



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0123PA-1 for Lebanon School District

### 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>

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

The applicant has developed a reform vision, and a plan. For example, the applicant has put forth a plan that focuses on students from the elementary through secondary education. The applicant has addressed the issue of student interests through a system of journaling, referred to as an 'aspirational journal'. Information on how educators will guide this process and how this process is integrated with the educational plan would benefit from more detailed information. The applicant reports having a counseling component, and references a highly regarded counseling program in the school system, which is a positive aspect of the school district. However, details on the connection between this program and the overall vision are vague. The applicant notes the incorporation of social workers, partnerships with counseling services, formation of student support teams, and a proposal to work with more social workers. The applicant did not provide adequate data on the impact of social workers, necessary to justify additional social workers. The applicant notes having made past mistakes utilizing iPads and iPods. Details on significant reform efforts to resolve future problems are lacking. The applicant notes the results of "Keystone Exams" to demonstrate the superiority of hybrid classrooms over traditional classrooms. Information on what the 'Keystone Exams' measure, and how they measure it, is lacking. In addition, the hybrid scores were significantly better, but still only around 50% at-advanced or proficient levels. Career readiness is vastly over emphasized in the proposal, at the expense of college preparation. The proposal lacks a coherent and comprehensive high-quality plan.

The applicant scored in the mid-range because although they provided a plan and reform vision, they have not developed a comprehensive and coherent high-quality plan. In addition, the plan does not adequately address the four core assurance areas as specified by the intention of the competition. The applicant has not adequately specify the policies, systems, infrastructure, capacity, and culture to enable teachers and school administration to improve student achievement, and close achievement gaps. The applicant has not adequately detailed how they will make equity in educational opportunity a priority. Examples of this include, not adequately detailing the classroom experience for students and teachers. In addition, the development of personalized learning is not adequately detailed within the reform vision. The plan is lacking adequate specificity on the development of individual tasks built around students' academic interests. The overall reform vision overemphasizes career ready standards, at the expense of college readiness. For these reasons, and others previously mentioned, the applicant scored in the midrange. The applicant received points for having a basic plan, but lost a significant number of points for failing to detail a a comprehensive and coherent reform vision.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The applicant reports that all schools in the district will participate in the initiative.

The applicant notes that a local Catholic school will benefit from the grant, as they have taken an interest in the initiative. It's unclear if other private schools, and other religious affiliations have been supported by the school district. In addition, data on the local Catholic school students, performance, graduation rates, and so forth are not included in the application. This makes the inclusion of the Catholic school in the applicant's proposal problematic on various levels. In addition, the applicant has not provided data on the Catholic school, making their inclusion problematic. The applicant did not adequately specify the rationale for choosing this school, in a manner consistent with the intention of the competition. In other words, it's not clear from data how the local Catholic school demonstrated serving students in a manner consistent with the eligibility requirements of the competition.

The applicant provided the names of the schools in the district that were chosen to participate in the initiative. The

applicant provided information on the number participating students. In the appendix, the applicant provided student demographics, including those numbers of economically disadvantaged students, students with special needs, and English language learners. The applicant received points for providing adequate information regarding the total number participating students, and those students who are high need as defined by the notice. The applicant did not receive full points for failing to adequately detail the rationale for the selection of partnerships, and additional schools outside the district. Subsequently, the applicant scored in the low mid range.

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

**10**

**2**

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

The applicant states a belief in the potential for their vision to become a blueprint for other reform efforts throughout the nation. No viable plan is presented to scale reforms to other districts. Due to the lack of a viable high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide reform, this section of the proposal scored in the low range. The applicant did receive points for referencing involvement in regional and national organizations, however details on how these organizations would help scale reform efforts was lacking.

The applicant lacks a comprehensive and coherent plan for how the reform efforts will impact schools in the district. The applicant only notes involvement with the 'National *Superintendents Roundtable*, and a *League of Urban Schools*. No real plan is presented to scale reforms beyond the targeted district. Because of the lack of a high quality, comprehensive and coherent plan this section of the proposal scored in the low range.

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

**10**

**3**

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

The applicant states that this is the first year their State is releasing academic performance scores for every school. The applicant appears to lack much of the necessary data needed to adequately develop LEA wide goals for improved student outcomes. For example, there is currently either limited or no data, and disaggregated in the matter that will allow the applicant to detail current achievement gaps. In addition, this includes any information on current efforts and success in closing achievement gaps. The applicant has information on graduation rates, but lacks information on postsecondary degree attainment. In addition, the applicant has not provided any disaggregated graduation data. Any disparities in graduation rates is not presented in the application. For these reasons, and those previously mentioned the applicant scored in the low range in this section.

The applicant reports that a report titled "Closing the Achievement Gap, for All Students and for Historically Underperforming Students" with data and scores will be reported for the first time in 2013-2014, as the achievement gap is being established with baseline data from 2012-2013. Therefore, the applicant does not adequately specify ambitious yet achievable goals for graduation rates, college enrollments rates, and does not provide adequate information on goals for decreasing achievement gaps. Regarding information on performance on summative assessments, the applicant is lacking thoughtfully developed goals. For these reasons, the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.

**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 applicant acknowledges that they have not made progress in all areas, regarding advancing student learning and achievement, increasing equity in teaching, and in learning. The applicant failed to meet the standards for science. According to the applicant, Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students are the majority of the district's students. There is some evidence of improvement for these subgroups detailed in the narrative of the application. Evidence provided in the appendices is not adequately disaggregated. For example, Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students have scores listed for 2013, however previous years scores are not detailed. In a 10 year period, the applicant reports only a four-point increase in reading scores for grades 3 -8. A more significant gain was made in math, with roughly a 15 point gain. The applicant reports having met state standards in writing. The applicant does not provide sufficient data to suggest improvement in student learning outcomes related to decreasing achievement gaps. Insufficient information regarding gaps in graduation rates in this section are problematic. The applicant lacks information on college enrollment rates. Ambitious and significant reforms in low achieving schools is lacking in this section. For these reasons the applicant scored in the low

mid range. A more detailed presentation of disaggregated data on achievement gaps would convey that the applicant has the information necessary for an effort to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps. The inclusion of college enrollment data would enhance this proposal by conveying that the applicant has the necessary information to strategically address this issue.

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

**5**

**3**

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

The applicant reports that their state has increased transparency. However, 2013 is the first year that school scores will be publicized. According to the applicant, the score is part of a school performance profile created by the state. This profile will include information on attendance rates, closing the achievement gap, PSSA scores, Keystone Exam scores, and graduation rates. The applicant states that parents have access to student grades, disciplinary records, and attendance records. The applicant notes public meetings. The applicant states that salaries, position titles, and building locations are posted. It's unclear from the statement exactly where and how this information is posted and made available. A connection in this section is unclear. It's unclear if additional budgetary expenditures are made available.

The applicant scored in the mod-range for the extent to which they provided demonstrated evidence of a high level of transparency in processes, practices, and investments. The applicant received point for making public, the personnel salaries. However, it is not clear that this information is broken down at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances. In contrast, the provided data appears to be simply an average across districts. For these reasons, and those mentioned the applicant scored in the mid-range.

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

**10**

**3**

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

The applicant has not demonstrated adequate evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. The applicant reports having a new teacher and principal evaluation system that requires data. Information on how this data could be utilized is not presented. It's unclear from the proposal if there are consequences for low scores, remediation processes, and so forth. There is also insufficient information on the standards utilized in assessing principals and teachers. The applicant notes beginning conversations regarding common core curriculum.

The applicant does not adequately address having the necessary conditions and autonomy necessary for successful implementation of the reform plan consistent with the goals of this competition. For this reason, the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.

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

**15**

**10**

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

The applicant begins this section of the proposal discussing the reform initiative with a business associate. The applicant does not provide enough information on this discussion, how it led to shaping the proposal, or the rationale for this inclusion of this business associate in developing the proposal. The applicant also reports discussing preliminary drafts of the proposal with parent representatives from schools in the district. The applicant states that before the plan is implemented "extensive parent outreach will occur...."

In this section of the proposal, the applicant reports receiving strong support, and reports statements suggesting that high school students provided a reaction to the plan. Specific details on what type of strong support was received, and specific details on the reaction among students is lacking in this section of the proposal. It's not clear from this section of the proposal what feedback was received, and how it was incorporated in shaping the plan.

The applicant did not adequately discuss collective bargaining in their state, and district. The applicant does not adequately

specify if 70% of teachers support the plan.

Most notably, information on inclusion of teachers in the development of the plan is lacking. The applicant states that teachers are “enthusiastic about the plan.” However, it’s not clear what they are enthusiastic about, whether or not they provided feedback that led to shaping the plan, and whether or not their advice was incorporated in this plan. The applicant received points for the discussion of the plan with business associates, and parent representatives. The applicant received points for sharing the plan with their PTA, and allowing them to review and respond to the plan. The applicant would enhance this section of the proposal, increasing their score, by including more specific detail on the feedback and shaping of the proposal. For example, the applicant notes that initial reviews of the plan were met with fear and silence. However, more specific details regarding this reaction are lacking from the proposal narrative. It’s unclear how the applicant addressed these issues. For this reason, the applicant scored in the midrange.

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

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

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

This section of the proposal lacks a coherent and comprehensive plan. For example, information required for a high-quality plan is lacking. It is not clear that any content is aligned with college ready standards. In addition, information on personalized learning based on student’s current knowledge is lacking. The applicant did not adequately include information on mechanisms to train and support students.

This section of the proposal was filled with unclear information. For example, the applicant simply references their vision, which they believe places a great deal of emphasis on setting individualized goals and aspirations. It’s not clear from the information how these goals will be developed and utilized by teachers in the context of personalized learning. The proposal is lacking information on the utilization of electronic journals. These journals are integral to the plan as they are connected to achieving career goals. The applicant references a transition plan that includes an internship for all high school graduates. It’s not clear what the rationale for the internship is, nor the instructional benefit of the internship. Without adequate information on the internship, it’s unclear how this would potentially support possible higher education goals among students. The applicant provides only vague references blended learning classrooms, which they believe will create opportunities for teamwork and creative thinking. However, this information is not adequately developed in the proposal.

This section of the proposal does not adequately detail an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners and specifically lacks information on engaging high need students in an age-appropriate matters. The applicant does not have an adequate link between the specified pedagogical and curricular approach with the personalized learning systems necessary to allow students to accomplish their goals. The applicant has not identified learning and development goals linked to college. The applicant does provide a link between schools and career goals, but fails to acknowledge college preparedness for students. In addition, information on career preparation is vague. For example, lack of information on the internship program and how this will support personalized learning initiatives with career readiness. It’s not clear from the proposal that students will be engaged or involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. This results from a lack of connection between the applicant’s emphasis on student journaling, and the curriculum development model. The applicant has completely ignored access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. This section of the proposal lacks information on the development of personalized learning recommendations based on students’ current knowledge and skill level. In addition, personalized learning recommendations are not adequately connected to students’ career or college interest. The proposal fails to mention access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. In short, the applicant lacks a coherent and comprehensive high-quality plan consistent with the intention of competition. For this reason the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

It is not evident from the applicant's proposed plan that students will participate in a program with rigorous course requirements aligned with college and career ready standards. Information on teaching and leading for educators necessary to improve instruction and increase capacity to support student progress toward meeting college standards are limited in the proposal.

The applicant does provide information suggesting they will target teachers needing training on blended learning

classrooms. However, specific information on when these trainings will occur, their frequency, and how proficiency will be measured is not adequately specified in the proposal. The applicant has identified utilizing surveys identify staff needing support. However, more specific details are lacking. The applicant reports the utilization of a teacher and principal evaluation system. More specific information on what these systems measure, how this information is utilized, and how this feedback translates into enhanced teacher performance would benefit this section of the proposal. The applicant does reference and training for teachers in meeting state standards. More information on how the standards aligned with the intention of the competition would enhance this section of the proposal.

This section of the proposal is lacking adequate information on how trainings will align with the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet students' academic needs and interests. In addition, it's unclear if the previously specified training will adequately prepare teachers to help students graduate on time, with college and career ready standards. In addition adequate information is lacking from this proposal detailing information on preparing teachers to help adapt content and instruction to provide students with optimal learning approaches. It's unclear from the proposal, if teachers will be adequately trained to frequently measure student progress toward meeting college and career ready goals, as well as utilizing data to inform instructional practices. As previously mentioned, information on the teacher and principal evaluation system is lacking. It's unclear if teachers and principals will be provided information.

The applicant lacks a high-quality, coherent and comprehensive plan consistent with the intention of the competition. For example, information specifying actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches is limited. In addition, a comprehensive and coherent approach to training systems to continuously improve school progress, and increasing student performance is lacking. It's not clear from the proposal that students will have high-quality learning resources. Information on the teacher feedback system, requires more specific detail.

The applicant is lacking a comprehensive and coherent high-quality plan for improving teaching and learning. For this reason, and those previously mentioned the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.

#### 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>5</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant has provided some aspects of the basic plan addressing practices, policies, and rules. For example, the applicant has developed a leadership team model, with cross district teams to perform walk-throughs designed to provide feedback the principles. Applicant states holding monthly meetings, and additional trainings. Although the applicant has some elements of a basic plan, they are lacking a coherent and comprehensive high-quality plan consistent with the intention of the competition. The applicant has not adequately detailed the organization of a central office governance structure necessary to provide support and services to all participating schools. Although the applicant has provided information on school leadership teams, there is not adequate information to suggest these teams have the autonomy over such factors as schedules, calendars, school personnel decisions, staffing models, and so forth. More information on these details with enhance this section of the proposal.</p> <p>The applicant has not provided the necessary information on giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery as opposed to the time spent on a topic. In addition, information is missing one giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. For example, the applicant references an employment readiness certificate in this section of the proposal. It's unclear what exactly this certificate is. It's unclear from the proposal whether or not this is a substitute for a diploma. It's unclear if the certificate will have value for students in a manner consistent with the initiative detailed in the requirements for this competition. Specific details on learning practices adapted to the needs of English language learners and special needs students is lacking.</p> <p>In short, the applicant lacks a coherent and comprehensive high-quality plan to support project implementation. For this reason, and those previously specified the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>

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

There was no section of the proposal labeled as D-2. Therefore, most information in relation to this section needed to be

inferred from the broader scope of the proposal. Within the broader scope of the proposal, the applicant did not provide a high-quality plan necessary to support project implementation in terms of an infrastructure that will provide students and educators with the support and resources necessary, when and where they are needed. For example, applicant did not make it clear that parents and students regardless of income would have access to the necessary technology needed to access the data portals. In addition, it's unclear how low income students will have access to personalized learning environments outside of the school environment. The proposal is lacking information necessary to ensure that students, parents, and educators have the appropriate level of technological support through a range of strategies. The applicant has referenced a data portal in relation to the project plan, but has provided insufficient information on how these portals will be supported. The proposal lacks sufficient data on the utilization of data systems that include human resource data, student information, budget data, and instructional improvement systems. There are some references to these data systems, the adequate information is lacking in the proposal.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant has referenced a school improvement plan process, one which is already in place in schools. However, this section of the proposal is lacking a high-quality plan for rigorous continuous improvement. For example, there are no specific details on measures to monitor progress, timelines, or persons responsible. The applicant might have considered hiring in external evaluator, as opposed to hiring a grant administrator data analyst. There is no information provided on evaluation methodology. The applicant does note that principals meet with staff to discuss review and revision of the improvement plan process. They meet at least monthly with leadership teams to discuss goals. However, there is no information on how the applicant will build on this existing program in a manner that will allow for the adjustments and revisions necessary for the implementation of the project specified here as consistent with the intention of the competition. In other words, the applicant lacks a clear plan for implementing the project they have detailed in this proposal. The review plan they reference is not specifically connected towards feedback on project goals, and currently not connected to the grant. The applicant does not adequately address how they will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by the competition. For these reasons the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant does not have a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The applicant simply states that they will develop one. The applicant references having a school community liaison, that will develop a communication strategy to ensure engagement. However, there is no specified plan. It's not clear from the proposal how this liaison will engage stakeholders, time intervals for engagement, nor how this information will be utilized. For this reason, the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>This section simply references charts, but it's unclear what charts they are referring to. The applicant does not possess a plan nor a high-quality approach to improve its plans. The performance measures that are included in the proposal appeared generic, and not based on existing baseline data. For example, sections have standard five point gains across the board. In addition, there are a number of sections missing from the performance data measures. Such as, college graduation rates. The applicant has not adequately provided rationales for selecting measures. Is unclear from the proposal how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, informative information tailored to the purpose of the plan. The performance measures that exist in the proposal did not appear based on implementation success, or specific areas of concern. The applicant has not provided adequate information to detail how they will review and improve the measures over time as they begin to collect data. For these reasons, and for the lack of a high-quality comprehensive and coherent plan, the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.</p>		

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant did not provide a plan to continuously improve their plan during the implementation phase. The applicant is lacking an approach to continuously improve, and there are not rigorous evaluation systems in place to enhance the effectiveness of funded activities. Professional development activities that employ technology are lacking in the proposal. In addition, there is no adequate plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of these plans. For these reasons, the applicant did not receive points for this section of the proposal.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has an adequate budget narrative, and information that adequately identifies the funding necessary to support the project. The applicant identifies one-time investments. However, ongoing operational costs are not detailed in this section of the proposal. In addition, it's unclear what contractual funds will be utilized for. The applicant has not adequately justified the requested funding either in the narrative or the budget narrative. For example, over \$2 million is requested in travel funds. However, it was never specified in the proposal why such a large amount would be budgeted, and necessary for travel. In addition, it's unclear why the applicant has budgeted over \$2,783,000 in contractual expenditures. In short, the applicant has not provided a thoughtful rationale for investments. There is not an adequate description of funding. For these reasons the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant lacks a coherent and comprehensive high-quality plan for sustainability. For example, the applicant states they will attempt to sustain students' supports proposed in the plan, but suggests that they are not sure whether or not it's possible. The applicant has identified some potential partnerships, and seeking out Medicaid and other funding sources. However, the applicant provides no adequate data on these funding sources to suggest adequate sustainability beyond the grant period. The applicant has not provided adequate information regarding state and local government leaders in terms of financial support. There is not adequate information on the effectiveness of past investments, nor the use of data to inform future investments. For these reasons, and the lack of a high-quality plan, the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant is seeking to provide therapy dogs, and an educational program for special-education female students with behavioral and social problems. The applicant provides no existing data to support the utilization of therapy dogs to impact student learning. The applicant notes that a number of their students have multiple learning, behavioral, and physical challenges. Information on the therapy dog program is lacking. Although the applicant has provided some information on the effectiveness of therapy dogs, there is not adequate information on how this approach will be consistent with the intention of the competition. The applicant has addressed how a limited number of partnerships were designed to assist at-risk students.</p> <p>Although the applicant has provided some description of partnerships, there is limited description that suggests these partnerships will be coherent and sustainable in a manner consistent with the issues identified under the competitive</p>		

preference priority section of the competition. For example, there is limited information on organizations that will provide public health, before school, afterschool, as well as social service providers. Information related to the partnerships is limited in terms of how they will support educational outcomes, prepare young children to succeed in school, and assist students in graduating from high school with college and career ready standards. The applicant has not provided adequate information to describe how the partnership will track selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children for participating students. No information is provided on the use of data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students. There is no information on developing a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students. The applicant did not adequately describe how the partnerships will, within participating schools integrate education and other services. The applicant did not adequately describe how the partnerships will build the capacity of staff in participating schools by providing them with tools and supports to assess the needs and assets of participating students, or identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports. There was some limited information regarding a plan to create a decision-making process and infrastructure, but there was not sufficient information provided to assess the potential of this infrastructure to evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results. Sufficient information was not provided regarding how the partnerships would engage parents and families of participating students in both decision-making about solutions to improve results over time and in addressing student, family, and school needs. The applicant did not provide information suggesting the partnerships would routinely assess the applicant's progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems. The applicant did not identify annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and provided only limited information describing desired results for students. For these reasons the applicant scored in the low range for this section of the proposal. The use of data to target resources with a special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, is limited in this section of the proposal. There are not clear strategies to scale these models beyond the participating schools, and improve results over time.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

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

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not comprehensively and coherently address how they will significantly improve learning and teaching through personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators. The applicant did not provide a plan to positively impact college readiness. The plan emphasizes career readiness, but does not adequately address college preparation. In addition, data on college enrollment is lacking conveying an inadequate understanding of the issue in order to properly address it. The proposal lacks a comprehensive plan necessary to accelerate student achievement and deepening student learning by addressing the specific academic needs of individual students. The applicant did not address how they would enhance the effectiveness of educators in a comprehensive and coherent matter. Information on expanding student access to effective educators was insufficiently described in the proposal. In addition, a plan to decrease academic achievement gaps across student subgroups was not coherently described in the application. The applicant did not provide a clear plan to increase the effectiveness of educators. For these reasons, the applicant did not meet the requirements as specified in absolute priority one, related to personalized learning environments.

The applicant did not coherently and comprehensively address how they will build on the core educational assurance areas. The applicant did not adopt standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college. The applicant did not provide sufficient information on how they would build data systems that measure student growth and success in a manner that informs teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction. The applicant did not provide adequate information on recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals. The applicant's plan is convincing regarding its potential to turn around low-achieving schools. For these reasons, the applicant did not meet the requirements for absolute priority one.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>67</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0123PA-3 for Lebanon School District

### 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>The application narrative does not address how the proposal builds upon previous work in the four required core educational assurance areas. There is no description of past work in the LEA on standards and assessments, and no information on how the LEA will build upon their current data system to inform teachers and principals with data to improve instruction. The narrative does not include any discussion on the LEAs efforts to recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective principals and teachers and how this application would enhance those efforts. Similarly, the narrative does not provide information about LEA reform efforts in its lowest achieving schools and how this proposal builds upon that work. The narrative presents a four-pronged approach to personalized learning, focusing on student counseling, school and classroom climate, rigorous curriculum, and technology. However, the information as presented lacks specificity and precision, with the narrative numerous times stating "this plan may change." The narrative includes a discussion of the classroom experience for teachers and students, but there is little description of what an everyday classroom experience would be like for a student. Instead, the narrative centers on various activities, projects, or options, such as the YMCA youth center that can provide after school support. Overall, the application provides a lengthy narrative with a lot of ideas and activities, but not in a coherent and clear manner, which supports a rating in the middle range.</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>Although the application states that teachers, parents, community, and higher education staff were involved in the development process for the vision, specific examples of participation activities are not provided in the narrative for this section. All schools in the LEA will participate in the initiative, as it is a districtwide project; however, the narrative does not specify any process used to communicate the vision to all levels of the district to engender districtwide support for implementation. The narrative and application tables provide a list of all of the LEA schools that will participate in the project, the total number of participating students, the number of low-income and high-need students, and the number of educators in the project. However, the tables do not include the numbers of students and educators at Lebanon Catholic School, which is included in the technology initiative. The evidence supports a rating at the low end of the upper range.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The application describes the project as a districtwide implementation, with no scale up to additional schools. The narrative does not include either a theory of change or a logic model to describe how the proposed activities and projects should work together in an aligned manner for educational improvement. The application does not provide a high-quality plan specific to section A3. The narrative does not include specific goals, nor activities related to a specific goal, nor timelines which include both year and month of completion, nor deliverables from the activities, nor the responsible party for activities. The narrative for this section is a single paragraph containing three sentences, none of which provides any of the</p>		

elements of the required high-quality plan. Overall, the evidence supports only a rating in the lower range.

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

**10**

**5**

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

The application includes tables of goals for improved student outcomes, for each of the required areas (i.e., summative assessments, achievement gaps, graduation rate, college enrollment). For summative assessments, the increases are 10 percentage points higher each year than the previous year. These are overly ambitious targets; it is not realistic that the project, during its implementation, would result in a 50 percentage point increase in achievement when other reform efforts have produced much smaller changes. Similarly, it is not realistic that 10 percentage point increases would occur each year for each subgroup, given different starting points and instructional needs for each group. The tables do not include baseline data for student growth or postsecondary degree attainment, which makes the targets for each year unrealistic, as the starting point is unknown. The decreasing achievement gap targets in Table A4b are not in alignment with the overall achievement score goals in Table A4a. For example, if the target for writing is 100% proficiency overall and for the Hispanic subgroup, there would be no Hispanic-to-Overall gap in achievement, which is indicated in Table A4b. Similarly, the year 4 targets for both the graduation and college enrollment rates are overly ambitious and likely not attainable. A 95% graduation rate target (with baselines of 52-74%) after four years of the program is unrealistic because the elements of the project do not support that dramatic increase, given historical graduation levels. Overall, the evidence supports a rating in the middle of the scoring range.

**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>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The Application's appendices contain State reports that provide evidence of LEA success in advancing student learning and student growth. It is not clear, though, from those reports or the narrative how growth is calculated if students are not tested in consecutive grades or in consecutive years. The tables included in the appendices do not present a clear record of success in raising achievement, as many negative (decreased) scores are reported across the various grade levels and areas tested (e.g., -4.2 for Biology students; -5.2 for grade 5 Writing). Similarly, the results for Hispanic students include a number of decreases in growth (e.g., -8.6 for Biology at the Basic level), which would indicate an increasing performance gap. The application does not provide evidence of four years of test scores, as Attachment OOO.1 is not included in the application or on the CD. In addition, four years of results for graduation rates, college enrollment, and closing achievement gaps are not provided in the application. The narrative describes successful reform at a persistently low-achieving high school by providing the number of students in the hybrid courses who scored at least proficient on the state test compared with students not in the hybrid classes. The data provided, however, are simply numbers of students and not results based on statistical analyses of the data. The narrative does not provide a description of how the LEA makes the student performance information available to students, educators, and parents. Overall, the evidence provided in the application supports a rating in the lower portion of the middle range.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The application provides evidence that the LEA is increasing transparency regarding student performance (i.e., through State School Performance Profiles), but the narrative is unclear regarding transparency of expenditures. The narrative indicates salaries, position titles, and building locations are included in personnel items on LEA Board agendas, with minutes posted online. However, the narrative does not provide sufficient information to determine if the required four categories of school-level expenditures (i.e., personnel salaries for all instructional and support staff, salaries for instructional staff only, salaries for teachers only, and non-personnel expenditures) are made public. In addition, Board of Education minutes typically do not include detailed school-by-school information. The narrative does not indicate that non-personnel expenditures are included in the agenda items, which consequently would not be provided to the public (a required selection criterion). Overall, the evidence provided in the application supports only a rating at the lower part of the middle range.</p>		

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The narrative provides some brief statements of state initiatives that support reform efforts, such as the teacher and principal evaluation system, and the PA Common Core adoption. However, the examples provided are not comprehensive or thorough in their description or explanation of how the LEA will leverage those state conditions or autonomy. For example, the narrative is vague on what resources are available to LEAs (e.g., the state has “many resources”, and “has a good handle” on changes), and provides little evidence (e.g., only participation in PA Learning Initiative) regarding how the applicant has used the flexibility and resources to promote reform and improve student achievement. Overall, the narrative does not provide clear evidence that the LEA has autonomy and conditions to implement successfully the personalized learning reforms in the application. Thus, the evidence supports only a rating at the low portion of the middle range.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The narrative provides a description of the application development process, which included a review of a preliminary draft with the LEA parent/teacher organization. The application includes a letter of support from the teacher organization, as well as letters from the LEA’s Board of Education, administrators, the parent organization, and members of higher education institutions. The narrative describes a fairly comprehensive process used in the LEA to revise the 2012 RTTD application, and garner support from the local Board of Education, staff from each school, and principals. The narrative does not provide, however, specific examples of how the proposal was modified based upon feedback by any of the various groups that had an opportunity to review a draft of the application. Overall, the evidence addresses the majority of the selection criteria, and supports a rating at the lower part of the high range.</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>7</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The narrative describes a reasonable argument that authentic learning experiences provided by focus areas (at the ES) and career clusters (at the MS) will enable students to understand that college and career success is linked to what they are learning. Similarly, it is reasonable to conclude the ES focus areas and MS career clusters should expose students to diverse perspectives and involve them in deep learning through field trips and partnerships with non-school individuals. The narrative provides sufficient explanation of how the ES focus areas link to the MS career clusters, which then aligns with the HS concentration areas. The hybrid classrooms and blended learning process are noted as providing frequent feedback. However, the narrative is not specific as to how often feedback is provided and the format of that feedback to students. Student use of an electronic journal to identify personal interests is described in various sections of the application, but additional information is needed regarding the development of this system and how it would specifically function to serve this role in personalized learning. A post-HS transition plan and internship is noted in the narrative. However, the information is insufficient to obtain a clear understanding of the components of the transition plan, who is responsible for monitoring each students’ plan, and specifics on arranging internships for each student, along with details on internship length (i.e., number of hours per day, and number of weeks) and evaluation. The narrative does not provide clear information on how ES and MS students will pursue an individual sequence of content and skill development. Rather, the narrative supports a case that ES and MS students will follow a path dependent upon a focus area or career cluster. The application does not include a high-quality plan specific to C1, with goals relevant to this section, activities aligned to the goals, a timeline for each activity, deliverables for activities, and responsible parties to implement the specific activities. The application does not describe how high-needs students will have access to accommodations to help ensure they are on-track for college/career success. The narrative does not describe what mechanisms are in place to ensure that students are trained and supported in the tools and resources available to manage their learning. Overall, the evidence in the application supports a rating in the low portion of the middle range.</p>		
<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p>		

The application provides an extensive amount of narrative outlining a general approach to personalized learning. However, the application does not include a high-quality plan specific to C2, with goals relevant to this section, activities aligned to the goals, a timeline for each activity, deliverables for activities, and responsible parties to implement the specific activities. The narrative describes ES and MS teachers as planning or working on teams, but does not indicate that all teachers will engage in professional teams or communities, only that they have opportunities for that activity. Similarly, the narrative notes that the principal and teacher evaluation systems will provide opportunities for feedback, but does not provide specifics on how the LEA will use the feedback, or how the LEA will train administrators and teachers to use the feedback. Similarly, the narrative notes that teachers have access to and have been trained in the State's standards and data systems. However, no information is provided on specifically how teachers are using the student test information in their instruction, or how school or district programs have been modified based on the use of the data systems. The narrative does not indicate a specific LEA plan for increasing the number of students taught by effective- or highly-effective teachers, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, or specialty areas. Overall, the narrative does not provide a coherent and comprehensive approach to training teachers and principals in the use of data and data systems to be able to personalize the learning environment for individual students. The evidence provided in the application supports only a rating in the lower part of the middle range.

**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>6</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The narrative provides a description of the LEA central office structured to ensure a reasonable amount of support and service to schools. Several districtwide committees are noted, but specifics (e.g., members, frequency of meetings) on the committees are not provided, so it is not possible to determine if the committees are effectively meeting their intended purpose. It is not clear how often the LEA leadership team meets, as both weekly and monthly meetings are noted in the narrative. The local Board of Education is considering a policy change to allow students to earn credit based on mastery, not seat time. However, no timeline is provided for the policy adoption or, if approved, when it would be implemented. The narrative does not indicate that students will have opportunities in multiple ways and at multiple times to demonstrate mastery. Neither does the narrative provide information on how students at the ES and MS levels will have opportunities to demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. The application does not provide information on how the LEA is providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and accessible to students with disabilities and English learners in ways other than through the blended classroom model. The blended model of instruction will not be implemented until project year three at the MS, and the narrative does not denote its use at all at the ES level; thus, the narrative does not sufficiently address how students with disabilities and English learners at ES and MS levels will have accessible personalized learning strategies in a reasonable timeline and manner. The application does not include a high quality plan specific to D, with goals relevant to this section, activities aligned to the goals, a timeline for each activity, deliverables for activities, and responsible parties to implement the specific activities. Overall the application does not provide sufficient details on how the organizational structure of the LEA and schools will provide support and services to facilitate personalized learning for all students at all grade levels. The evidence supports a rating at the lower portion of the middle range.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The application does not include a high quality plan specific to D, with goals relevant to this section, activities aligned to the goals, a timeline for each activity, deliverables for activities, and responsible parties to implement the specific activities. The application provides evidence that the LEA has technology staff trained to support students and educators, but it is not possible to determine the adequacy level of this support for the number of current or expected digital devices in the district. The application is not clear on the level of access to the internet that all students have in their homes, and how the LEA will ensure web access regardless of family income. This web access outside of school is essential for the hybrid learning initiative, so the application is insufficient in addressing this key issue. There is no evidence provided in the application that the data systems use interoperable data structures, and that parents are able to export relevant information in an open data format. Overall, the evidence presented supports only a rating at the lower portion of the middle range.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The application does not include a high-quality plan specific to E1, with goals relevant to this section, activities aligned to the goals, a timeline for each activity, deliverables for activities, and responsible parties to implement the specific activities. The narrative describes only in a general manner how the LEA will engage in a continuous improvement process, essentially through the hiring of additional staff. The narrative does not include any details on how these new staff will ensure a rigorous improvement process, and there is no information provided on how the LEA will publicly share information about the project implementation. The narrative provides only minimal information about how the currently existing school improvement plans will incorporate changes necessary to monitor activities and goals from the proposed project (i.e., during a regular SIP review meeting, school staff would align their plan to the grant). Overall, the evidence supports only a rating at the lower part of the middle range.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The application does not include a high-quality plan specific to E2, with goals relevant to this section, activities aligned to the goals, a timeline for each activity, deliverables for activities, and responsible parties to implement the specific activities. The narrative includes insufficient information (i.e., only four sentences in one paragraph) describing the methods it will use to communicate to its stakeholders (e.g., Facebook; other electronic media), how often it will communicate, and how it will ensure engagement of its stakeholders. It states that feedback "will need to be addressed." The evidence provided supports a rating in the low range.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The application includes tables of performance measures and targets, for all participating students and relevant subgroups, for all of the required cognitive and non-cognitive categories, including: highly effective teachers/principals; effective teachers/principals; students on track to college- and career-readiness; FAFSA completion. The narrative does not describe the rationale for selection of the measures, nor how the LEA will review and improve measures over time if needed. Table E3 does not provide baseline information for several measures (e.g., FAFSA; students on track to college/career readiness), which is needed to develop targets that are reasonable and achievable. Thus, it is not possible to determine if the targets are ambitious for the LEA. The table does not include targets for 2014 and 2015 for percentages of students with highly effective or effective teachers/principals. In these same tables, the baseline percentage is listed as 100% of students having effective or highly effective teachers/principals, with targets for 2016 being at a 50% level, which is neither accurate or a logical change progression. Overall, the evidence provided in the narrative and tables is incomplete, inaccurate, and insufficient to support a rating higher than at a low middle range level.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The narrative provides two sentences to describe this section, neither of which address rigorous evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities that would be funded through the grant, which is insufficient information. The application does not include a high-quality plan specific to E4, with goals relevant to this section, activities aligned to the goals, a timeline for each activity, deliverables for activities, and responsible parties to implement the specific activities. The evidence supports a rating of zero (0).</p>		

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

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

The application includes a short budget narrative and budget tables for the overall budget and each subproject. However, there is not sufficient detail provided in either the narrative or tables to determine if the costs are reasonable, necessary, and sufficient for the project. For example, there is no explanation for the \$2.2 million of travel expenses. The budget narrative and tables do not indicate the personnel costs included in each specific subproject. The application did not indicate clearly which costs are one-time expenditures and which ones are ongoing throughout the project and needed after the grant funding ends to continue project activities. The narrative describes professional development costs as one-time investments, but ongoing professional development is needed at least partially to train staff that is new to the district each year. The tables do not detail what costs are included in the contractual budget lines, which is necessary to determine if costs are reasonable for services such as project evaluation. The narrative does not explain why funding for staff such as data analysts and technology integrators will not be needed after the grant, which is inappropriate as these positions are integral to ensure ongoing teachers' understanding and use of both data and technology to personalize student learning. Overall, the evidence supports a rating in the low range.

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

**10**

**1**

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

The application does not include a high-quality plan specific to F2, with goals relevant to this section, activities aligned to the goals, a timeline for each activity, deliverables for activities, and responsible parties to implement the specific activities. The narrative provides minimal discussion (i.e., the LEA will "seek ways to work with community groups") of how the LEA will sustain the program after grant funding ends, and indicates only that it will "attempt to sustain some of the student supports." The narrative provides no information on how the LEA will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use that data to inform future investments. Overall, the evidence provided in the application supports only a rating at the low range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The application provides only a brief, limited description of the partnerships between the LEA and two organizations. The details are insufficient to conclude that the LEA would have sustainable and coherent partnerships with the entities to support the overall project. The narrative includes only educational results as outcomes for each program (i.e., therapy dogs and facility for female students in Yellow Breeches), and does not include the required family/community support outcome. The application does not address how the partnerships would build the capacity of staff (selection criteria #5). The narrative does not describe how the partnerships would provide added value above and beyond the general project to increase the graduation rate, which is one of the CPP performance measures. The table for the CPP performance measure on student perception does not include a baseline percentage. Thus, it is not possible to determine if the targets are reasonable or appropriate for the project's activities and goals. Overall, the narrative and tables do not provide complete and sufficient information and evidence for any of the six selection criteria. Thus, the evidence supports a rating in the low range.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

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

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The application did not demonstrate how the project builds upon the core assurance areas throughout the narrative, particularly with core assurance area #3 (i.e., recruit, develop, reward, retain effective teachers/principals). The narrative, particularly in sections A and C, provided very little reference to the selection, recruitment or retention of effective teachers and principals, especially in schools or content areas in which they are most needed. The application does not provide a coherent and comprehensive description of a personalized learning environment for all of their participating students K-12, particularly at the elementary and middle school levels. The narrative is unclear and incomplete regarding meeting the needs of all students, particularly high-needs students.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>78</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

**Application #0123PA-2 for Lebanon School District**

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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

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

Lebanon School District's proposal includes four projects:

1. Counseling/experiential learning
2. School Climate
3. Academic interest
4. Technology - blended learning

The applicant intends on serving all its 7 schools- 5 elementary (K-5), 1 middle (6-8), and 1 high school (9-12). The district also identifies Lebanon Catholic School as receiving services from the technology project without providing specific information about the size and scope of these services. Therefore, these services to Lebanon Catholic School are vague.

The work to build on the four core educational assurance areas is not addressed or referenced in the application. The application lacks descriptions of how the four projects link to the assurance areas and how the proposed projects will enhance them. This lack of detail is unresponsive to this overarching criterion of the grant.

The application includes details about each of the four project strategies in the proposal, clearly describing the components of each project as follows:

1. The counseling project includes strategies such as aspirational and electronic journals.
2. For the climate project, strategies include a social worker assigned to each school, use of student support teams for high-need students, school improvement planning using data and professional development. Teacher training includes methods such as small group sessions, individualized coaching and guided practice, feedback loop, and classroom observations. The goal is for 100% of the teachers to be proficient. Leadership conditions will be addressed using each school's existing School Improvement Plan while adding a data review strategy.
3. For the third project, academic interest, the strategies include higher education training of teachers and partnerships to provide mentors to students. Student academic interest will be achieved by exposing students early on to options. Ultimately, in 10<sup>th</sup> grade students will develop a transition plan and participate in an internship option.
4. The strategies for the fourth project (technology) are the I-pad program to grades 1-8 and professional development to teachers. Technology is already being used in the high school using a blended learning approach. The academic outcome evidence provided in the application demonstrates that this strategy has shown success. The applicant reports success in decreased discipline problems and increased student engagement. No data is provided for these two areas. This blended learning model has been in operation as a pilot (eight teachers) for one year. The district received a grant to expand this strategy in the current school year.

In addition, the focus of the elementary schools would change in that they will be redesigned into magnet schools, each of a different theme. It is not clear how this redesign will support the proposal. This elementary magnet model may not be reasonable since students in these early grades (K-5) would not likely choose to attend a school outside of their neighborhood or a school different from where their siblings attend.

The classroom experience for students and teachers is clearly described. The classroom experience will change with the use of the technology project in all the grade-levels in the district for both students and teachers. Teachers in the elementary academies will need to expand their knowledge in the individual school's focus. In the middle school, the length of class periods would change and a trimester structure will be used. Internships at the high school will be implemented focusing on a career.

Overall, the applicant does not fully provide a vision that builds on the four core educational assurance areas - standards and assessments, data systems to measure student growth, effective educators, and turning around the lowest performing schools. The extent to which the applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision is not demonstrated. The strategies of each project are described however; the elementary school design is not credible. As a result, the score for this section is in the low end of the medium range.

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

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

The applicant states "all the details have not yet been figured out" for this proposal. However, the overall vision has been presented to stakeholders. Because more planning is required to implement the initiatives, it is possible that the implementation timeline will be delayed and possibly the proposal itself will be changed. This is a weakness to the application.

The applicant will be serving all seven of its schools in the district. The decision to include all the district's schools is not described. The seven schools are identified and listed on the data tables and collectively meet the eligibility requirements (82% low-income.)

On these school tables, it indicates that the subjects targeted are English, math, science, social studies and visual and performing arts. Also, in the elementary schools, the grade spans served are K3-5. It is not clear exactly what elementary grades will be served. The tables show that all students in the district will be participating. It is unclear if all teachers in the district are participating in this grant due to the targeted subject areas. This is confusing.

The applicant states that three-year olds and students at Lebanon Catholic School will be served in the grant. The data for these Lebanon Catholic participating students is not displayed on the tables or provided elsewhere. This prevents an analysis of eligibility of these students.

The score for this section is medium, losing points for the lack of clarity on the participating educators and participating students at Lebanon Catholic School.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

A plan describing how the proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform is absent. The applicant states only that the "vision has the potential to be a blueprint for other reform efforts throughout the nation." The applicant further states, that the superintendent's participation in educational organizations is "a natural connection to other districts across the nation." This is the extent of the plan to support change beyond the participating schools.

The proposal does not include a Logic Model, Theory of Action, or Implementation Plan that will help guide the implementation of the strategies and projects of the proposal. There are no specific goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties. As a result of having no plan to scale-up the projects and a failure to adequately address the details of the proposal's implementation, this section scores a zero.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The applicant's academic goals are provided in data tables. According to the applicant, the goals are equal to and align with those of the state targets. This satisfies the requirement for the goals to be equal to or exceed the state's ESEA targets.

The summative assessment data is presented in total for grades 3-11. There is no breakdown by grade-level. In addition,

the goals for each of the summative assessment goal areas all increase by 10% each year. This does not seem reasonable that each goal, for each measure would all increase at the same exact rate. The equal increments do not account for individual subgroup performance and their challenges. These goals are not at all differentiated and thoughtful. Therefore, these goals are neither ambitious nor achievable as presented.

The applicant plans to use the state's growth standards as a measure of progress. No baseline data is provided although targets are listed. It is likely that targets will change once baseline data is obtained.

In the decreasing the achievement gap table, the applicant is using the "all students" as the highest achieving comparable subgroup. It is not specified that this subgroup is the highest performer in the district. Because the data in this table may not be compared to the highest achieving subgroup in the district or state, it is unclear if the goals are ambitious and achievable.

For the graduation rates table, the post-grant goals are 100% for all subgroups. This may be ambitious but not realistic and achievable. It is virtually impossible to achieve a 100% graduation rate in five years. For example, the special education subgroup baseline rate for 2013 is 52%. The goal is to reach 100% in year 2018. For proficiency outcomes for this population, the baseline in math is 12% with a goal of 62% post-grant. These measures (proficiency and college graduation) are not consistent.

College enrollment data is provided with goals and targets that are reasonable. For the ELL subgroup, no baseline data is provided even though goals are set.

The extent to which the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals is not clearly articulated. Because the data tables are incomplete and the goals are not all ambitious or achievable, this section scores in the high end of the low range.

## 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>3</b>

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

The applicant states that the district experienced a clear record of success in student learning, achievement, and equity although not in all areas. Presented as evidence is the newly released state report on value added outcomes by grade level for the "all students" category. Overall, the data shows growth. However, this evidence only shows data for 2013 as compared to 2012 not sufficiently providing evidence of a four-year record of success.

Because evidence is not provided by individual subgroups it is impossible to determine if achievement gaps are closing. The applicant has selected one subgroup (Hispanic and economically disadvantaged combined in one analysis) for focus and has provided data that shows promise for this past year.

Data for high school graduation rates show mixed results from 2012 to 2013 with an increase in the overall student group (69% to 74%) and the economically disadvantaged subgroup (62% to 68%). Two of the other subgroups show a decline (Hispanic 62% to 58% and IEP 55% to 52%).

College enrollment data shows an overall reduction from 2012 to 2013 (60% to 42%). No baseline data is available for the IEP and ELL populations. The four-year rates are not documented.

The applicant provides a graph as evidence to demonstrate academic success. The graph is titled; "More students score at grade level or above- 2003 compared to 2013". The graph gives a percent for two measures only, 2003 and 2013. Grade levels are combined (3-8). While this graph shows an increase over ten years (Reading 40.7 to 44.2 and Math 39.4 to 55.9), the graph does not provide strong evidence of success. No high school results are provided as evidence to demonstrate a four-year record of success.

No information is provided about the district's specific reforms in its lowest-performing schools. Therefore, there is no evidence to support ambitious and significant reforms in its lowest-achieving schools.

Not documented are the specific methods used to make student performance data available to students and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. The only method described is the posting of individual school profiles on the district website.

While showing some very promising results and successes this past year, there is not a clear four-year record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity. Therefore, this section results in a low score.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
---	----------	----------

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

There is not a high level of transparency to the extent to which the applicant makes available actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff. The evidence is insufficient to verify that the four categories of school-level expenditure data are already made available to the public. The applicant only states that salary information is posted on its web site; however, no evidence is provided to document this practice.

The evidence in the application is a listing of the 22 school districts in the county with a total per-pupil cost for each of the districts. No school-level expenditures are evident. The evidence only shows total the district per-pupil amount. It is not clear how and where this information is available.

The applicant also includes a letter from the district business administrator as evidence to indicate that the business practices promote transparency and to support that the district would be a "good steward" of the grant funds. However, this letter discusses business practices, not school-level expenditures and is thus, insufficient evidence to support a high level of transparency of making school-level expenditures available to the public. Therefore, this section receives a zero.

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

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

The applicant specified no issues under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements regarding implementation of the proposal. The applicant provides the state's letter in response to the proposal however, the state did not comment about the application stating that it is "not reviewing applications". Because the state did not review the proposal, it is unclear if there are any restraints. No evidence is provided to support or refute autonomy under state requirements.

The applicant states that some work needs to be done at the local level to successfully implement the strategies of the proposal like the theme elementary schools and class schedules at the middle school. It is not clear if these reform efforts would be in conflict with the state.

The applicant reports that the state has adopted the common core standards and an educator evaluation system, both of which support the proposal. There are conditions at the state level to support the proposal such as adopting the core curriculum content standards and aligned assessments, providing student growth data, and implementing the educator evaluation systems. Little information is provided about the state's efforts with respect to low-performing schools other than the provision of support from their Intermediate Units.

The conditions at the state level do not interfere with the successful implementation of the proposal although evidence from the state is not available. It is not clear if the applicant has sufficient autonomy to implement the proposal. This section results in a medium score losing points for the lack of discussion of the state's school improvement efforts and also the need for local approvals to initiate strategies of the reform efforts of this proposal.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

The superintendent took the lead in engaging stakeholders in the application's development. Meetings and outreach were held with district administrators, PTA, principals, business leaders, the mayor, the board of education, school staff, students and the teacher's association. This demonstrates stakeholder engagement.

A planning meeting was held with representatives of teachers, counselors and school administrators from each school. The applicant describes revising and editing the proposal based upon the meetings and outreach, although no evidence is provided about the actual revisions made.

Engagement with parents about the proposal did not occur and is planned if the grant is funded. As a result, meaningful engagement with parents is not evident. Because part of the plan is to redesign the elementary schools, the lack of parental input weakens the application.

Evidence of the support of the teacher's association is provided. A letter of support is included and the application is signed by the education association president. The mayor also submitted a letter of support, which is included in the application. A letter also documents submission of the application to the state. The 10-day submission to the mayor and state are met.

There are also letters of support from the individual schools, parent organizations, students, the business community,

providers of educational services, proposal partners, health centers, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education. The letters submitted as evidence are from a wide variety of stakeholders and include statements of support and also some feedback for improvements.

Overall, there was a high level of stakeholder engagement and input resulting in a high-medium score losing points for the lack of meaningful parent engagement and little evidence of revisions made to the application based on 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>3</b>

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

The application describes the strategies that are planned for implementation. The approach is provided however the extent to which the plan is designed for successful implementation is lacking. The elements of a high-quality plan are essentially absent. Specific activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties are not clearly articulated.

The applicant lists the strategies without providing the specific steps to achieve the goals. Some of the strategies are: interactive electronic journals, planned class trips, and a re-design of the elementary schools to career clusters.

The applicant lists the activities to address approaches to engage and empower learners, many of which are appropriate and relevant. However, the necessary plan of action is not provided to guide this work. For example, the electronic journals will be used to engage students to better understand that learning is key to their success. College professors will work with the curriculum coaches to ensure that content is of high-quality and aligned with the standards. At the middle school, the plan is to change to a trimester schedule. None of these approaches are defined and described sufficiently to ensure successful implementation.

There are several initiatives that are being implemented this school year and will continue in the grant. The high school transition plan and internship will be implemented this year with its freshman class. The blended learning pilot is being expanded this school year in the high school and at the 8<sup>th</sup> grade social studies class.

The details of implementation are not provided to ensure success of high-quality digital content, exposure to diverse cultures, development of positive learning skills and traits, and a process to provide immediate feedback for students to measure their progress toward their goals. Activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties are not included in the application on expanding blended learning to the earlier grades as part of this proposal.

A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development is planned using the electronic journals, the internships and a transition plans for high school students. Also, students can take college courses at the high school or at the local college campus. All but the electronic journals are currently operating in the high schools. The electronic journals have yet to be designed and as such will not be useable at the beginning of the grant period. There is no concrete plan to approach the steps to design and implement the journals.

To address climate, the district plans to continue to use a service agency that has provided training focused on resiliency. Another partnership is with the Community Health Council that provides funding for the resiliency training. The goal is to reduce the number of student suspensions.

The implementation details are not included in the plan regarding ongoing and regular feedback, which will be used to provide instructional resources to students. Updated individual student data will occur using the state's newly initiated Measures of Annual Progress. This will be used for personalized learning recommendations. Because this is a new system, the district recognizes that educators need professional development. The plan to provide this training is not clearly described.

The only accommodations and strategies for high-need students is a program at the YMCA after school. This is described as for students who need support. Few details are provided about this program other than to say that this service exists.

A family involvement coordinator will be assigned to each school to provide training and support to students and parents. The role of the parent is not specifically addressed as a means to engage and empower students in their learning. Also, the timelines, deliverables and responsible parties are not provided.

Overall, the components of a high-quality plan are not included in the application. Due to the lack of a cohesive plan to

implement the learning projects and strategies of this grant, the score for this section is in the low range.

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

**20**

**2**

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

The extent to which the applicant has a plan to implement teaching and learning for educators to use instructional strategies of the proposal is weak. Missing are most of the elements of a high-quality plan. Specific activities do not include timelines, deliverables and responsible parties. The applicant lists a number of activities such as more training on blended learning classrooms and more content specific support for the elementary school teachers whose schools are being redesigned. In most instances the "how" of the implementation is absent from the application.

To frequently measure student learning, the applicant does not describe in detail how it will use and enhance the newly initiated state diagnostic system, which is not fully implemented. Likewise the state's educator evaluation is just being initiated. The applicant states that the state's system will not be readily usable. The plan does not include timelines, deliverables and responsible parties.

No timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties are specified for methods planned to increase effective teachers. Only activities are identified such as: small group sessions, individualized coaching and guided practice, feedback loop and classroom observations using the state's teacher effectiveness plan.

Educators have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources. Available to educators is the state's eMetric program, which provides student data on test results. All teachers have access to this system and have been trained. The district also uses a local program - Performance Tracker - which houses student assessment data. Actionable information is available from these data systems.

To adapt content, the state's Standards Aligned System is available to participating teachers. Training has already occurred. However, it is not clear about the level of teacher usage of this system.

Although work will also occur in partnership with college professors to ensure that learning resources are of high-quality, the details of this strategy do not provide for a timeline, deliverables and responsible parties.

A high-quality plan to address blended learning processes and tools to serve, as the means to match student needs, is not evident. The blended learning experience started last year at the high school as a pilot. Expansion plans for the elementary and middle school are not detailed and do not include the elements of a high-quality plan.

The application does not include a plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals other than using the state educator evaluation system. The outcomes of this system will not be readily available for several years.

Missing from the application are steps and activities to be utilized by the district to ensure a high level of implementation fidelity. Essentially there is no concrete plan to ensure the quality of teaching and leading. As a result, the score for this section is in the low range.

**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>2</b>

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

The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan to support project implementation. The application does not include a specific, defined plan to organize its administrative work to support the proposal implementation. To implement the practices, policies and rules of the proposal, insufficient details are provided such as timelines, deliverables that are measurable, and responsible parties.

Specifics on how the grant will be managed and implemented along with the current district structures and operating committees are not provided. The current operations of the central office are described without specifying how it will be organized to support the grant implementation. It is not clear if there are specified frequencies of current operations; rather it is described generally using terms such as "usually", "regularly", "closely" and when "they are able to do so".

Providing school leadership teams with sufficient flexibility and autonomy are not evident in the application. At the school-level, principals have Student Support Teams to address their school improvement plans. There are few details about the

grant implementation efforts within these teams. Evidence is not provided regarding the structure, policies and operations of these teams.

At the high school level, the applicant intends to eliminate "seat time" for mastery and credit by adding a career experience requirement. This gives students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. This policy is not yet board approved. The applicant does not provide evidence of a high-quality plan and timeline to accomplish this policy approval.

Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways is not sufficiently described. One opportunity for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways will occur at the high school level using the newly implemented internship program. This is the only grade-span addressed by the applicant.

Not addressed or described in the application are the learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including those with disabilities and English learners.

Because many of the details are not included in the application about district and school infrastructures and supports and the lack of a high-quality implementation plan, the score for this section is low.

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

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

A plan to support project implementation through district and school infrastructure is not sufficiently addressed. The elements of a high-quality plan are not provided.

Also, the applicant does not ensure that all participating students, regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the proposal. For example, the goal of providing I-Pads to students does not include specific activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties.

As evidence, the applicant only provides a general description of its technology department's overall operations. Nothing specific about this proposal is described in the evidence.

It is unclear how appropriate levels of technical support will be provided to stakeholders. For example, the only support to parents is described as being "available and outreach is occurring". This plan is insufficient as the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties are not specified.

The applicant does not provide any information about the ability for information to be used in an open data format or in interoperable data systems. Evidence from the technology department does not address opportunities and accessibility of exportable data.

Due to the lack of details for implementation, the lack of a high-quality plan, and the lack of information about the open data systems, the score for this section is in the top of the low range.

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

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

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

A high-quality plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals is not evident in this application. The plan lacks specific activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties.

The applicant describes the continuous improvement for this proposal to occur in each school's improvement plan process to monitor and measure the reform efforts of this proposal. To address timely and regular feedback, the applicant states that this will occur "at least monthly" and that the "structure varies from building to building". There is no evidence to identify the steps to incorporate the components of this grant into the individual school's plan. The only activity identified in the application is a statement that this work will occur if this grant is awarded.

To support implementation of the revised school improvement plans, additional staff will be hired to assist central office and the principals. The responsibilities of this staff are very briefly described as focusing on the "overall timeline of the grant, the curricular initiatives and the data piece". This is an insufficient plan. It only addresses hiring of staff who will only then

work on the details of crafting a continuous improvement plan.

To publically share information about the grant, the applicant plans to hire a school community liaison to "ensure that we publically share information on the quality of investments". This is a goal, with no other elements of a plan such as activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

The application does not include any elements of a viable plan to ensure continuous improvement and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during the grant period. Missing from the plan are key goals, specific activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties to monitor, measure and publically share the outcomes.

The level of detail for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process is not sufficient to ensure that the grant is on track. Due to a lack of comprehensive information, the score for this section is low.

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

**5**

**0**

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

The plan for on-going communication and engagement is non-existent. The only activity identified is for the school community liaison to "develop a communications strategy". There are no goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties. The applicant states in the application only that communication "will need to be addressed". Therefore, the score for this section is 0.

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

**5**

**1**

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

Performance measures are provided for 12 outcomes, which are incomplete, missing data and inconsistent as follows:

- For the highly effective educator table, there is no data for the teachers, only for the principal. For the effective and highly effective educator tables, the baseline data already is at 100%. Targets are then provided for each of the grant years increasing each year for all the subgroups at the same rate. Ultimately, in the post-grant year the target is again at 100%. These tables are inconsistent since the baseline is already at 100%. Therefore, the targets are not realistic.
- For the pre-K 3 students, academics and student behavior (bullying) is identified. The baseline and targets are provided and are not ambitious although achievable. For example, the baseline is 6 and the target for year one is also 6. This is achievable, not ambitious. Also for the bullying measures, baseline data is not provided for four of the five subgroups and the targets are defined as "<6".
- For grades 4-8, baseline data is provided for the indicator - "students scoring two grades below chronological age in reading ability, two consecutive years". The targets for this indicator should be going down instead of up. This table is inconsistent.
- For grades 4-8, proficiency data for both the baseline and targets are displayed and are ambitious yet achievable. For the bullying factor, baseline data is not provided and the targets are defined for example as "<5".
- For the high school population, the free application for federal student aid data, the number of students at the end of each grade who have achieved a minimum number of credits, and students with an individualized career plan are used to demonstrate the outcomes of the reform efforts for the high school population. No baseline data is provided for these tables. In year 2016-2017, the targets for students who have achieved a minimum amount of credits for graduation are at 100% for the four subgroups. This target is unrealistic to attain 100%.
- For high school, in another performance measure table, the students in grade 11 on track to graduate, no baseline data is displayed and the post-grant target is 100%. There is also a perception measure - again no baseline data. The targets are general - "5% increase from baseline". The targets are unrealistic at 100% and because baseline data is not provided, the targets are difficult to assess for ambitious, achievable attainment.

Because there is a lack of data and less than ambitious goals, these performance measures are insufficient. Additionally, the applicant does not provide a rationale for selection of any of these measures. Notably, within the application, no information about the incidence of bullying is described as an issue to address and thus no strategies identified as part of the proposed projects. No description is included in the application as to how these measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information. Additionally, the applicant does not provide any description of how these measures will be reviewed and improved over the course of the grant.

Because the baseline measures are not always provided and thus the targets not reliable, the performance measures and goals are not sufficient. Due to the inconsistencies, incomplete data, and lack of responses to the criterion, the score for

this section is in the low range.

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

**5**

**0**

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

The plan to evaluate the effectiveness of investments is non-existent. The extent of the plan consists of two sentences. None of the elements of a high-quality plan are provided as evidence. Therefore, this section scores a zero.

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

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

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

The budget section only consists of an overall budget summary and a very brief narrative for the overall proposal. Summary budgets are provided for each of the four projects; however, individual narratives are not included in the application. Also absent from the application are each of the four Project-Level Itemized Costs.

There is a note on the budget page that states the following: "The charts that we have developed do not merge into this document. Please see the budget spreadsheets that are enclosed as part of our cds and they are provided in hard copy." These charts are not included in the application and thus are unavailable for review. Therefore, it is impossible to fully evaluate the budget to determine if the costs are reasonable and sufficient. Also, due to the missing budget information, rationales for the investments are not available to review.

Based upon the overall budget summary, it shows that the total budget for the proposal is \$19.3 million. \$1.2 million is identified as funds from other sources to support implementation of the project. These other funds are not specifically identified. The funding for the four projects as specified in the overall budgets are:

1. Counseling/experiential learning (\$5.5 million)
2. School Climate (\$2.3 million)
3. Academic interest (\$8.1 million)
4. Technology (\$3.3 million)

The applicant identifies the costs that are for one-time investments and for on-going funding. However, the definition used by the applicant for one-time and on-going costs are inconsistent with what is defined in the federal notice. For example, the applicant defines personnel costs that are charged for each of the grant years as one-time costs. This is inconsistent with the grant definitions.

Because crucial information is not included in the budget - individual project narratives and budgets, it is impossible to determine if the costs are reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. Therefore, this section scores low.

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

**10**

**0**

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

The applicant does not include a plan to sustain the project's goals after the term of the grant. Rather, an activity is briefly described as an "attempt to sustain some of the student supports" and "seek ways to work with community groups". Due to the lack of essential elements of a high-quality plan (goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties), the score for this section is zero.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

For the Competitive Priority, the applicant plans to address its special education population. The plan consists of two components:

1. Therapy dogs
2. Yellow Breeches

The description of the partnership is not coherent and sustainable. For the therapy dog component, the applicant states "the addition of a therapy dog will have a positive impact on school climate" and that this strategy "can have a profound effect". No data is provided to support the selection of such a program based upon the needs of the targeted students in the participating schools. This description is insufficient to determine the value of this project. It is unclear how this project would be implemented and how the students would be selected to participate.

The second program, Yellow Breeches, is planned to serve female special education students who have difficulty making social and behavioral progress in the school setting. Yellow Breeches is a private academic school. The district has a similar program for its male students and plans to use Yellow Breeches for the females. The applicant reports that the program for the males has been successful. No outcome data is included in the application for the male program, which has been in operation for one year. The program could serve up to 10 female students within the school boundaries. Up to 10 female students from other districts could enroll by paying tuition. This is the extent of the scale-up plan. Because year 1 of the grant is a planning year for Yellow Breeches, services would not be implemented in a timely manner. The applicant states that there is a need for the Yellow Breeches program without providing evidence. Also, this program would appear to be the core educational program for these female students, as it is not only addressing their social-emotional needs. This is not consistent with a program to augment the students' educational program.

The table for the population-level desired results is specific to the special education students. The desired results identified only include educational outcomes. No family and community support results are identified. The educational desired results are not measurable. Rather, words such as "improved" and "reduced" are used. Also, attendance rates are cited as a desired result; however, this is not included as a performance measure. This is inconsistent.

For improved climate, a survey would only be used for high school students. This is inconsistent with the therapy dog project as all grade-levels would participate in that project.

The district also plans to use graduation rates as a measure for its IEP population with a 100% target at post-grant. This target is not realistic as the baseline rate for this subgroup is 52%. Reaching 100% in five years is not attainable.

Further, another performance measure is to "increase student perceptions of school effectiveness". There is no baseline data for this measure. An example of a target is "5% increase from baseline". It is unclear if this would be applicable to the 10 served female special education students as the survey will only be administered to high school students.

The descriptions of the partnerships to support the plan are not coherent and sustainable to support the plan. There is no information in the application that addresses the following criteria of the partnership: track the selected indicators, target its resources, scale the model beyond the participating students, improve results over time, build the capacity of staff in participating schools, assess the needs of participating students, identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community, create a decision-making process and infrastructure, engage parents and families, or routinely assess the applicant's progress.

Due to the lack of measurable outcomes and a significant number of criterion not addressed in the description of the partnership implementation plans, the score for this section is low.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

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

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The Lebanon School District application does not meet Absolute Priority 1. Based upon the content of their application, the implementation of personalized learning environments is not achievable. The plan is not coherent or comprehensive. There is a significant lack of high-quality plans throughout the application. In several sections, the applicant was not responsive resulting in a score of zero. Additionally, planning for many of the strategies would occur in the beginning of the grant period leading to a delay in actual implementation. The goal of increasing student graduation rates would not be assured

based upon the implementation of this plan. Also, the redesign of the elementary schools (K-5) to magnet schools is not a credible approach.

The applicant does not describe how it builds on the four core educational assurance areas. The district is using the state's growth model to measure student progress. This system was just initiated and is not fully operational. The proposal does not sufficiently address how the capacity of teachers will be built to use this model effectively (assurance area 2). For assurance area 3, its strategies for recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals are weak. The district is relying on the state's educator evaluation system, which will not be operational soon. It's own efforts to improve educator effectiveness are limited. Additionally, efforts to expand student access to effective teachers are insufficient. For assurance area 4, turning around low-performing schools, no information is provided about the district's efforts and successes.

Because the application does not sufficiently address the development and implementation of a personalized learning environment for all of its participating students, it has not met this criterion.

Total	210	46
-------	-----	----