



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0188KS-1 for Derby Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Derby School District did not outline the four core educational assurance areas.</p> <p>Although rigorous standards through College and Career readiness and accelerated learning and graduation / college promotion were noted through various initiatives No discussion was presented regarding retaining/recruiting highly effective teachers and principals as well as turning around the lowest performing schools.</p> <p>The District did provide an outline of their personalized learning vision being the basis for as the basis for all targeted plans with the primary focus on data collection and an assessment system to drive data driven instruction. However, even the vision for personalized learning was limited in specific details.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District provided a list of schools that will participate. The total number of participating students was also provided. This list outlined: high need students, low-income families, etc... However, no description of the process was provided. In addition, no discussion regarding the its approach to implementing the reform proposal was presented. The chart did not provide evidence to support the approach to implementation.</p> | | |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This District provided a chart that outlined five key goals for the LEA wide reform. This response significantly lacks a description of the elements of a high quality plan. Some of the goals are ambitious - such as the elementary level learner-centered classroom; however, there is no description as to how this will be implemented or what specifically is involved. In this specific example, virtual and outdoor learning was identified; however, no plans or details as to how that would be implemented. Therefore, the ability to achieve these goals can not be evaluated. A high quality plan is absent within this response.</p> | | |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| <p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District provided a variety of assessments being used for performance: State Assessments, DIBELS, SMI, SRI, and NWEA. However, there is no clear discussion as to what is specifically being identified within the chart. For example, the chart on page 31 is limited in understanding due to the lack in descriptor. The overall graduation goals are identified; however, the district reported 93%, 85%, and 90% of each sub-group for graduation; but they listed a total goal of 98% for the district. This goal does not seem achievable. It is not possible to evaluate the extent to which the vision will improve student learning without additional descriptive information.</p> | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
|--|-----------|-------|

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 2 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District provided information pertaining to several specific programs that it has implemented to support struggling learners: TOP Early childhood Education, Project Lead the Way, Success 101 - 104, and Reading Coaches. No documented evidence of a clear track record of success over the past 4 years was provided. The response is lacking a description of the reforms targeting the lowest-achieving schools. No evidence regarding accessibility of student performance data was provided.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The description provided is insufficient. The District only listed where the financial records and expenses for all school level personnel could be found - on their web-site. The description does not reflect a high level of transparency, did not provide information pertaining to personnel salaries and was extremely limited in its description of making the information available to stakeholders.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The provided description of the LEA's ability to sustain successful conditions and autonomy is insufficient. The District described the passage of the Senate Bill 155 to support Career Technical Education. The LEA also noted that Kansas is a local-control state and each district is permitted to choose the best programs to meet state guidelines; however, the description is limited. There is no direct correlation to all elements of the District's vision and the ability to implement the necessary steps to enact the change.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 3 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District identified a five year strategic planning process that took place in 2012. A total of 50 people (within 2 groups) were noted. In addition, two letters of support were provided. The district's description of stakeholder engagement is limited. No discussion was provided as to the methodology of how the feedback will be gathered or how the feedback will be used. In addition, the District did not provide any documentation to demonstrate support by the collective bargaining and non-collective bargaining units. The described engagement of all stakeholders is insufficient.</p> | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|------------------|--------------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 14 |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district provided a high quality plan. Elements of college and career readiness, increased graduation rates, rigorous standards, with a correlation to personalized learning. The LEA identified an emphasis on college and career preparation and readiness at all levels: K - 5 through the career exploration program and 6 - 12 through the CTE / career guidance program. The CTE Pathway programs are identified for all students in the district and students will choose one of 12 pathways combined into four career academies. There is a correlation between the description provided and college and career with a strong link to personal interest.</p> <p>Through the Learner Centered Model, the district notes that self determination skills such as self-awareness, goal setting, choice making, problem solving and self monitoring will be taught.</p> <p>Evidence of personalized learning opportunities for students is provided through the individual academic plans that will be developed for students in grades 6 - 12 in conjunction with the counselor in addition to the individualized electronic portfolios which will serve as an academic progress guide. Data will be used to guide students into individualized academy selection through a collaborative decision making process. Counselors will be in place to provide training and support to students.</p> | | |

The response is lacking a specific focus on high quality strategies for high need students and high quality digital content. The response also does not embrace previously noted components of the overall described vision.

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 10 |
|--|-----------|-----------|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Elements of a high quality plan are presented: college and career focus through career opportunities, personalized learning through e-portfolios, accelerated learning through dual credit options and final course requirements, and rigorous standards through the CCSS alignment work outlined. Although the elements are presented, many are stated without any follow up description as to the manner in which the personalized learning implementation strategies will take place. No formal plan, roll out, description of roles, etc... is provided. The application addressed a School Improvement PLCS that will look at teacher observation data etc...; however, no further planning or action is noted.

The application discusses the plans to implement coaches to support professional development in the Learner Centered System; however, the discussion regarding matching the tools to student needs is incomplete. The District presents a discussion on creating high quality learning experiences; however, the components of these experiences are lacking specifics. For example, the response described a math lesson example; however, the plan for utilizing coaches is not identified. In addition, no link to high quality learning and the coaches role was identified. Frequent measurement of student progress is a focus of this grant through the development of common assessments and the partnerships with higher education. Actionable information to guide personalized learning needs to be expanded upon.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 3 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The District is lacking components of a high quality plan within this response. The district only provided information related to personalized learning (through differentiation); however, no discussion regarding college and career readiness, rigorous standards was presented.

The response is lacking relevance to leadership teams. No description is provided to outline the school district's autonomy over school schedules, calendars, personnel decisions, etc... The District did not provide information pertaining to the structure of governance. The district reported that the Board has approved classes that allow students to earn credit based upon mastery. Students can move through material at their own pace in the K - 12 virtual school and year long courses can be completed in a semester.

Minimal information was presented related to providing resources for students with disabilities. The District did not address giving students the opportunity to progress through mastery.

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|---|-----------|----------|

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This response does not include all of the elements of a high quality plan. The District only addressed providing equal and open access for all students will be provided through iPad carts, 1:1 iPads for middle school and 1:1 laptops for high school. The District did not provide a discussion on 3 other elements of a high quality plan: rigorous standards, personalized learning, or graduation/college and career readiness.

In regard to using technology systems and ensuring that the systems are interoperable, the District identified ways in which to ensure inter operable data systems. The system Skyward will serve as the original data platform from which all data will be exported. A directory system that is synchronized with Google Apps will keep the systems unified.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 3 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Elements of a high quality plan were not included. The District did not present information related to college and career readiness, rigorous standard implementation, equal access for all students, and graduation rates. No discussion was provided related to personalized learning or the District's vision of personalized learning.</p> <p>However, the District did identify a Grant Coordinator and Data Analyst to monitor, measure and publicly share information. Even still, the statement is vague and incomplete. There is no description of how this is going to take place or the process for regular feedback regarding project goals.</p> <p>Other various methods for timely feedback was noted through monthly BOE meetings, monthly school site council meetings, a tri governmental group, weekly PLCs, etc... However, there is no discussion as to how that data will be shared out and the process for reform revision. The project goals were not a focus of the reported feedback.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The response only included a basic list of 7 ways in which the District will communicate with stakeholders was presented. The list included local news, online surveys, quarterly responses, PLC opportunities, teacher newsletters, etc... This description was vague and the elements of a high quality plan are not documented. No discussion of access for all students, rigorous standards, college and career readiness, or increased graduation rates were mentioned.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>All three levels (PK - 3, 4 - 8, 9 - 12) have at least one grade appropriate health or social-emotional performance goal. No rationale for the selection of measures was provided. No rationale for how timely and formative feedback will inform the proposed plan.</p> <p>Without a provided description of the measures, it is very challenging to evaluate ambitious and achievable goals. The percentage of teachers and principals that are identified in one chart as effective in the baseline data is 65%; however, the 2018 goal is 50%. This does not reflect an ambitious goal and the measure is confusing.</p> | | |
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Not provided.</p> | | |

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 3 |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A chart identifies all funds that will support the project. Only RTTT-D funds are identified. The presented budget chart integrates some vague information. For example, no rationale was provided to explain the number of coaches for each position: 13 math, 12 reading, and 12 instructional coaches, etc... .No rationale is provided to explain why the Take Flight Teaching positions expand over the 4 years and where those positions will serve. 1500 ipads will be purchased each year; however, there is no explanation as to why 1500 was selected as the identified number. On-going costs are also not identified.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 2 |

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Elements of a high quality plan are not provided. No resources for state or local support are discussed. The District outlines that all but the coaching staff will be able to be maintained with no additional funds. However, this is inadequate. No discussion is provided relevant to evaluating improvements; however, gains in each building will be evaluated near the end of the grant to decide which coaching positions remain. No plan for financing those additional coaches is presented.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 4 |

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

A description of a sustainable partnership is provided. Gracemed Health Clinic at Oaklawn and USD 260 and Derby Recreation Commission (DRC) are identified. However, the Gracemed Clinic resources will only be available to the Oaklawn School that has a 92% free and reduced lunch rate. The DRC will provide after school programming to both Oaklawn and Cooper elementary.

The Field Experience described is connected to the personalized learning experiences in the original grant proposal.

The description for capacity is vague. Although school and community partnerships are identified, the specific outline for the decision making infrastructure is lacking. Limited engagement of parents and families is described.

Most of the performance measures are achievable. However, the minutes of physical activity per day for Cooper and Oaklawn do not increase by school over the course of the grant even though the amount of exercise during the after school program does increase to 60 minutes. No rationale is provided to justify this constant.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Not Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The absolute priority was not met. The proposal includes a limited vision of personalized learning in grades PK - 12. The Core Assurances were not thoroughly addressed and were lacking in several of the responses. Limited evidence of turning around the lowest performing schools was presented. The District only discussed addressing the needs of the first poorly performing school. The District briefly discussed retaining and recruiting high quality principals and teachers.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------|
| Total | 210 | 63 |
|--------------|------------|-----------|



Race to the Top - District
Technical Review Form
Application #0188KS-2 for Derby Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 3 |

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Derby Public Schools (DPS) has set an ambitious vision based on a Learner Centered Model (LCM) throughout the entire district. This new model will allow for assessments to shift from being strictly knowledge-based to being competency based. This new model is called "Tracking Success, Nothing Less"

DPS has set forth an ambitious vision built around four core educational areas:

- Assurance 1: Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy.

DPS indicated that it is currently looking for a formal program of assessment specifically written to address the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The applicant indicated that such tool would be very helpful but based on the narrative does not appear to have a plan in place at this time. DPS listed a comprehensive list of summative assessments to be used including assessments aimed at measuring college and career readiness. The district indicated that its standards are aligned to state standards and that it is in the process of becoming aligned with CCS for English Language Arts and Math and to also adopt the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). BDS explained that it is interested in providing students in grades K-5 with scientifically validated career assessments to help students learn about personal interests, skills and work values. The district is also interested in purchasing ACT WorkKeys a job skill assessment system as well as adopting Social, Emotional and Character development Standards to provide schools a framework for integrating social-emotional learning (SEL). Based on the information provided in this section DPS has met Assurance 1.

- Assurance 2: Building data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction.

DPS will implement an assessment system aligned with CCSS in Math and ELA, as well as brief formative and summative assessments in grades (2-12) and observational tasks in grades K-1. A data warehouse would also be built to provide teachers and principals to inform practice by tracking levels of achievement. DPs would also keep using the current Skyward system to communicate with parents about students' grades, activities and progress. In 2010 the district introduced standards based (CCSS) report cards to inform parents on students' progress, the district intends to expand this service for Science and Social Studies. DPS also indicated that Skyward family access and "My 10 Year Plan" will allow families to access updated information on student progress. The planned acquisition of the National student clearinghouse will also provide the district with valuable data about its graduates. Based on the information provided in this section DPAs has met Assurance 2.

- Assurance 3: Recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most.

DPS indicated that teachers get a pay raise every year, that they have a free membership top the Derby Recreation Center and that they provide teachers with competitive salaries and awards. The district explains that it recruits aggressively at Career and College fairs and that every teacher has opportunities to obtain professional development credit. However the district does not provide a strategic plan for recruiting, developing and retaining effective teachers especially where they are needed the most. Based on the evidence provided DPs does not meet assurance 3.

- Assurance 4: Turning around lowest-achieving schools.

DPS describes several initiatives aimed at meeting the needs of students (Take flight for dyslexia, reading coaches, the implementation of a DOD grant and the opportunity project in early childhood education). However, these isolated initiatives do not address how the district intends to turning around lowest achieving schools. Based on the evidence provided DPS does not meet assurance 4.

DPS plans to implement a career academy with well-defined certification opportunities for students to provide greater acceleration of student achievement. The district also plans to add instructional coaches as well as the implementation of project and challenge based learning. DPS also indicates that the district wide career wide assessment system and the district-wide assessment system will assist students in selecting an area of focus to study and a plan of study. DPS presented a wide array of initiatives but did not provide a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement.

DPS describes what learning will look like in Derby Public Schools envisioning that teachers would become facilitators of learning, rote memorization, worksheets and bookwork abandoned and replaced by project and challenged based learning. Students would work on their own technology device experiencing personalized support. All students' needs would be served. DPS's description is interesting but this narrative lacks specific information about the experiences of teachers in this new model.

Overall DPS offers an ambitious but incomplete vision for the future.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 4 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It appears that DPS will be taking a system wide approach for "Tracking Success, Nothing Less", however the applicant did not provide a narrative for this section, it has not demonstrated effectively why it selected all schools in the district that are to participate in RTT-D funded activities. However, the district has listed the schools that would be participating as well as the number of students being served, as well as information about all sub-groups that would be served if RTT-D funding were received. Overall, DPS has presented an incomplete plan for its approach to implementation.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

DPS has developed 5 goals aimed at implementing meaningful reform district-wide. The five goals are centered on specific areas:

Goal 1 focuses on supporting the LEA and community partners in the Derby Public School's program, Tracking Success and nothing more! However the applicant lists many activities that go beyond the scope of the goal and deals with project implementation. The chart provided by the applicant lacks clarity.

Goal 2 focuses on the implementation of individualized plans of study (POS) for every student, the chart provided does not include sufficient information to clearly assess the action plan.

Goal 3 focuses on the implementation of Kansas Career and College Ready Standards. Here again, the chart provided does not include sufficient information to clearly assess the action plan.

Goal 4 focuses on the implementation of improved assessment, here again, the chart provided does not include sufficient information to clearly assess the action plan.

Goal 5 focuses on teacher, principal and superintendent evaluation systems that are tied to student growth. The chart provided does not include sufficient information to clearly assess the action plan.

DPS did not provide a high quality plan. While key goals are presented, a narrative clearly explaining activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the deliverables and the parties responsible for implementing the activities is missing. Overall, DPS has not presented a strong case for LEA-wide reform & change.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 3 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district appears to have set ambitious, yet achievable academic growth on summative assessments (State Assessments ELA and Math, DIBELS, SMI, SRI, NWEA Reading and Math). The district only provided data for students receiving free or reduced lunch, English language learners, and students in special education. The applicant did not

provide data for any subgroups (White, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino. However the applicant does not provide a narrative explaining why it did not provide data subgroups. The district has set ambitious yet achievable goals in its attempt to close the achievement gap, increase high school graduation rate and college enrollment rate. Overall, the district has set mostly achievable LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes; a narrative detailing goals for all groups would have strengthened this section.

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 4 |
| (B)(1) Reviewer Comments: The district presented very limited evidence of reform in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement. The district presented the same set of initiatives as presented in section A1 (Take flight for dyslexia, reading coaches, the implementation of a DOD grant and the opportunity project in early childhood education). The applicant provided some data regarding partnership with TOP (Early childhood education), but the data provided does not appear to be reflective of gains in DPS. Some of the initiatives may improve student learning and graduation rates but the applicant does not provide information about ambition and significant reforms in its persistently lowest achieving schools or low performing schools nor does it provide information about how it makes student performance available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Overall, DPS has presented a very limited record of success. | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| (B)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provided a limited amount of information in this section. A more detailed narrative addressing every subsection would have been useful. Overall the applicant has demonstrated a limited amount of transparency. | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| (B)(3) Reviewer Comments: The district provided very little information in this section. The district briefly discussed Senate bill 155 mandating school districts to maintain an individual career plan of study for each student enrolled in grade 8 through 12 and stated that its own plan is in alignment with the new mandate. The applicant also indicate that the city manager of Derby provided feedback on the application and that the Deputy Secretary of the State of Kansas was involved in the grant application and that Kansas is a local-control state, stating that each district is allowed to decide which programs are best to meet broad state guidelines. However, the applicant has not demonstrated evidence sufficient to earn a high rating in this section. | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 2 |
| (B)(4) Reviewer Comments: DPS discussed a five-year strategic planning project started in 2012 and listed several objectives but did not provide any information about stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal. | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 11 |
| (C)(1) Reviewer Comments: DPS has an ambitious plan to prepare students for College and career, however this plan is not very well articulated. The applicant does not address how its plan would enable students to understand what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. The applicant intends to implement career exploration programs in elementary, middle and high school such goals will allow students to identify and pursue learning and | | |

development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The district plans to assist students in getting more information about opportunities in schools and when they leave school through electronic portfolios serving as academic guides. DPS also plans to continue offering 12 career pathways from five of the six federally identified career clusters. Overall, the district addresses some of the criteria in this section but the lack of clarity in the narrative, the rationale for the activities, the deliverables and the parties responsible for implementing the activities make it an average quality plan.

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

20

7

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

DPS presented an incomplete plan for preparing students for college and careers through teaching and leading.

The district indicated that it intends to improve the quality of the curriculum, assessment and instruction provided in each classroom. However the applicant does not indicate how all-participant educators will be trained to prepare students for college and career, a timeline for training activities is not provided. The district indicated that it intends to develop learning targets and common year-end, semester and unit semester assessments through professional development to serve the needs of students but did not provide a specific rationale, timeline for this initiative. The district also indicated that university representatives will be involved or the parties responsible for providing this training to teachers but a timeline is not provided, the involvement of university personnel is not clearly defined, a clear plan of action does not appear to be in place. The district appears to want to switch instruction to a learner-centered environment but does not have a clear plan in place to adapt content and instruction providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks in response to their academic needs, interests and optimal learning approaches. The applicant intends to rely on e-portfolio to map and measure longitudinal progress across their educational career as well as unit mastery data collected throughout the year. However the applicant does appear to have a high quality plan in place to ensure that educators (other than counselors) know how to use these tools to accelerate student progress towards meeting college-and-career ready graduation requirements. The applicant does not appear to have a plan in place to provide appropriate training regarding the district's teacher evaluation system. The applicant did not provide information about how it intends to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective or highly effective teachers and principals. Overall, the applicant does not appear to have a high quality plan in place for improving learning an teaching since it is lacking timeline, the deliverables and the role of individuals responsible for implementing many of the activities described in this section.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 7 |
| (D)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The district provided appropriate evidence that the school district's leadership team is organized to provide support and services to all schools in the project. The applicant explained that individual schools have autonomy and operational flexibility to implement learning in the best way for the students in each building and cited several policies to support its claim. The applicant indicated that it will give students opportunities to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery once a competency based unit system is adopted, students are already able to finish some courses in one semester. The applicant also stated that it offers a virtual K-12 school offering students opportunities to move through material at their own pace. The district also envisions a plan to make students aware of these options. When it comes to giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways, the district plans to differentiate instruction based on Gardner's theory(1985), this choice appears questionable since there is very little empirical evidence to support it. The applicant presented a strong case for its ability to serve the needs all students, including married students, pregnant students and students who are parents.</p> <p>DPS provided sufficient evidence that a quality plan is in place to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 5 |

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided some evidence that through its school infrastructures it supports personalized learning. The district indicated that it has deployed l pads in grades K-5 in shared carts and that in Fall 2014 all 9-12 grade students will be

issued a MacBook Air laptop they will be able to use at home and at school. The district indicated that it employs ten individuals who provide technical support to the district, this group is also able to troubleshoot issues remotely or in person. However the applicant did not indicate how it will provide technical support to parents or how it will provide access to the necessary content, tools and other learning resources to students, parents and educators out of school. The district provided evidence that the Skyward unified student and finance information system to provide information to parents. However, the applicant does not indicate that it is using interoperable data systems. Overall, DPS presented insufficient evidence to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 3 |
| (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: DPS has not provided a strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The district indicates that it will hire a grant coordinator and data analyst to monitor publicly share information on the progress toward the project goal. However the plan does not include specific information about the rationale for the activities to be undertaken with this plan, a timeline is provided but lacks specificity about the deliverables for such a large project. Overall, the applicant has not provided a high quality plan. | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
| (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: DPS did not present a high quality plan, the description provided lacks information about key goals, rationale for activities undertaken, the timeline, the deliverables and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| (E)(3) Reviewer Comments: DPS has selected ambitious yet achievable performance measures. The rationale provided for selecting each measure makes sense (the applicant described the measure in section A4: State Assessments ELA and Math, DIBELS, SMI, SRI, NWEA Reading and Math, FAFSA application, CTE applicators, health indicator.), the district selected measures starting in the early grades to high school. The district only provided data for students receiving free or reduced lunch, English language learners, and students in special education. The applicant did not provide data for any subgroups (White, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino). The applicant also indicated precisely how it these measures provide rigorous, timely, and formative information tailored to their proposal. However, the applicant indicated that currently 65% of students are taught at a school with effective teacher/principal and indicated that its goal in 2017-18 is to have 50% of students taught at a school with effective teacher/principal. This target goal does not make sense. The applicant also did not provide information about how it plans to review its plan overtime. Overall, the applicant presented an incomplete plan. | | |
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
| (E)(4) Reviewer Comments: Section E4 is not included in the application. | | |

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 3 |
| (F)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |

DPS's budget clearly identifies all funds that will support the project. Based on the evidence provided it appears that the budget is sufficient to support and implement the applicants' proposal. The budget is broken down into categories (personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual, training stipends, other (SUB costs). However, the budget is problematic in several areas, first, the applicant does not justify why it will hire trainers/outside consultants throughout the duration of the project. Second, the applicant does not provide a rationale for the purchase of 2,150 Ipad for teachers and students. The district also fails to provide information about funds and strategies that will be used to ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments. Overall, DPS provided an incomplete budget that is lacking critical information about how it would use RTTD funds.

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

10

2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

DPS provided a very limited plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The district did not indicate if it has been seeking partnerships to sustain project goals beyond the term of the grant. DPS indicated that it would not be able to afford career specialists and coaches after the four years but believes that by that time the staff will be fully trained and the number of coaches could be reduced. Overall, the applicant has not provided a high quality plan for sustainability because key goals, activities to be undertaken, rationale for the activities, timeline, deliverables and the parties responsible for implementing the sustainability of the project's goals are missing from this section.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 4 |

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

DPS described a very interesting program aimed at serving the needs of students at two elementary schools that have over 90 % of students living in poverty and to prepare students at Derby high school for college and career. The second project would establish a non-profit health clinic at one of the elementary school mentioned above. The district also intends to have school personnel assist high school students with filling out FAFSA application. Lastly the district intends to develop and implement a field experience program to provide internships for students in 11th and 12th grade. The district provided population-level desired result for the competitive preference priority but did not provide information for subsections 5 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e). Overall, DPS provided an ambitious but incomplete plan.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Not Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Based on the evidence provided in this application DPS does not meet Absolute priority 1. It does not always meet the needs of all students, it does not systematically increase the effectiveness of educators, it does not expand student access to the most effective educators. Overall, DPS has not met absolute priority 1.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------|
| Total | 210 | 67 |
|--------------|------------|-----------|

Race to the Top - District



Technical Review Form

Application #0188KS-3 for Derby Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 0 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative within the application is extremely choppy lacking in overall coherence, does not present a definitive vision, simply lists off-the-shelf acquisitions that the district seeks to deploy without any sense of integration or alignment with a specific purpose to support the reform goals and offers no evidence of any correlation with the four core educational assurance areas. The quality is very poor and reflects even a basic proof-reading of the application. For example, two letters are inserted out of sequence at the start of the application without explanation. The early reference that the district seeks to learn from a model introduced by a successful district applicant in the earlier Race to the Top District competition was initially inspiring but no supporting language accompanied that assertion which would provide evidence of a meaningful strategy. The narrative includes a large number of typographical and grammatical errors which greatly diminish the quality of the application and is exceptionally distracting. Further, the narrative frequently introduces a number of citations to various authors and research but these references are not integrated into any fulsome explanation of their purpose and they are frequently out of context as a result. The district states on page 9 that it seeks to "implement a formal program of assessment" without ever describing how it intends to achieve the objective. Frequently, the narrative describes an objective with the qualifier "ideally" but fails to ever declare specifically what is part of the proposed plan. An example of this is on page 12 with the statement, "The resources would ideally also include..." The narrative references both the Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium and the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers but never indicates if the district is participating in either. The plan refers to "the former No Child Left Behind system" yet NCLB is obviously still the law. On page 14, a set of items is listed commencing with "b". There is no comment on where "a" is located nor does the list contain a predicate explaining what it is linked with or the purpose, again, reflecting exceptionally poor quality. Appendices are referenced on page 15 yet they are not labeled nor is it possible to locate them in the application. References to random curriculum are included, for instance on page 15 regarding Success 101, but absent any coherent explanation whatsoever resulting in an inchoate plan, at best. In sum, there is no discernable vision from the application nor is any credible approach presented at all that would accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, or increase equity through personalized student support. Finally, the application fails to articulate what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. None of the elements required of the criterion are met.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 4 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) It is inferred from the table that all schools in the district are participating in the plan, though this is not expressly stated. No description whatsoever is included to meet the criterion.</p> <p>(b) The application provides a complete list of participating schools as required.</p> <p>(c) The table included indicates that 6,773 students are participating, 49% are from low-income families, 4,164 are high-need students, and 746 educators are participating as required by the criterion.</p> <p>Overall, the narrative fails to present any description of the approach the district intends to take with regard to implementation.</p> | | |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 0 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application fails to confirm whether or not all there is any room for scalability as it is not clear that all schools within</p> | | |

the district are participating. The plan includes a rough Vision Action Plan, presented as a table, but is absent any qualifying or descriptive narrative to indicate its purpose or how the goals were determined, what they mean or how they are aligned with any overall reform plan. There is no evidence of meaningful reform nor any indication of how the district intends to reach its outcome goals as none are clearly identified in the first place. The application fails to meet the requirements of the criterion.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The information included in the application lacks any coherence whatsoever. There are references to items, for instance "AMOs", without any explanation as to what they mean or why they are even relevant. The methodology for determining growth is incomplete at best. All required subgroups are not addressed in that Hispanic and African American are left out. The table is extremely confusing in that it indicates an 88% baseline, overall, for "State assessments proficiency status or growth" which would be a remarkable starting point if any supporting narrative were included to indicate the origin of the baseline. The baseline score for DIBELS, k-3 in reading for Special Education is 37.4% with a post-grant targeted goal of 90%. Similarly, Free and Reduced Lunch students and ELL students have baselines in the 60% range with a post-grant targeted goal of 90%. This is excessively ambitious and not reasonable. Given the failure to address all subgroups, it is impossible to ascertain any visibility with regard to decreasing achievement gaps. The plan's targets for high school graduation are ambitious yet reasonable. However, the table indicates a SY 2011-12 baseline for Special Education students as 61.5% and a baseline for SY 2012-13 as 85.1% without offering any explanation regarding this unusual variance. Regarding data for college enrollment rates, the narrative explains the lack of meaningful data, that the information known is based on a limited survey, yet goes on to state "it needs to be stated that college enrollment is not a goal for every student." This is inconsistent with stated target goals of an overall college enrollment rate of 85%. Finally, the application includes a table for postsecondary degree attainment indicating a post-grant goal of 50% but fails to provide any evidence with which to judge the extent to which the goal is supported by the district's vision or is aligned with an overall strategy.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 3 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The application emphasizes an intervention program, Take Flight: A Comprehensive Intervention for Students with Dyslexia, that is derived from a successful implementation in Dallas. The narrative does not explain the rationale for why a program designed, ostensibly, for children suffering from dyslexia was selected as appropriate for Derby students who were identified through their having not responded effectively to other district reading interventions. Further, the narrative asserts that data from the intervention indicated success but fails to provide any evidence. The criterion requires evidence of a record of success in the past four years across improvement in student learning outcomes, closing achievement gaps, achieving ambitious and significant reforms in persistently lowest-achieving schools, and making student performance data meaningfully available. As evidence, the application offers Success 101 as one program yet the data only exist for one year therefore not encompassing the four years required, and are incoherently presented both in lack of narrative explanation and with a chart this is difficult to interpret. The application is frustrating in that disparate programs are referenced with varying degrees of explanation. There is ample discussion of the deployment of reading coaches without detail indicating how many schools or participating students are engaged nor any supporting data to provide evidence of the success asserted in several statements. There is a brief reference to cutting edge grant programs without any details to substantiate their impact nor by including any relevant timeframe. Finally, a randomly inserted set of data titled "Pearson Work Sampling System Assessments" is included suggesting extraordinary gains, but lacking any coherent explanation which renders the information as unbelievable.

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
|---|----------|----------|

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application makes minimal effort to comply with the elements of this criterion beyond a simple statement indicating that the financial information is provided on the district website. This falls far short of demonstrating a high level of transparency or of sufficient evidence to support the validity of the assertion.

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 0 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application presents a few incoherent sentences that do not address the requirement of this criterion to demonstrate evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to successfully implement personalized learning environments described in the proposal. In addition to the lack of any evidence regarding autonomy, the application does not provide any description of personalized learning environments with which to evaluate any relevant conditions, had they even been presented.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 2 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It is incredulous to read the narrative reference to a five year strategic plan developed by the district in 2012 yet see no evidence whatsoever in the application as to the details of this plan. The criterion require evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement. The plan presents no supporting documentation or evidence to meet the criterion. There are two letters included with the application, first presented out of sequence and again copied in the appendix. Though the letter from the City Manager is quite supportive and reflects knowledge of her interpretation of the plan, the two letters are not sufficient to rise to the required level of meaningful evidence. Further, the bland statements that "two groups of 25 people" participated in developing a strategic plan do not constitute the necessary description of how students, families, teachers and principals in participating schools were engaged in a process to create the district's plan, as required by the criterion. Finally, the narrative enunciates four objectives resulting from the strategic plan, one of which indicates evidence of an achievement gap, yet data is not presented by sub-group to align with the existing gap nor is any strategic approach to close the gap described. The elements of the criterion are not met.</p> | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 14 |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the application presents the first glimpse of a vision linking an emphasis on career education with successful high school completion that could devolve into a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments, including a brief reference to an envisioned data system supporting all stakeholders which might evolve to meet the criterion for ongoing and regular feedback, and indicating that this strategy will touch every student in the district, the overall narrative remains incomplete and frustratingly incoherent. The narrative continues to jump from one randomly inserted and unexplained point, Learner Centered Model, to another, "Hattie's rankings" without ever drawing a link, explaining the context or why this is relevant to the district's vision. The Learner Centered Model appears to be the foundation of the district's vision but the application never successfully defines what is meant by this model or how it intends to deploy it.</p> <p>On the other hand, the narrative shifts to a coherent section in offering a quality approach through the creation of career academies and a personalized e-portfolio for participating students in grades 6-8 that indicate a strong instructional focus and plan supportive of a personalized sequence of instruction as required by the criterion. There is a rich degree of explanation by grade of expectations, approach and strategies including accommodations for high-need students built around the framework of the e-portfolio. The e-portfolio's design is linked to strong, meaningful stakeholder, parent and student access and is described as being developed by counselors, teacher leaders, career facilitators and technology specialists supported by Race to the Top District investment. There is a stark contrast with this section, its relative coherence, meaningful vision, goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties and the earlier sections of the application. The elements described are ambitious yet achievable and appropriate for each level of learner in support of the district's foundational vision for linking career awareness with an array of successful outcomes consistent with the spirit and expectations of the Race to the Top District competition.</p> <p>While many aspects of the criterion are met, the plan is not thorough in defining how students will come to understand the link to what they are learning with their later success in accomplishing their goals nor is it clear that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure they understand how to use the tools and resources provided, as required by the criterion.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 5 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The plan fails to fully articulate a systemic framework supportive of an effective educator implementation of the model described. Though this might exist, it is not evident in the plan provided. The plan does offer specific ideas for how content and instruction would be adapted to accommodate the new strategy including the support of Instructional Coaches. The plan contemplates ongoing post assessments and post unit assessments but does not describe the level of frequency nor sufficient detail regarding the specific assessments selected. The plan is silent with regard to any principal evaluation system.

(b) Though the narrative paints a picture of tools, data and resources, there is no evidence of actionable information that would assist educators in identifying optimal approaches for individual student academic needs. Further, the plan does not describe specific resources to be deployed beyond generalities. The overall effect is to present a strategy but fails to develop the necessary implementation aspects as required by the criterion. The criterion require specificity and this is lacking throughout the plan. While the e-portfolio is clearly a digital resource, the plan never demonstrates what the portfolio consists of or the design of its format making it difficult to evaluate against the criterion's requirement for high-quality learning resources.

(c) The plan is augmented by the introduction of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) which are fully described and offer an excellent approach to ensure the flow of student information among educators linked with the e-portfolio. While the plan infers that training, policies, tools, data and resources are available to educators, the elements are not completely identified consistent with the requirements of this criterion. The district is re-evaluating its teacher evaluation system and the plan does not offer any specific detail as to what is contemplated going forward. The plan does offer assertion of professional development support in the form of traditional presentations, work in the classroom, planning, observation and feedback but fails to reach the level of high quality through its lack of detail.

(d) The application fails to address any approach to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers as required by the criterion.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 0 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The narrative refers to elements without defining them which makes it difficult to evaluate against the criterion. For example, the plan refers to "The Curriculum Department at USD 260" but does not indicate what this is, where it is located within the district, or how it supports the governance structure relative to the plan's objectives. "Meaningful support" for teachers is ascribed to this unit but specifics are missing. The plan is soft in elaborating how the LEA central office structure and envisioned staff of a Program Manager and Data Assistant will facilitate personalized learning.

(b) The narrative fails to meet the criterion for providing evidence of a high-quality plan to provide school leadership teams with sufficient flexibility and autonomy. The plan offers reference to a few incoherent existing policies none of which address schedules, calendars, personnel decisions, staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets, as required by the criterion.

(c) The plan is weak in addressing the requirements for this criterion. Though vague assertions are made that students have the ability to advance in ways not linked to time-in-seat, no specificity is included. The narrative admits that few students are aware of the available tools regarding the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery and not the amount of time spent on a topic but fails to describe how the district will remedy the situation through its proposal.

(d) The plan fails to address the criterion

(e) The plan presents a list of incoherent programs suggesting that they meet the criterion but failing to specifically address which are resources adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. No information is offered with regard to instructional practices.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| (D)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>(a) Through the use of available technology, the district assures that all participating students grades 6-12 have access to necessary content, tools and other resources in and out of school in compliance with the criterion. For students in grades k-5, the district utilizes iPad carts which provide access during the school day but not necessarily outside of school. The district relies on the cloud to enable parents, educators and students to access tools out of school but does not indicate the penetration level for numbers of families that have access to the internet at home.</p> <p>(b) The narrative addresses technical support access for educators and for students but does not speak to any support for parents or other stakeholders as required by the criterion.</p> <p>(c) The plan briefly speaks to how information technology systems can be used by parents and students to export information as well as to enable data use in other systems such as Google Apps and Skyward generally meeting the requirements of the criterion.</p> <p>(d) The plan is silent in assuring that schools use interoperable data systems.</p> | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 2 |
| (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The application fails to present a high-quality plan defining the elements of a rigorous continuous improvement process. Though the existing framework of monthly school board meetings and School Site Council meetings can be considered a passive format for information feedback, the plan does not strengthen these statements in fact with any propose structural evidence to support consistent, timely feedback as required by this criterion. Moreover, the plan does not address at all how ongoing corrections and improvements might be made during and after the grant. The plan is also silent with regard to how the district intends to monitor, measure and publicly share information as required by the criterion.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
| (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The application does not provide a high-quality plan that addresses the implementation of ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| (E)(3) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The application fails to include all subgroups. Hispanic and African American subgroups are not included, nor is there any explanation if a valid exception exists to justify the exclusion, therefore not complying with the overall applicable population performance measure for all students. The application does provide the required information for all participating students including subgroups for free and reduced lunch, ELL and special education.</p> <p>The plan includes more than 12 performance measures as required by the criterion. These measures comply with each requirement by population grade sub-category as necessary according to the criterion.</p> <p>(a) The plan is silent with regard to any narrative explaining the rationale for why a performance measure was selected, as required by the criterion.</p> <p>(b) The plan fails to address how the performance measures will be used to provide timely, rigorous and formative leading information.</p> <p>(c) The plan does not address how measures will be reviewed and improved if they are insufficient to gage implementation progress.</p> <p>The proposed performance measures are ambitious yet the overall lack of quality in expressing a coherent plan provokes concern regarding the likelihood that the goals are achievable. In the aggregate, the plan does not meet the requirement for high-quality through its lack of specificity and by not complying with the elements required by the criterion.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
| (E)(4) Reviewer Comments: The plan is completely silent in responding to this criterion. | | |

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| (F)(1) Reviewer Comments: <p>(a) The application successfully identifies all funds that will support the project. It is stated that only funds generated from Race to the Top District will be used.</p> <p>(b) The budget charts alone are presented with limited narrative in explaining the various line items. The budget calls for an identical salary amount for all relevant personnel including the Grant Manager, Data Analyst, Career Specialists, Take Flight Teachers, Instructional Coaches, Math Coaches and Reading Coaches though it would seem the qualifications for these positions would vary considerably resulting in a differentiated amount. This is not addressed either by explaining the commonality or indicating the rationale behind the figures. The use of iPads and laptops is a central aspect of the proposal yet the quantities identified in the budget fail to address why 650 iPads are needed for teachers when 743 are participating in the proposal or why 1500 iPads are needed for elementary students. Justification or rationale for the equipment levels is completely missing.</p> <p>(c) The plan is silent with regard to a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities, does not indicate that any fund sources exist beyond Race to the Top District funds, but does indicate, were applicable, when one-time investments are made versus those that will be used for ongoing operating costs.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 0 |
| (F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The application provides a few sentences in response to this criterion and does not present a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. There is no indication of support from State and government leaders, how the district might evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget nor any narrative that would comply with the requirements of this criterion. | | |

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 5 |
| Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The district has identified two important areas, extreme poverty in two district elementary schools, and to develop interactive programs at the high school level in support of college and career readiness, upon which to focus its energies aligned with existing or proposed partnerships consistent with the requirements of the Competitive Preference Priority. The plan presents a reasonably coherent description of proposed partnerships with the USD 260, Derby Recreational Commission Collaborative After School Program and Gracemed Health Clinic at Oaklawn as well as district staffed proposed projects to enhance FAFSA completion rates and to create a field experience program. Further, the application presents 8 performance measures in which to track success and to identify ambitious yet attainable goals. These goals are identified by population and include both family supports and educational results. The annual performance measures are all reasonable and ambitious, with the exception for the dramatic jump anticipated between SY 2014-15 and SY 2015-16 for the number of graduates who completed at least one job experience which seems excessive and unattainable. The narrative falls short in addressing how the partnerships would integrate education and other services as required or in responding to any of the requirements for building capacity of staff in participating schools beyond indicating that two | | |

Career Specialists would be hired to implement the field experience program.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Not Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

With regret, the application presented by the Derby Public Schools fails to coherently and comprehensively address how it would build upon the core educational assurance areas. While there is a reasonable level of discussion regarding an emphasis on college and career ready objectives, the plan is not specific with regard to standards and assessments nor is the notion of preparing students for global competition ever addressed. The plan vaguely alludes to data management systems, does not address a strategy for increasing the number of effective and highly effective teachers, nor does the plan ever address specific strategies for turning around lowest achieving schools. There are enormous gaps in the plan that leave out entire chunks of what is required of this competition, as reflected in the substantial reduction in points across a number of sections. What is presented is poorly written in most every aspect, lacks accuracy, and, above all, coherence in any meaningful way. There is no discussion for how to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning or how to decrease achievement gaps. Even more damaging is the complete lack of data for required subgroups necessary to evaluate the achievement gap situation in Derby. The plan is disappointing, inadequate and not sufficient to merit inclusion in this competition.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------|
| Total | 210 | 47 |
|--------------|------------|-----------|