the data to inform future investments.

The applicant's plan for sustainability of project goals after the term of this grant contains some of the ideas of a high-quality plan, however, it lacks the details to demonstrate how the applicant will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes based on their post-grant budget.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has provided a description that is coherent and sustainable. The partnerships have been in effect for several years and its model of support of high-needs students has yielded success.

The services provided by the partnerships highlight the current needs and challenges that may exist in many of these communities. The challenges as a result of living in rural areas from which the applicant describes as impoverished children and families populations face significant challenges. These factors often when combined with socioeconomic and language barriers have a direct impact on student achievement and the level of family support. The need for social and behavioral services and supports, combined with the academic supports from personalized learning environments, will provide students with a much needed holistic approach needed to address the underlying obstacles that create achievement gaps and impede student achievement, thus providing reform to the needs of the whole child from grades PreK-12. The services being provided are aligned to the goals of a personalized learning environments because it offers students and families relevant and real world interests.

The applicant identifies seven population-level desired results for students that align with and support the broader vision of the proposal. These results include early childhood learners to be prepared to succeed in school, decreasing achievement gaps and improving student achievement, graduate college and career ready, and learners and families are healthier.

Student and family participation will be tracked and monitored using the Infinite Campus System to monitor the progress as well as to ensure that resources are being properly targeted to improve student and family results, as well as being used to

inform and assist staff in the prioritizing of resources so that students receive equitable access to all services.

Scaling of this project beyond the proposed schools districts will be achieved through the use of resource guides, media programs and mentoring services between districts, as well as utilizing Professional Learning Communities to provide ongoing sharing of information, training and coordination and sustainability planning.

Overall, the applicant's narrative meets the criteria for this preference. The desired results for students - creating a system to address social, emotional and behavioral needs of students and their families - given the challenges, are ambitious yet achievable because the collaborative projects have been previously supported and proven successful.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant has met the criteria of coherently and comprehensively to address the core educational assurance areas to create personalized learning environments to improve learning and teaching through the use of personalized learning, anytime/anywhere digital learning, college and career readiness utilizing extensive evidence-based support and ongoing professional development. The applicant has demonstrated and provided support for an ambitious yet achievable plan to implement and sustain personalized learning environments for students who have been identified as high needs or low socioeconomic status and living in communities considered generations of systemic "under-educated" communities by proposing the adoption of standards and assessments that will ensure students are prepared to succeed in college and the workplace; to support the widespread access and use of technology by providing computer and mobile devices for all students and families in this consortium; to utilize multiple measures and strategies that will increase achievement and decrease achievement gaps by allowing students and families to access learning anytime/anywhere, project-based learning, and professional learning communities. This access not only provides students with learning opportunities that remove isolation and academic limitations, but also will enable families of all students to also have access to many of these resources.</p>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>152</b>
--------------	------------	------------