



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0243KY-1 for Grant County Board of Education

### 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>

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has set forth a reform vision of how students are educated across the Consortium through the development and implementation of the E=MC<sup>2</sup> project. The vision is clearly aligned with the core educational assurance areas and will address the learning needs of kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade students by reforming the traditional classroom model. The E=MC<sup>2</sup> project seeks to prepare students for college and career readiness by creating classrooms that specialize in mass customizations. Customized classrooms will likely meet the needs of students that have normally struggled with whole group direct instruction.

The application describes a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support. For example, the research provided states that the students in another test group showed gains of an additional half-year of student growth. If the applicant is able to achieve similar success rates, students performing below grade level will have the opportunity to catch up while students who are performing at or above grade level should be able to excel. Factors that make the vision is achievable is that it builds upon current data systems; has curriculum alignment with Common Core Standards and Next Generation Science Standards ; and has built in supports for teachers. Utilizing the various assessments such as Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-Prep), Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology Systems (CITTS), should provide the applicant with information to affect individual student growth. The CITTS will be an integral component in customization strategies used in teacher planning and providing other key resources. By providing 116 hours of ongoing professional learning at each school site teachers are likely to be able to implement the program with fidelity.

The applicant provides a vivid description of a middle school math class. The reformed classroom seemingly departs from the traditional look and current methods of teaching. Student learning should be paramount as teachers will tailor instruction to the interests, learning styles and academic achievement of each student. By departing from the common lecture-based large group instruction, the applicant has the potential to address the students' needs on an individual basis.

The applicant scored in the high range for this section.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The proposal outlines a general description of how the schools were selected to participate. The description of the participating districts is conflicting. For example, the applicant states that there are five LEAs forming the consortium, but lists only four districts which are Anchorage Independent, Eminence Independent, Franklin County School District and Grant County Public Schools. A total of twenty two schools, sixteen of which have been identified as "needs improvement" according to the Kentucky Department of Education will participate in the proposed program. The applicant does not fully explain the determining factors for selecting the participating schools, only states that the consortium members all expressed interest in the curricular redesign method of mass customization and committed to a scaled approach that would incorporate all of their students from pre-kindergarten to high school.

LEAs and schools which will be involved in the reform efforts are clearly outlined in the grant proposal. The proposal includes a list of all of the participating schools. All elementary, middle, and high schools were chosen to participate in the

initiative and 100% of all students at each school will participate in this reform.

The consortium will serve 25,372 students in grades pre-kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade. Most students being served through this grant proposal attend schools that are classified as "needs improvement" according to the Kentucky Department of Education. According to the applicant 84% of the students are high-need students and 51% are from low-income families. These statistics meet the criteria as defined in the notice, but more importantly demonstrate a need to implement forward thinking strategies to address the academic shortfalls these students will face.

The applicant scored in the medium range for this section.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The proposal provides a broad description of the three phases of the reform initiative to be implemented. These three phases allow for the students to progressively be exposed to the expectations of learning through the mass customization format. By the time the students graduate from high school, all students will have been taught math using the mass customization methods.

Additional information regarding the LEA-wide reform is needed. Full credit could not be awarded for this section as it lacks detail to fully explain how the proposed plan will lead to reform and change. The applicant scored in the low range for this section.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The applicant has provided basic tables to illustrate performance on summative assessments, reducing achievement gaps, increasing graduation rates, and college enrollment. The applicant seeks to increase graduation rates and college enrollment by 3% and 5% respectively per year at each school.

The applicant does not disaggregate data based on the subgroups tested other than the subsidized meals and total population. In addition, the applicant states that data for the 2012-2013 school year was not released prior to grant submission. The information provided appears to be contradictory, as the 2012-2013 data is mentioned as its evidence for demonstrating a track record of success. The applicant did not provide sufficient information to determine if LEA-wide goals are ambitious or achievable without making assumptions regarding the data not provided. It cannot be ascertained if the goals are ambitious or achievable for each participating school or district with summative assessments and decreasing achievement gaps. The applicant scored in the low range for this 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>6</b>

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

The narrative does not strongly articulate a clear track record of success. The examples provided are not based on consistent information. The narrative provided indicates student learning outcomes have improved in some areas. The applicant has clearly demonstrated that each district has achieved pockets of success as measured using a variety of indicators. For example, the Eminence Independent Schools reported and increase of 16 percentage points in college enrollment while Anchorage Independent Schools have earned the classification of "Distinguished".

It is hard to determine the success in efforts of student learning outcomes and closing the achievement gaps based on the information provided. The applicant does not supply pertinent information as it relates to standardized testing, graduation rates and college entrance for each of the participating LEAs. Furthermore, the applicant does not specify the timeframe it took the schools mentioned in the narrative to reach the levels of success that is boasted. It cannot be ascertained if the accomplishments happened within one, four or more years. Additionally, it cannot be ascertained if student achievement has occurred in all subgroups as it relates in grades 3-12 based upon the criteria for this section. Data displayed in a chart

or a table relaying this information could have been helpful. The applicant fails to clearly articulate its ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools.

The districts provide student data to parents and students through its Infinite Campus portal which can also be accessed using a mobile device. Using this system will allow students and parents to access to such information as their individual learning plan (ILP), attendance, disciplinary incidents, grades and assessment scores. Students are also able to use Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System to manage assignments. Teachers use CIITS to allow teachers to view content they have assigned. The applicant does not clearly demonstrate how parents will be able to receive data through methods other than using technology. There is not a contingency plan given for parents who are not technologically savvy or have the means to access the data electronically which may become an issue making sure that parents are informed and able to participate in ensuring that their children are performing to the best of their abilities. This is important as parents may not be fully informed on the needs of their children and will not be able to provide additional assistance to their children.

The applicant scored in the low-medium range for this section.

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

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

The plan outlines the strategies that are used to increase transparency in the LEA processes, practices and investments, the applicant indicates that each LEA in the consortium makes public, all personnel salaries and all school level expenditures through Kentucky's open record request process. In addition, the applicant reports salaries for district leadership, school administrators, teachers, and other school level instructional staff through a region-wide Salary and Wage Report published by the Ohio Valley Education Cooperative, which is available on the Cooperative's website. This document is available publically on the Cooperative's website. In addition, the annually released *Kentucky District Data Profiles*, allows stakeholders to contrast districts' expenditures with other districts in the state.

The applicant scored in the high range for this section.

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The narrative provides some evidence of the applicant being able to exercise autonomy under the Kentucky's District of Innovation statute, KRS 156.108. This statute would allow the districts the opportunity to apply to the Kentucky Board of Education for exemption from certain administrative regulations and statutory provisions in an effort to improve the learning of students.

It is not clearly evident that the applicant has sufficient conditions and autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in this proposal. The new evaluation system is not thoroughly explained. It cannot be ascertained how this instrument will assist in improving teacher performance by placing them on a type of improvement plan or how the district administrators will be able to remove ineffective teachers. In addition, the applicant does not expound upon how it will take advantage of the aforementioned statute that allows for exemptions administrative regulations other than providing flexible dates for end-of -course testing. The applicant fails to justify how flexibility with teacher accountability will increase autonomy or lead to successful conditions.

Evidence provided for this section earns a low-medium score.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The applicant has garnered strong support for the proposal as evidenced by 90% of teachers approving the proposal. The proposal has been extended beyond 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students in mass customization in the classroom to include primary classes because of strong support from primary teachers.

Support for the proposed project is not clearly demonstrated for all stakeholders. The letters of support appear to be templates. The proposal lacks having valid letters of support by IHEs, local industries, and head start agencies. Although there is strong evidence of trying to gain teacher buy-in, the applicant fails to demonstrate how other key stakeholders such as principals, families and students were engaged in the development of the proposal

The lack of evidence for support reduces the score for this section to the low range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>

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

The applicant has provided an adequate plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students with the support to graduate and be ready to pursue rigorous study and accelerate according to need. The applicant proposes a mass customization classroom model for early childhood to high school classrooms. These classrooms will be technologically equipped learning spaces divided into multiple learning stations, in which the teachers will use multiple instructional strategies. The strategies listed in the narrative include using:

- students’ activities, interests, opinions, preferred learning styles, academic needs, and academic/career goals;
- CCSS and the Next Generation Science Standards;
- effective learning strategies conducive to customization; and
- high-quality digital content.

The proposal's success relies heavily cultures of student responsibility in which the students take major ownership in their learning. The applicant will incorporate training such as the Leader in Me series to assist students in developing a stronger sense of responsibility.

Identifying and pursuing learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards is clearly evidenced. Mass customized classrooms will be designed to provide weekly or daily reminders of students learning and development goals. The middle and high school teachers will utilize students’ individual learning plans (ILPs)—which indicate college-and-career interests—to inform the work of customization and connect coursework with students’ long-term plans. In doing so, students will have a real-world connection to the learning happening each day in the classroom and will gain perspectives to motivate and deepen their learning.

The applicant clearly demonstrates a variety of high-quality instructional approaches. Each day, students will attend their math classes and will participate in a variety of instructional approaches customize their learning needs. Instructional approaches can include small group instruction, cooperative learning, manipulatives, online tutoring for non-mastered content, learning through gaming and completing high school math courses through online curriculum. However, there is concern that the student teacher ratios in the classrooms will not be beneficial for students with disabilities or ELL students.

Edgenuity and Khan Academy are two examples of the high quality digital content that will be used in the proposed program.

Other than the Leader in Me series, no other influences are provided to support helping students understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. Although the plan states that parents will have the ability to access the ILPs and the Infinite Campus data portal to view grades, it does not indicate the parents' role in assisting the students to understand that what they are learning is key to them accomplishing their goals. In addition, the proposal does not clearly communicate how the strategies are specific to high-need students.

Students will receive feedback and recommendations on a daily basis under the proposed program. However, the applicant does not clearly articulate how this feedback addresses the students' progress to being college and career ready.

The mechanisms for providing training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning is not clearly explained.

The applicant scored in the medium range in this section.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

The applicant outlines a high quality plan for improving teaching and leading by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. By incorporating a series of workshops and other professional learning opportunities, it appears that the applicant has built an adequate strategy for professional development and support. Professional learning will focus on the following strategy bands such as cooperative learning, metacognition, manipulatives, action research, and digital learning which should be integral in providing quality instruction and promoting student growth. Providing on-going support through periodic professional development and access to teacher leaders are likely to increase the fidelity of implementation of the program. For example, teachers will be provided ongoing instructional support every four weeks by receiving a half-day coaching visit from the instructional design team and in house teacher leaders will be tasked with taking cohorts of three teachers (per teacher leader) through a semester long intensive on school culture strategies; lead in book studies and model lessons in classrooms as a means of providing extra support. These supports will likely assist teachers who may be struggling with the proposal's concept and need more support than the six instructional days.

The plan outlines measures used to monitor student progress toward meeting college and career readiness standards. Examples of tools that will provide actionable information that will enable teachers to respond to individual student academic needs include: K-PREP, the state's assessment system; ACT-assessments, including PLAN, EXPLORE, and ACT tests; interim assessments aligned to standards, such as MAP) or common assessments aligned to standards

The evaluation of principals and teachers within the Consortium is guided by the Kentucky Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES). The system includes of multiple measures of student growth and achievement as well as components to measure leadership, professionalism, instruction, learning climate and assessment practices. The process is likely to provide thorough and effective evaluations which will yield feedback can be utilized to collaboratively develop plans and strategies to address any identified deficiencies or weaknesses.

The applicant provides a limited plan to ensure that all participating educators (as defined in this notice) have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

Opportunities for technical support utilizing the CIITS resource will be provided during the instructional design days. It is uncertain how much time can truly be devoted to technical support as the instructional design days appear to be heavily scheduled with providing professional learning opportunities with the strategy bands for customizing the classrooms and participating in book studies. Although most teachers have more than likely accessed this system on numerous occasions, it is unclear how the applicant will address the needs of new teachers or teachers having difficulty learning the new components of the system being added to accommodate the proposed program.

The applicant does not have a high-quality plan in place for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

The applicant scored in the medium range in this section.

**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>7</b>

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

The applicant presents a limited plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies. The proposal outlines the challenges that will occur as a result in implementing the E=MC<sup>2</sup> project. The LEAs and schools will need to exercise more flexibility in regards to scheduling to ensure that teams are able to teach together, students are grouped accordingly to allow for the appropriate pace of acceleration and classes have the proper setting for the various learning stations.

The applicant vaguely addresses the project governance. The lead LEA and its board of directors will be for key such as staffing, contracting, managing finances, and submitting reports. The Superintendents Advisory Council will advise the

project director in project management activities. The applicant states that its governance structure will ensure fidelity, efficiency, autonomy and flexibility, but provides limited details to support this statement. The roles and responsibilities of lead and partner districts are not clearly outlined and should allow for successful implementation of the proposed program.

Although the plan provides students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, the applicant does not convey that it will provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. The applicant fails to address how it will make accommodations for students with disabilities and Limited English Proficiency.

The applicant scored in the medium range in this section.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

The applicant does not present a high quality plan to support project implementation through district and school infrastructure. Money has been allocated to increase the adequacy for the participating schools infrastructure. It is not evident that the applicant completed a study to determine if all of the schools will require the same allotment or is it certain if the applicant plans to consolidate other funding to assist with bringing the schools' infrastructure up to par.

The applicant currently has systems in place that allow participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders to have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the proposal. Students and parents/guardians are encouraged to utilize Infinite Campus to monitor student information and progress while teachers can store, process, and manage student data and other educational resources through CIITS. The applicant does not provide a contingency plan to address how low-income families without internet or smart phone technology will be able to access Infinite Campus. Furthermore, there is not a plan to ensure that students, parents and educators have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies.

Infinite Campus Inc. manages the Kentucky Student Information System (KSIS) which uses interoperable data systems in the participating schools and districts.

The applicant scored in the low medium range in this section.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant outlines a broad plan for a continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements. Students will be assessed multiple times throughout the school year to measure their progress. Testing includes a computer adaptive test given quarterly as well as the end-of-year assessment. The proposed project will be evaluated using quantitative and qualitative methods. The applicant does not address its plan for regular feedback. The lead LEA, superintendents' advisory council, and the project director plans address the concerns of stakeholders as identified in annual focus groups, but it is uncertain if the applicant will be able to sufficiently handle concerns with such infrequent follow up. It is unclear how the evaluation will address each LEA's program implementation, details of the extent to which the project is progressing toward meeting annual goals, the extent to which the project is being implemented with fidelity, and feedback from stakeholders. As the proposal is written, it appears that the applicant will only prepare annual reports which cause major concerns regarding the applicant's ability to address crucial concerns that may occur during the year.

The applicant scored in the low medium range in this section.

<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant fails to provide a high quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external

stakeholders. The applicant does not provide key details regarding communication and engagement. There is not a defined timeline for the plan nor are responsibilities clearly addressed. The section could have been strengthened by detailing a plan that includes the rollout of the proposed project to stakeholders; established clearly defined goals and objectives provide support that would be made available principals and parents. In addition, it is not evident how the participating LEAs will communicate concerns or share successes with all stakeholders.

The applicant scored in the low range in this section.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**  
 Full points could not be awarded for this section as key data points were not included in the projected growth tables. The applicant fails to provide any data as it relates to highly effective teachers and principals. Baseline data was not provided for participating students in prekindergarten through third grade, students in grades 4-8 or high school students. Without this key information, it cannot be determined if the provided performance measures are ambitious or achievable for any group. The rationale for the performance measures are not given.

The applicant scored in the low range in this section.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
--	----------	----------

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**  
 A limited plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the RTTD funded activities is provided. The applicant will hire an external evaluation firm to provide formative and summative evaluations of the project. The plan outlines the criteria for hiring the external evaluator, but fails to provide relevant details regarding clear processes for internally evaluating the program.

The applicant scored in the low range in 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>6</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**  
 A budget narrative is not included in the proposal. The applicant fails to provide information to justify awarding full points for this section. All funds that will support this project other than grant funding are not known.

The applicant provides a yearly cost description for the investments and priorities of grant funds that will be used to support the implementation of the proposal. The budget appears to be reasonable to support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal. The project will concentrate its efforts on creating mass customization classrooms focusing on mathematics for students in pre-kindergarten to 12<sup>th</sup> grade. With a total four-year project cost request of \$24,998,181, this amounts to approximately \$985 in annual program costs, per student participant. The total cost is also inclusive of the following defined line items: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractuals, training stipends and indirect costs.

The applicant scored in the low medium range in this section.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant provides a broad outline to sustain the proposal beyond the grant award period. The proposal states that " the project

gradually shifts the burden of implementation to participating districts." Districts will be responsible for continued professional development of faculty. The plan lacks details of how districts who may be struggling with performance or financially will be able to sustain the project. Vetting and recommending resources for struggling districts does not ensure that this proposed project will be sustainable. The applicant fails to provide possible revenue streams to assist with replacing outdated hardware and software which will be a major component of the program.

The applicant scored in the low medium range in this section.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b>		
The applicant did not address the Competitive Preference Priority explicitly nor did the applicant provide evidence of the priority throughout the proposal. No points were awarded.		

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b>		
The applicant fails to clearly demonstrate that it meets the criteria to be awarded Absolute Priority points. Although the applicant seeks to introduce customized classrooms in the participating schools, the proposal does not outline a well-defined plan to personalize learning. In addition, it lacks detail to fully explain how the proposed plan will lead to reform and change. The applicant vaguely describes the phases of implementation of the customized classrooms in math classes only. The proposal provides broad-sweeping statements about what a personalized learning atmosphere will most likely look like, but fails to clearly detail how the customization process will clearly address the needs of students with disabilities and ELL students. There is no clear description of how participating schools were selected or an established plan to scale up the proposed plan. The plan lack a solid sustainability plan and lacked evidence of strong partnerships. The teaching practices illustrated in the plan reflect sound practices and theory but did not provide any innovative instructional approaches.		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>99</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0243KY-2 for Grant County Board of Education

### 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>Selection Criteria (A)(1) – Vision: Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision.</p> <p>The Grant County Public Schools and other LEAs does not clearly specify and articulate a clear and comprehensive reform vision. The applicant includes some support evidence that supports the overarching vision of school reform. The applicant states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The applicant mentions all four of the components defined by the "Core Educational Assurance Areas." However, the applicant neglected to go explicitly detail all of the components. The applicant shared that the districts followed the CCSS and shared their participation of grades 3-grade 8 in a state assessment aligned to the CCSS. The LEAs have system that monitors student performance. Employees have access to data and resources through this system. The LEAs have a program they use to bolster teacher recruitment and a plan to retain teachers. The applicant provides limited information/data as it relates to the correlation between the customized approach to learning and increasing student achievement. The applicant shared that 16 of the 22 schools were identified as a "needs improvement" school. However, not enough information was detailed in this section to highlight how student performance will increase.</li> <li>b. The applicant shares some information related to the development of the “E=MC2” program designed to support student achievement by differentiating the learning to meet the needs of individual learners. It mentions the goal to close the achievement gap though customization. However, details to close the achievement gap was not shared.</li> <li>c. The applicant described some components of the aspects of the classroom. The reader could clearly visualize the learning environment. However, the reader questions whether this learning environment will truly meet the needs of diverse learners. Additional elaboration needed.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, this section scored in the lower-middle range for this section. Although the applicant provided an overview, they were not explicit regarding all of the areas. The applicant shared a vision of an individualized learning experience that supports the needs of all learner. However, the vision is reflective of common practices that do or should occur in classes on a daily basis (not to this scale).</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Selection Criteria (A)(2) – Vision: Applicant’s approach to implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The applicant shared that the LEAs agreed that mass implementation, from Kindergarten - 12, for the customization classroom program. However, the applicant did not provide details as it relates to the exact process used in this selection/identification.</li> <li>b. The applicant clearly outlined and named the school districts that would be participating in this project. The 22 schools in the LEA were identified and named. There were 16 schools that were identified as the schools categorized as a needs improvement school by the state.</li> <li>c. The applicant shared the total number of participating students, the percentage and actual number of students who are FARMS eligible (low-income), and the specific number of participating educators. Although the applicant</li> </ul>		

shared the number of participating educators, more detailed information regarding how many participants per LEA would be beneficial. The applicant also shares the exact number of students who are participating and who fall into the high-need status.

An upgrade would be for the applicant to identify a clear process used to select the schools not only criteria for selection.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

Selection Criteria (A)(3) – Vision: LEA-wide reform and change.

a. The applicant described opportunities for "planned work" and "intended results." The was shared in the form of a bulleted diagram. The applicant did not explicitly share how this program will be "scale-up."

b. The applicant explicitly shared specific information pertaining to each school and LEA represented in this application.

Although the applicant explained with whom they would share the plan, they neglected to share how it translated into meaningful reform to support schools organization outside of the consortium of schools. The applicant failed to share how the scaling-up of this project would assist the applicant in reaching an overarching goal. The applicant did not make an explicit connection between the scaling-up of the project and how scaling-up would support goal attainment.

Overall, the applicant scored in the lower middle range for this section. An upgrade would include the applicant explicitly sharing how this project will meet the need of the participants and others outside of the participant pool. The applicant needs to be more specific regarding how the aspects of this project will be shared, the targeted audiences within each organization mentioned above, and the ideal vision related to district-wide transformation.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

Selection Criteria (A)(4) – Vision: LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes

a. The applicant conveys achievable goals yet not necessarily ambitious. The applicant did not provide a specific rationale for why the yearly target values were selected. For example, the Algebra target went from 35% (2013-2014) to 41% (2014-2015) to 52% (2015-2016) to 59% (2016-2017) to 70% (2017-2018). The interval values are not consistent nor do they show a pattern of growth. Therefore, the quantitative goals selected did not reflect clarity. The applicant conveys the reform efforts to increase student achievement but, only selected math as a goal area.

b. The applicant noted that the goal is to decrease the achievement gap by 50% from 10% to 5%. However, the lack of information or rationale determining why those targets were identified was not shared.

c. The applicant identified reasonable and somewhat ambitious goals as evidenced by the quantitative values shared as projected benchmark goals. The applicant only shared the outcomes of the LEAs as a composite but, neglected to identify specific subgroups within each LEA. The applicant did not outline the specific attention that would be given to closing the achievement gap. Each LEA identified incremental increases of 3% per year, from 2014 - 2018 for graduation rates. However, The lag data was insufficient and only reflected the 2011-2012 SY. The applicant shared that the 2012-2013 graduation rate data was "pending state release."

d. The applicant identified reasonable yet achievable goals for entering college of the years of the grant and the post-grant year. Once again, the applicant neglected to provide enough information to determine if the proposed benchmark trajectory is appropriate or achievable. The applicant did not add data to reflect the goals for specific demographic groups.

An upgrade would include the applicant explicitly sharing how this project will long-range goal attainment. There was not enough evidence to support that district-wide reform would occur. The data points for the sub-groups shared was not enough data to support student achievement for all groups.

**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>9</b>

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

Selection Criteria (B)(1) – Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform: Demonstrating a clear track record of success.

- a. The applicant described how the LEAs within the consortium raised student achievement on various benchmarks. The applicant shared specific schools that demonstrated increased student performance. However, increased specificity would have assisted the reader to determine which student groups made the significant gains.
- b. The applicant does not clearly identify “persistently low-performing” schools. The applicant provided some information related to achievement but, lacked specifics that outlined reforms. Data chart reflecting the student achievement gains of the students. However, a specific number of students at each grade level were not provided in the chart. As a result, there is not a clear understanding as to the impact the intervention had on the student population at large. The applicant did not include any evidence of student performance sustainability as a result of reform and response to intervention.
- c. The applicant casually shared that data is available “24/7.” The applicant shared that state and district data can be retrieved through a technology system. The parents are able to retrieve student performance data through a specific portal design to increase parent access. The applicant needed to provide concrete examples of the reciprocal approach to the communication process.

Overall, the applicant scored in the middle range for this section.

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

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

Selection Criteria (B)(2) – Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform: Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.

The applicant shared that the instructional staff salaries is reported in the Salary and Wage report and the other salaries for the Cooperatives can be found on the website.

The applicant shared that all expenditures are reported and shared with the public. However, explicit information was not provided. A sample of this data would have been helpful.

Overall, the applicant scored in the low range for this section. The applicant did provide the website to review. An upgrade would be to share how the school/LEA shares information with all stakeholders related to school finances. The applicant did not share how LEA finances are shared with actual school-level personnel.

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

Selection Criteria (B)(3) – Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform: State context for implementation.

The applicant reflection provided some information related to the details regarding implementation and state support.

- 1. The applicant clearly states that the state is in support of the E=MC2 project implementation.
- 2. State Evaluation System – The application provided more detailed information related to the Professional Growth

Evaluation System and Kentucky's District of Innovation Statute, KRS 156.108. As a result this is evidence of autonomy. The applicant shared how this evaluation system is an effort to improve administration and provided a moderate description of how this will manifest for student learning. However, the applicant did not provide details to ensure teacher needs are being met.

Overall, the applicant scored in the low range for this section. The applicant did not provide any information related to the personalized learning environments for each LEAs. The applicant needs to provide a better explanation as to how the duplication of student data will support the individual evaluation of staff assigned to the multi-staffed classroom. The reader needs to know how the duplicated student data will reflect on individual staff evaluations.

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

**15**

**6**

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

Selection Criteria (B)(4) – Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform: Stakeholder engagement and support.

1. The applicant described specific comments/quotes from members of all of the LEAs interested in implementing the project. The applicant neglected to share how they received the information from the stakeholders. However, samples of the direct quotes from some elementary teachers and students were added.
2. Most members of the interested LEAs, voted yes to move forward with this project. The applicant shared that 451 out of 500 stakeholders agreed to move forward with this proposal. The applicant provided a data chart reflecting a number individuals who supported the proposal.
3. The evidence that parents supported the proposal was stated but, the evidence was not available. The selection criteria requires that the applicant provide evidence in the form of letters of support from parents and there was no evidence to support the statement.
4. The applicant shared that four stakeholders (organizations) committed to supporting the project.
  - Various Universities (The applicant did provide specific names of the universities)
  - Local industries

Overall, the applicant scored in the lower range for this section. An upgrade would include the applicant explicitly sharing how stakeholders contributed to the development of the proposal and include evidence of this engagement. Although feedback from student stakeholders was shared, the applicant did not provide enough information reflecting the number of students in the student focus group. Therefore, the validity of their feedback may not provide an accurate reflection of stakeholder input.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9</b>

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

Selection Criteria (C)(1) –Learning: An approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner.

The applicant attempted to convey how the plan will support all tenets outlined in the *Learning* selection criteria.

- 1a. The applicant did not clearly convey a specific trajectory that identified specific learning goals with clarity. The applicant shared that providing students with opportunities to work in Mass Customization Classrooms (MCC's), will enhance student learning and expose students to higher level thinking and provide students with a foundation for college and career readiness. The applicant attempted to make a connection to MCC and students identifying a

learning style. The applicant mentioned that students were to learn "respect, understand, and cooperate with classmates." However, more detailed programming information is needed. No graduation information provided.

1b. The applicant shared diverse approaches to teaching and learning lifted from the effect-size research of John Hattie's Visible Learning. However, many of these practices are considered daily instructional strategies that are regularly implemented in classes. The applicant shared that this approach would support students in becoming career and college ready. The applicant did not detail the exact prerequisite skills/work needed to move on this trajectory.

1c. The applicant makes reference to parent and student stakeholders having access to student performance data. The applicant provides minimal information related to the use of formative assessments to guide the individualized learning environment. The applicant shared the importance of involving the parent stakeholders in the implementation plan yet does not provide specific information related to their involvement.

Overall, the scored in the low range for this section. An upgrade would be to include:

- Provide clarity regarding the role of students in their learning
- Describe the specific connections between the program proposal and career and college readiness.
- Provide how the plan will provide differentiated support for the success of all students.

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

**20**

**12**

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

Selection Criteria (C)(2) –Teaching and Leading: An approach to teaching and leading that helps educators (as defined in this notice) to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students.

The applicant conveyed the main components for all tenets outlined in this selection criteria.

C2a. The applicant identified opportunities for Professional Development for the staff members who will be involved in meeting the needs of students. The applicant shared the type of training that the teacher would receive at each school level. They also noted that they would be hiring two teacher leaders to train teachers on the targets of the culture of student responsibilities. The applicant noted that the monitoring of teachers and leaders will be done through the Professional Growth Evaluation System (PGES). However, the applicant neglected to mention any information related to career and college readiness and graduation requirements. There was no explicit information detailing feedback for the staff.

C2b-c. The shared that they will identify multiple measures to assess student progress. They shared that there will be a level of autonomy used by educators to assess their students against measurable standards. The applicant will be dependent of state PGES to assist staff with goal-setting. However, the applicant did not share explicit details related to specific feedback protocols. The applicant did not explicitly share or state connection to career and college readiness or strategies to support bolstered graduation rates. The applicant did share how the data would be used and collected and the integration of technology.

Overall, the applicant scored in the medium range for this section. An upgrade would be to include:

- Provide more clarity regarding the staff development plan that clearly and coherently outlines opportunities to build staff capacity

**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>7</b>

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

Selection Criteria (D)(1) –LEA practices, policies, and rules: The extent to which the applicant has a high-quality plan 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.

The applicant clearly conveyed the main components for most tenets outlined in this selection criterion.

a. The governance structure was specifically outlined. The applicant explicitly noted that the work of the LEAs in conjunction with the board of directors. They shared the responsibilities of all involved but, did not go into too much detail.

b-d. The applicant shared limited to no information pertaining to earning credits, demonstration of mastery and students with disabilities and with ESL plans. The applicant shared the importance of equipping all schools who will be impacted by the proposal \$70,000.00 to upgrade hardware and technology in all schools. However, the applicant did not share why this amount was selected and if all schools need the same technological upgrade. The applicant made two loose connections to students' use of technology to master concepts. An upgrade would be to provide the reader with explicit examples of how students make progress and demonstrate mastery of standards multiple times and multiple comparable ways.

Overall, the applicant scored in the low range for this section. An upgrade would be to include:

- Providing specific data related to the students who receive individualized instruction and who are English Language Learners. The applicant did not provide enough details reflecting whom the plan would specifically support these student groups.

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

**10**

**4**

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

Selection Criteria (D)(2) –LEA practices, policies, and rules: The LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning.

The applicant clearly conveyed some tenets outlined in this selection criterion.

- The applicant explicitly shared the access that all parents would have to monitor their child's progress and attendance. However, the applicant neglected to share the steps they would take to ensure that parents received the appropriate training to maximize this opportunity to support their children through monitoring
- The applicant did not share if or how the LEAs would ensure that the parents access to technology is feasible. They neglected to include how they would ensure if all parents had access to technology. Nor did they share any type of training that would be made available for parents
- The applicant shared that there would be an interoperable data system in place to support the management of student performance data, attendance, and communication. The applicant noted a blanket amount for each LEA. However, an analysis of the individual systems and needs was not explicitly shared. The applicant also neglected to clearly frame how technology will be supported or accessed by stakeholders outside of the systems, like parents. The details of this management was not shared.

Overall, the applicant scored in the lower range for this section. An upgrade would be to include:

- The applicant needs to provide more developed and detailed ideas as it relates to each of the criteria outlined.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

**Selection Criteria (E)(1) – Continuous improvement process**

The applicant conveyed some tenets outlined in this selection criterion.

- a. The applicant did not explicitly share strategies for implementing a continuous improvement process. The applicant shared that the lead LEA would collect and share quantitative and qualitative data via five reviews. The applicant shared that appropriate changes would be made to the program, based on feedback. The continuous improvement would be shared to address barriers.
- b. The applicant provided a clear and concise list of the evaluation of the program. However, there were tenets shared that needed additional details to explicitly outlined.

Overall, the applicant scored in the medium range for this section. An upgrade would be to include:

- Providing more details related to monitoring the plan to determine effectiveness
- Revealing how the funding is supporting and/or impacting the program

<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

**Selection Criteria (E)(2) – Continuous improvement process**

The applicant completely this selection criterion.

- The applicant provided twelve examples of how they would move forward with reflecting on the effectiveness of the proposal. However, some of the examples shared were vague.
- The applicant shared how they will use various mediums in order to communicate information pertaining to the project. The following are modes of communication that will be used, which included: appropriate response time for different forms of communication and social media. The applicant shared that a protocol would be distributed but, the details of the protocol was not clearly outlined. The applicant shared the appropriate response for the different forms of communication but, the applicant neglected to share what those forms of communication were, how they will explicitly share and collect information, and how often this will be done.

Overall, the applicant scored in the low range for this section. An upgrade would be to determine the best few modes of operation to support effective communication. If questions will be asked of the stakeholders, an example of the type of questions should have been provided.

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

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

**Selection Criteria (E)(3) – Continuous improvement process**

The applicant provided adequate information for this section. There were specific upgrades shared that would provide more clarity related to the rationale.

- a. The applicant stated that the school reform goals are geared toward the students who receive free and reduced meals and career and college readiness. The goals outlined on the plan: Regulation of student emotions, math proficiency of grade 3-8 students, high school students taking Algebra II.

- The targets selected are reasonable and ambitious
- The information for the Professional Growth and Evaluation for teachers and supervisors was not available

- b. The applicant did not fulfill the requirement for the 14 performance measures. The goal benchmarks, as quantitatively shared, were not ambitious yet achievable. The applicant provided limited support as to how the staff would gauge implementation success over time.

Overall, the applicant scored in the medium range for this section.

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

**5**

**3**

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

Selection Criteria (E)(4) – “Ambitious yet achievable” plan

The quantitative data attached to the plan reflect benchmark that are not ambitious yet achievable. However, some of the performance targets are were not available, like the teacher performance targets due to the lack of baseline data.

- The applicant shared the individuals who would be responsible for sharing the concerns of the project with the stakeholders. The applicant shared that the lead LEA, project director, and the superintendent’s council will address the concerns. However, the applicant neglected to share how often the information would be collected or shared. The applicant did not explicitly share how the information would be collected.
- The applicant shared that the timeline for evaluating the continuous improvement of the program and the timeline for the deliverables for analysis. However, the timeline was not specific. The applicant shared that they would collect qualitative and quantitative data five times per year. However, they neglected to provide specificity related to the type of data collected. The applicant also shared that the deliverables would include disaggregated student performance data, project-wide aggregated data and qualitative data. The applicant shared that the timeline to evaluate the effectiveness of the program would occur on an ongoing basis. The applicant did not provide explicit information or a clear timeline to ensure that the evaluation of the program occurs with integrity.
- Additional, specific information is needed to determine which stakeholders are providing the specific feedback. The applicant also needs to share how parents and students were involved in providing feedback on the plan.
- An additional upgrade would be to explicitly share which formative and summative finding are being analyzed.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

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

The applicant clearly conveyed all aspects of the funds needed to support the project. The applicant provided a complete rationale for the funding request..

- a. The district shared that the project will be sustainable and shared three specific actions to make this happen.
  - The first action noted that the teachers would naturally transitioned and incorporated their new teaching practices into their daily repertoire of daily of strategies used to meet the needs of their students. The applicant neglected to add any information pertaining o teacher attrition and the training of new staff.
  - The second action incorporated the inclusion of planning days. However, the applicant shared that the days would decline by one day every year, from five to three. This training may not lend itself to supporting the sustainability of the program.
  - The third action was to keep the Customization Crosswalk as a tool to implement the program.

The applicant never mention the maintenance of funding to ensure sustainability. The applicant did not provide enough information pertaining to the proposed actions. The actions shared do not lend to this plan moving forward beyond the life of the grant.

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

**10**

**4**

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

Selection Criteria (F)(2) – Sustainability of project goals.

The applicant shared an inadequate plan to support sustainability of the project once the grant ends.

- The applicant indicated an understanding that it is important to extend the program beyond the life of the grant. However, the applicant did not provide a sufficient plan for sustainability. Although the applicant shared the importance sustainability, not enough supporting evidence was given to ensure that sustainability of the project would occur beyond the life of the grant.
- The applicant neglected to provide a evidence of financial support from outside agencies.
- The applicant did not include a rationale to explain/support the various expenditures outlined in the budget.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The Grant County applicant did not include any evidence of the tenets of a Competitive Priority. The applicant did not include letters of support or partnerships from any outside agency. The applicant did not provide any evidence of outside agencies or partnership that support the consortium or individual districts. There was not evidence of the impact of a partnership on family involvement.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant accurately framed the goal of the project. However, there were several instances when the applicant missed the opportunity to expound on several ideas to scale-up the plan and make it sustainable. Although the plan highlights some innovative approaches to learning, much of the ideas shared reflect sound teaching practices that can be naturally embedded into instruction. The infrastructure shared would lend itself to building a bridge between home and school but, the idea needed to more development regarding the implementation.

More specific information was needed related to Career and College Readiness, Graduation Requirements and the closing of the achievement gap.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>101</b>
--------------	------------	------------

**Race to the Top - District**

**Technical Review Form**

**Application #0243KY-3 for Grant County Board of Education**



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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant outlines a clear vision for restructuring teaching and learning in an environment that strongly reflects the activities, interests and opinions of students through a multi-faceted cooperative learning approach. Noted highlights of the project incorporate the Common Core State Standards which are aligned with assessment procedures that effectively support the individualization of addressing the instructional needs of each student which in turn is supported by defining teacher effectiveness and the need for professional development. Additionally, most of the target schools included in the project have been classified as (needs improvement) thereby focusing special attention on the academic needs of a diverse population relative to remediation and advancement through self interest, activities and opinions. As outlined the presented vision reflects a strong emphasis on technology and its evolution as noted by cited examples because technology in the 21<sup>st</sup> century demonstrates the direction of future applications.</p> <p>Information is not provided in response to the complete social studies curriculum for elementary and middle school aged students.</p>		
<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>For each instructional level included in the project the applicant outlines how students will be effectively involved as noted by exposure for k-5 students, experience opportunities for middle level students and an expansion phase for high school students. Each phase of the project offers students specific learning characteristics that reflect their developmental milestones. Reflecting on the developmental needs of students suggest that the applicant will develop specific structures that support the academic desires and abilities of students individually and as a group.</p> <p>The target schools that will participate in the project have been identified. Participating schools identified as needing improvement are highlighted. However, information is not provided that defines a selection process. Among the schools selected more than fifty percent of participating students receive free and/or reduced lunch and attend a school identified as needs improvement. All schools meet the eligibility criteria as required. Because limited information is provided in relationship to school selection it is difficult to ascertain the level of need among all schools within each district. A clearly defined selection process determines equitable decisions in regards to defining greatest needs among all participating schools. Additionally, this limitation does not offer full support for equity in the selection process.</p>		
<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>The applicant outlines a conceptual framework that defines resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact. All elements of the framework support the applicant's efforts for district-wide and individual school reform and change. Highlighted activities support a basic premise in supporting and addressing the academic and instructional needs of students which reflect improved student achievement. The mass customization model provided denote student assessments, a student focus on individualized instruction as supported by a strong emphasis on the Common Core State Standards which support accountability. Because of the examples cited the applicant has developed a plan that will have a positive impact on project participants. Taking into account the developed framework the applicant has effectively capitalized on designing systems that reflect new methods of viewing and structuring teaching and learning. However, information is not provided regarding scaling-up relative to how specific strategies of the project will be replicated to other schools within the consortium.</p>		

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>As noted by baseline data provided by the applicant a noted increase has been projected for each year of the project relative to improving proficiency or above proficiency in math, increasing graduation rates, and increasing the percent of students enrolling in college. The projected targets for each area are ambitious and attainable based on the data provided. All incremental increases reflect continuous improvement in response to each year of the project and are commensurate with the needs of participants and the intended purposes of the grant. As a direct result of these projections the project presents a plan to effectively improve student academic performance at all levels which is consistent with the intent of the grant. For the 2012-13 school year the applicant indicates that baseline data is pending state release. The lack of this information does not fully allow for a complete review relative to a starting point. Also, the lack of data for areas outside of math limits a full understanding of expectations in other subject areas. The data provided in response to decreasing achievement gaps is not supported by a narrative. The lack of a narrative does not explain specifically how a gap reduction will be achieved or what are the responsibilities of key staff.</p>		

**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>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides several examples by district from within the consortium that have demonstrated effective improvements in student achievement and graduation increases. For example during the 2011-2012 school year Anchorage Elementary and Middle School received a distinguished classification. Additionally, the elementary school was rated as the highest performing elementary school in the state. Other noted examples that support a past record of advancing learning and achievement include the performance of students at Franklin County middle school who performed 7.1% higher than other students state-wide in reading. Lastly, data from the 2012-2013 school year indicates that Grant County High School advanced from the 57<sup>th</sup> to the 91<sup>st</sup> percentile thereby changing classifications from needs improvement to proficient. The above examples indicate pockets of success without any standards for defining success throughout the consortium.</p> <p>Through the use of a technologically advanced student management system teachers and staff are provided with opportunities to track student performance and make needed instructional modifications that support the individual achievement of each student. The system allows students and parents to track individual performances through a secured web-based portal twenty hours a day thereby allowing access to data anytime and anywhere. Available data include grades, attendance, student assignments, assessment scores and disciplinary incidents. For these reasons the applicant generally has an effective system although information is not provided in response to how students and parents will be trained to use these applications.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant identifies varying methods in which financial consortium data is available to various stakeholders. Salary and wage information is reported by the Ohio Valley Education Cooperative which available through the organization's website. Additionally, information relative to district expenditures are published through the Legislative Research Commission and the state's Office of Education Accountability. Information is also available to interested parties by the Kentucky open records process. Collectively, all avenues in response to financial expenditures support open access. In the interest of public accountability open access is an overall expectation. The applicant does not provide information regarding how the information will be made available to those without Internet access.</p>		

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Noting state support for the project the applicant indicates that the district will guide and implement a student data management system (continuous instructional improvement technology system) which will serve as the primary tool for providing district data to the project. Reliance on a proven system effectively allows the project to utilize data in making decisions relative to the implementation and operations of the project. Provisions have been outlined to implement a new teacher evaluation system that will focus on educator effectiveness as measured by student growth. The data management system will provide support in this area as noted by providing student data that will be used to effectively measure student academic growth which is a cornerstone of the project. Additionally, through legislative enactment the project will be exempt from certain regulatory requirements to enhance student learning. Additional information on these exemptions would effectively strengthen the applicant's overall design of the project.</p> <p>Of note the applicant indicates that Kentucky was an awardee in the third Race to the Top competition. The strategies and activities outlined on behalf of the state offer noted support for the implementation and execution of the project. The applicant identifies two potential areas where state intervention might be requested in support of the project. However a definitive plan to address these areas has not been established. Additionally, the applicant does not indicate if there will be widespread support for these or other areas of modification from the consortium.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant included various stakeholders in the development of the project as demonstrated by the inclusion of various focus groups which included teachers, parents, students, principals, the business community and higher education institutions. Limited information is provided that explores the depth or level of involvement of these focus groups. The inclusion of pre- drafted letters of support does not indicate complete involvement and participation in the development of the project. Complete letters of support often reflect the interest and involvement of the organization submitting the letter rather than submission a letter that has been developed. Additionally, wide-spread support for the project could be realized by including letters from a variety of sources as opposed to what has been submitted.</p>		

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(C)(1)</p> <p>The applicant outlines a complete plan that will effectively improve teaching and learning based on the overall design and key components of the project. Noted highlights of the plan include providing varying learning stations that incorporate the individual learning styles and needs of students. The supporting plan to address student involvement and engagement for their own learning through the three phases scale-up opportunities for a more focused student. Defining an expectation that students become more focused enhances the ability for self-directed learning in and out of the classroom which in effect deepens the learning experience thereby effectively improving a personalized education.</p> <p>While the applicant plans to primarily focus on math instruction limited information is provided as to how the project will be effectively implemented in other content areas in relationship to the Common Core State Standards. This limitation does not allow for a complete understanding of how subject areas such as social students will be included within the mass customization classroom. Additional information in this regard would effectively strengthen the applicant's ability to ensure that the principles of mass customization are fully expected in all content areas.</p> <p>The timeline outlined for the project and its implementation is commensurate with the needs students and teachers. Emphasis will be devoted to a professional development plan for teachers that offer key support in addressing the instructional needs of the overall design to include small group and individual instruction. Specific attention will be devoted to individual goals. However, complete information is not provided in response to a fully developed plan to address specific college and career readiness activities for all students. As a key component of the project a clearly defined college and career readiness plan for all students effectively support a vision of achievement for all students.</p>		

The inclusion of a timeline will allow for a roadmap that will chart a course in improving the major components of the project. A clearly defined course of action speaks to the applicant's forward thinking and vision for achieving specific benchmarks. A purposeful direction through leadership aligns the project with its intended purposes.

(C)(1)(a)

Opportunities for students to be reminded of their learning goals will be provided through the design of the project. Specific plans include creating a positive culture that will be embedded in defining a climate for high expectations for student achievement and civic engagement. These principles effectively support an educational experience that directly impact society in a positive manner which is an intended purpose of the project.

(C)(1)(c)

Specific instructional strategies have been defined for the project which reflect the varying needs of participants. Noted strategies include small group instruction, guided practice, action research, tutoring, game-based learning, cooperative learning and gallery walks. Technology resources will be provided in support of instructional strategies that will be utilized to include proven programs such as the Khan Academy. Student performance will be tracked through an online web-based portal that allows access to each student's individual learning plan. All learning plans will include college and career goals and will be tracked by staff. However, information is not provided relative to next steps for students once they have been able to access student level data.

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

**20**

**16**

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

(C)(2)(a)

The applicant has outlined a professional development plan that provides for various forms of professional growth specific to the needs of teachers and the project. The creation of instructional customization teams allow for individual and group support in learning and implementing new instructional strategies with appropriate feedback. The proposed training schedule reflects the needs of teachers by allowing for frequent opportunities for professional growth while still maintaining teaching as a priority. The plan reflects a vision for 21<sup>st</sup> century classrooms through the development of team work which is a college/career readiness trait. Of note, the plan allows for the development of instructional customization teams but does not provide complete information on college and career readiness requirements.

Pre-determined strategy bands that will be offered at least three times each year will allow teachers to increase their professional knowledge and instructional skills each year of the project. Coupled with feedback from the instructional design team teachers will have the opportunity to put theory into action. Coaching assignments will be determined based on how much support is needed. Allowing for ongoing professional support effectively increases the knowledge and skills of teachers and further reflects an understanding of the correlation between teacher preparation and student achievement.

Through the implementation of a new professional growth and effectiveness system measures that will serve in determining effectiveness have been identified. All identified measures are consistent with supporting essential elements of the project's instructional design. The inclusion of this system provides for defined opportunities to effectively measure and monitor student growth. Through the measurement of student achievement the applicant will be able to effectively determine the effectiveness of teachers and their need for professional growth which translate to improved student achievement.

The professional learning plan does not provide information regarding how teachers who will be new to the project following the initial launch will be effectively scaled-up in their professional development.

(C)(2)(b)-(c)

The applicant proposes to utilize the state data management system as the collective foundation in providing teachers with the resources and tools needed for the implementation and operation of the project. Key elements of the data management system offer educators the needed tools to design, implement and modify the instructional program and address the individual needs of students. Opportunities to customize the system reflect a definitive capacity to effectively define academic growth and progress through periodic assessments based on local and state standards. Collectively, the data management system will offer support for the full implementation and operation of the project and its many components. Establishing these systems reflect present and future technological applications that generate productivity across

demographics. The ability of educators to effectively identify and modify the individual needs of students through data enhances learning in a visionary and structured manner.

**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>9</b>
<p><b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(D)(1)</p> <p>(a) Through legislative action the applicant notes that participating LEAs will have the opportunity to request relief from some administrative regulations. Additionally, the mandatory school attendance age has been changed to age 18 for all participating LEAs based on the needs of the project. The identification of support teams such as the instructional customization and instructional design teams further offer central office support. Although these teams have been developed the applicant does not offer a framework as to how they will work collaboratively at the central office level. Additional information regarding how they will effectively work together will strengthen team support.</p> <p>(b) The applicant provides evidence that the project will allow for flexible scheduling at each instructional level in addition to comparable schedules for the teaching staff. Additionally, the Superintendent’s Advisory Council will provide direct oversight of the position of project director which clearly define lines of communication and authority.</p> <p>(c) Incorporated into the instructional design of the project the applicant demonstrates strategies of allowing students to advance through course content once mastery has been achieved. However, a complete plan has not been outlined to provide support to parents who do not have Internet access.</p> <p>(d) Through demonstrated progress and practices students will be allowed to show mastery of content through their preferred learning style. This shift in student achievement supports the applicant’s attention to address individualized instruction through customization.</p> <p>(e) A noted weakness of the applicant’s instructional design is that the project does not address the instructional needs of students with disabilities or English learners.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) Based on information provided by the applicant provisions will be made to ensure that all participating LEAs receive the budgetary assistance needed for a sufficient infrastructure that will support the implementation and operation of the project. A commitment of \$70,000 for technological upgrades has been devoted to the project. The committal of funding to each district ensures that all LEAs will have the support to ensure hardware and software upgrades. These upgrades will ensure a basic level of technology for each LEA thereby supporting the needs of participants which is an intended purpose of the project. However, the applicant does not provide supporting information relative to guidelines of procedures among the LEAs in utilizing this one time financial allocation.</p> <p>(b)The Kahn Academy an online instructional support program will be utilized as an instructional tool that will support remediation and advancement. The academy allows access internal and externally relative to supporting the customization of instruction. Utilization of this instructional tool facilitates individualized instruction that is cost effective and flexible. Through flexibility each participating student will be afforded the opportunity to monitor their own learning independently.</p> <p>(c) The applicant will make the infinite Campus portal available to students and parents thereby allowing them access to grades and other relevant data. The inclusion of this portal will allow student data to remain relevant across the state. As students relocate to other within the state their student information matriculates with them. Defining a student management</p>		

system that is transferable data will be immediately available to the receiving district which increases efficiency and productivity for staff. Additionally, other information relative to student performance will be made available informing parents of the project.

(d) Various technology data management systems have been identified that will offer support to students, parents and teachers relative to human resources, student information data, budget data and improvement data. Utilized data systems will allow access through the android format thereby allowing parents and students' current information. The android format reflects a majority of technology users which in turn means greater accessibility and flexibility. By providing systems that support easy access the project allows for immediate and ongoing information essential to a complete educational experience. Information is not provided that supports providing Internet access to students and parents.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's plan to continuously monitor the project through the collection of quantitative and qualitative data is commensurate with the need for hard and soft data relative to key elements of the project. Defining specific data that will be collected and when allows the applicant to effectively monitor student performance as evidenced by its testing program and the establishment of focus groups. Both strategies will yield relevant information that assesses the status of the project thereby allowing for modifications and revisions. Additionally, identifying what information will be shared with stakeholder groups such as parents and the advisory council allows for the sharing of project information publicly. Information identifying methods of sharing the information would strengthen external communications. Although specific monitoring strategies have been defined limited information is provided by the applicant in response to a timeline as to when all collected data not only student level data will be used in assessing the total project. Collectively, the inclusion of all data components strengthens and enriches the discussion relative to the status of the project.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Tasking the project director with defining an ongoing communications protocol with internal and external stakeholders provides varying opportunities for essential information relative to the project to be shared. Defining methods of communications such as social media clearly denotes that the project will effectively report useful information in a meaningful manner. Also, establishing high expectations for the dissemination of information strengthens the applicant's ability to effectively engage all stakeholders. The applicant meets most requirements of this criterion as evidenced by establishing a key goal of improving the project quantitatively and qualitatively, establishing activities that monitor student growth and defining a timeline. The rationale provided in support of the plan clearly expresses why data is essential to continuous improvement. Additionally, identified deliverables include five summary documents that will focus on student data. The applicant does not provide information that clearly defines what other deliverables will be provided and when and by whom.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The identification of a LEA wide testing program and defining when testing will occur provide varying opportunities for ongoing monitoring of performance measures established for the project. All measures reported reflect positive incremental increases which denote projections for the effective implementation and operation of the project as designed.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide complete information relative to discussing how each performance measure was selected for inclusion into the project. A supporting narrative in response to a rationale for selecting each performance measure would provide background information that fully connects the project to implementation, operation and management. Additionally, the grant requires this expectation.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>

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

Plans to identify an external evaluator to conduct a formative assessment of the project and its varied components will provide the applicant with meaningful data. However information is not provided in response to how the evaluator will be identified and when. Defining specific standards and areas where required data collection is needed further support a complete plan for ensuring that appropriate information specific to intent of the project will take place. Additionally, all requirements of the external evaluator are consistent with effectively assessing the project and its many elements. Defining a structure that effectively assesses the project creates a pathway for other districts in using technology to evaluate their programs. With intent the project has been designed to ensure that all technology programs support identified purposes of the project in a meaningful and timely manner.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(F)(1)</p> <p>(a) The applicant provides a budget that clearly outlines all associated expenditures for the implementation and operation of the project. The budget as presented provides a description of each line item and its relationship to the project. However the applicant does not provide a written narrative in support of the budget.(b)All line items reflected in the budget reflect reasonable costs associated with the project and its intended purposes. The budget as outlined will meet the needs of the project and its day-to-day operations.</p> <p>(c)</p> <p>(i) The identification of state and local expenditures in support of the project denotes the applicant's commitment to the project and its implementation and operation. All contributing resources are clearly outlined in the budget.</p> <p>(ii) One-time expenditures associated with the project are clearly defined in the budget. All associated expenditures are directly aligned with supporting specific strategies and/or activities relative to the implementation of the project.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant outlines a three prong approach to sustaining the project once federal funding has ended. By gradually allowing teachers to shift their instructional planning in support of mass customization builds on the existing infrastructure that has been created. Allowing the instructional design team opportunities to review and recommend additional resources to districts with limited resources further sustains the project.</p> <p>The sustainability plan does not include supporting information relative to committed financial resources from the state, local or other entities. This limitation has the potential to negatively impact the project and all progress made in accordance with implementation and operation. Additionally, a timeline as to when key sustainability activities will take place is not provided.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not provide information in support of this priority.</p>		

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>
<p><b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant addresses most requirements of Absolute Priority 1 as evidenced by providing a plan for addressing the individual needs of students, creating a professional development plan for teachers, providing support to teachers, identifying district-wide support teams and defining a plan to address college and career readiness. However, there are a number of noted limitations as evidenced by the lack of a clearly defined plan to effectively support the college and career readiness of all students through a structured plan.</p>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>128</b>
--------------	------------	------------