



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0094OH-1 for Maysville Local School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section received a low-high score because the applicant details a clear vision regarding existing conditions in the four educational assurance areas along with the proposed enhancements through grant initiatives. Currently the applicant encompasses standards alignment k-12, common collaborative web portal for educators, students, and parents, targeted coaching, and data informed decision making policies and practices.</p> <p>Continuing to work through the consortium, the applicant has set forth attainable and realistic goals detailing their approach to increasing student achievement. However, it is unclear as to how the applicant will meet the needs of parents and families of disadvantaged students to accelerate student learning. Secondary 6-12 student will be offered a variety of educational choices to meet their individual needs with opportunities to earn college credit, but the applicant does not detail how low performing students or English Language learners learning will be accelerated by meeting their diverse needs.</p> <p>The applicant has current initiatives in place in which they can build upon such as the arts or STEM learning environments. Students will have the ability to participate in curricula of interest across the entire network of 22 rural LEAs. The applicant's implementation plan across the 22 rural LEAs is coherent and innovative when referring to non-struggling students, but it is unclear how districts will reach out to and support disadvantaged students, gifted students, and students who continue to struggle.</p> <p>The applicant details the classroom experience for grades 6-12 in all participating LEAs. Students will have access to digital learning platforms, four different personalized learning pathway options, dual enrollment courses, and student ownership of learning. The applicant also details a case study that provides evidence of the classroom experience and how it will be enhanced with grant funding.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section scores in the high range because the applicant utilized a cohesive process that included multiple stakeholders to select participating schools. Schools in the consortium serving students in grades 6-12 are included in the application. The applicant has provided a comprehensive list of all schools that will be participating in the grant. The applicant provided the total number of students participating to include low income, high needs, and participating educators.</p> | | |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 4 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's LEA-wide reform and change is based on the belief of establishing routines to drive and monitor personalized learning performance. The applicant utilizes a logic model approach for describing their plan for resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and goal. However, the applicant does not provide a high-quality plan that details how their reform proposal will be scaled up into meaningful reform district-wide beyond the participating schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They include a logic model, Fulfilling the Fifth Assurance: Theory of Change, summarizing their vision, goals, priorities, and delivery mechanisms for the successful implementation of grant initiatives, but the model does not translate into meaningful reform for all schools throughout the 22 LEAs. The activities stated are vague and require more specific detail. For example, it is unclear how the applicant plans to provide leadership development of support to principals, or how do they plan to increase access to and the use of quality digital content and which stakeholders they plan to include in this. In addition, the applicant does not detail a plan for providing professional development in formative instructional practices to all participating educators and how the effectiveness of this professional development will be measured. • Even though this model details the applicant's intent to support LEA reform and change for the participating schools, there is a disconnect between activities and outputs in the logic model. For example, the notion that all student, parents, and educators will use Ohio Digital Learning Systems is ambitious and not supported with a plan of action for implementation. • Also, it is unclear as to how parents, teacher, administrators, and parents will be trained on all of the new technology resources that will be made available and there is no plan as to how the effectiveness of trainings will be monitored. | | |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section scores in the low-high range because the applicant provides extensive detail for increasing student achievement on required state assessments for reading and math. In addition, the applicant provides detailed goals for school grading expectation outcomes. The goal is to have all participating schools at an A or B grade by post grant. The state assessment goals are aligned with the school grading goals. The applicant will utilize the state's formulas for determining % proficient and advanced to determine increase in student achievement. However, the applicant's outcome goals for closing</p> | | |

achievement gaps are too ambitious by striving to close achievement gaps 50% by the end of the grant period. High School Graduation data indicates a lack of clear record of success for supporting low performing populations.

The applicant provides a table detailing graduation rate goals articulated by the Ohio Department of Education. These goals support the applicants vision and will likely result in improved student learning if accomplished. The goals are ambitious and achievable across districts and subgroups.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 7 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio Appalachian Collaborative has been in place since 2009 with a common mission of transforming rural education. Collective reform initiatives have shown positive impacts on student achievement. Data displays that since 2010 collectively schools have seen an overall increase in student performance. Grades 8 and 10 have made strong gains in reading achievement on the state assessment. The consortium also outperformed the state on the statewide mathematics assessment. However according to data it is evident the consortium needs to close achievement gaps and increase proficiency for economically disadvantaged students.</p> <p>The applicant has not detailed a clear record of success as it is not evident to the extent scores are raising student achievement for economically disadvantaged students. Achievement gap scores are not significant based on the populations served and the data provided does not detail if disadvantaged students are making gains. It only states whether the subgroups meet or exceed the Annual Measurable Objectives.</p> <p>The applicant details reform initiatives in their lowest performing schools. The applicant does not provide data as to whether these initiatives have made ambitious and significant reform. It is unclear as to how these reform initiatives have made a positive impact on student achievement.</p> <p>Seventeen out of the 22 LEAs are equipped to provide teachers, parents, and students access to real time data and individual student progress. However, all LEAs host parent events and parent-teacher conferences to share student performance data with parents.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section receives a high score because the state of Ohio maintains a comprehensive online display of District Profile Reports to include personnel salaries and non-personal expenditures, in addition each LEA also displays this information to the public as required by the grant application.</p> <p>In appendix B, the applicant provide's samples of explicit building level detail of expenditures per pupil that includes building operations, instruction, support, and administration. These reports are provided to the public and are available on district websites. In addition, in appendix B the applicant provides supporting evidence of public accessible documentation of building level personnel salaries for instructional staff, teachers, and actual non-personal expenditures.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section receives a low-high score because the 22 participating LEAs demonstrate the ability to implement personalized learning environments under the state's adopted plan for implementing methods for students to earn high school credit based on demonstration of subject area competency. This plan is in state statute and outlines sufficient autonomy for districts to have the freedom to implement personalized learning environments. However, it is not clear if the applicant has the successful conditions to higher highly qualified teachers in critical need areas. This is essential for creating the conditions to implement personalized learning environments.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 13 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant documents successful stakeholder involvement in the support and development of the proposal. The applicant provides a detailed table outlining stakeholders and their engagement support, along with the plan revision outcomes. The table provides evidence of stakeholder involvement to include families, community members, and teachers. However, there is no evidence as to how families were directly involved in the development of the grant proposal and how feedback from families was utilized to make changes or improvements during the process.</p> <p>The applicant has provided a detailed table indicating 18 out of 22 network LEAs are represented by a collective bargaining unit. The 18 collective bargaining LEAs have MOUs signed by their union presidents. The four LEAs not represented by collective bargaining have provided evidence of at least 70 percent of teachers in participating schools support the proposal. This evidence is located in appendix B4.</p> <p>The Appendix also includes letters of support from key stakeholders such as parent and student organizations, early learning programs, and the business community, across LEAs and there is also a letter of support from the Ohio Department of Education.</p> | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 15 |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> | | |

The applicant provides a high quality plan that details innovative structures to ensure learning occurs to meet the needs of all learners and provides multiple exposures to diverse cultures contexts that deepen student learning.

- This high quality plan is supported through the collaborative effort of the consortium to include parents and educators, in which students will engage in creating detailed learning plans based on their interests and needs. These plans will provide an opportunity for students to participate in face to face instructional activities, online learning environments, and hands on vocational settings across the consortium. All students will assess their interest and career goals through the already established Ohio Career Information system. The applicant will provide all students and families access to this system so students can work through planning for their personalized learning tracks. This system and the Individual Academic and Career Plans will help students identify milestones and goals aligned to college and career ready standards. The applicant states that students will have access and exposures to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that deepen student learning, but it is unclear as to how the applicant ensures this will take place, which activities will be implemented, and how these activities will be measured. In addition, the applicant does not specifically detail their plan for students to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, and problem solving. For example, the applicant explains how the student will progress through their personal pathway, but does not extend the plan as to how they will ensure students will access the tools required to master those specific areas.
- The applicant outlines a detailed plan describing how all participating students will have Individual Academic and Career Plans that include personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development. To support this initiative districts will provide a net-work catalog of course offerings on the Personalized Learning Pathways digital management system. This system will greatly expand options to rural areas and provide learning opportunities that currently do not exist. The applicant's plan details a variety of high-quality instructional environments to include face-to-face, blended online learning, experimental learning, and service learning. The applicant will utilize iLearnOhio which is a newly developed system that will provide high-quality learning content. This content will be measured through student assessment data, student engagement data, and student growth data. Student success will be monitored through an online monitoring system facilitated by teachers and advisors. The LEAs will partner with Connect Ohio to determine internet need for families of poverty. This partnership will provide students of poverty with internet access from home. The applicant indicates that at-risk students will create a plan that meets their individual needs and will participate in a multi-tiered system of support, however the applicant does not include a plan as to how these students needs will be met to increase low performance, how their performance will be monitored, or what remediation procedures will be in place to support struggling students to include English Language learners and special education.
- The applicant provides details that support current infrastructures are in place to provide training and support to students to ensure they understand how to use the tools and resources. However, the applicant does not provide a coherent plan as to how students will receive adequate training. For example, in the deliverable timeline the applicant details students will begin utilizing digit tools in phase 1, but teacher training does not occur until phase 2. This details a disconnect in meeting student needs for successful use of the digital tools and resources.

This section receives a mid range score because the applicant provides extensive information as to how the learning plans will meet the needs and interest of students, however it is unclear as to high need student accommodations will be met to help ensure they are on track. Without this detail it is unclear as to how the district will ensure high need students will meet college and career readiness goals.

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

20

18

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section scores in the high range because the applicant provides a high-quality plan that provides extensive detail to their teaching and leading plan by providing a table that includes goals, activities, and the rationale. Their program goals align with current initiatives for increasing student achievement. The applicant details the need to build capacity by providing streamlined professional development that is provided for teachers by teachers. There is a continued focus for developing leaders through structured and effective learning environments. The applicant has current professional learning system processes in place that are supported by robust educator networks, professional learning communities, and online peer to peer exchange.

- The applicant's high-quality plan details the utilization and expansion of their current successful system of support to meet the needs of all learners and educators. This includes the continued use of job-embedded coaching and instructional walkthrough processes. However, the applicant does not detail how these continued infrastructures will be measured to ensure they are improving teacher and principal practice and effectiveness.
- The applicant's plan specifies how current and newly developed digital learning systems will be utilized to accelerate student progress toward meeting college and career readiness goals. This is accomplished through district based coaches who can provide professional development to educators, existing and enhanced network teams that are made up of teachers and administrators, and district leadership teams that will support the work of coaches and network teams. These teams will work in collaboration to ensure educators are receiving adequate access to and know how to use tools, data, and resources. The applicant details a high quality plan as to how they will integrate and utilize high-quality resources with newly developed resources that are aligned with college and career readiness standards.
- The applicant details their plan to ensure all participating school leaders have training, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure effective learning environments that are enhanced through the utilization of the teacher evaluation system and training systems. To accomplish this the applicant will provide real time student data to evaluate and inform teaching strategies. In addition, educators will utilize results from their formal evaluations to develop individualized professional development plans.
- The applicant will also increase the number of students receiving instruction from effective to highly effective teachers and principals in hard to staff schools. This will be accomplished by creating a Dual Enrollment System Delivery Group to align and facilitate student pathways to

graduation and postsecondary. However, it is not clearly defined as to how the LEAs will monitor, evaluate, and measure teacher effectiveness to ensure high quality.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 9 |
| <p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium has established and ensures effective LEA policies, practices, and rules regarding personalized learning. They have proactively set up systems to support school leadership by establishing flexibility over grant initiatives to meet student and teacher needs. Governance structures at each LEA will be organized to support the implementation of grant initiatives. This includes the addition of a full-time staff member dedicated to support the work.</p> <p>The applicant will administer surveys and utilize the data to help inform leadership structures to facilitate the implementation of personalized learning. The Performance Management System Delivery Group will oversee and support the evaluation system to provide recommendations for program improvement.</p> <p>This section scores in the mid-high range because it is unclear as to how the applicant plans to support students who struggle and perform below grade level in math and reading. In addition, it is unclear as to what structures are or will be in place for English Language learners or students with disabilities. The applicant does not detail how all students will have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. In addition, it is not stated as to how all student will have the opportunity to demonstrate master of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's plan details how they have partnered with multiple organizations to ensure that participating stakeholders have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school. This partnership includes technology centers that will aid in providing internet access to students at home in high poverty and rural areas. LEAs will continue to partner with Educational Service Centers to assist in auditing and improving data systems and alignment of data and learning platforms. This supports schools having access to interoperable data systems.</p> <p>This section scores in the mid range because even though it is a comprehensive plan it lacks high quality because it is unclear as to how the applicant will provide learning resources and necessary content for below proficient students, English Language learners, or student with disabilities. In addition, the applicant does not address how low income families will have access to data, tools, and resources detailed in the grant.</p> | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 10 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a detailed plan that includes a comprehensive table detailing specific information on how the consortium will, measure and publicly share information on the quality of grant investments. The table includes what aspects of the grant they will monitor, measure, and share with stakeholders and the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personalized Learning Practitioners embedded in each LEA will oversee continuous improvement processes Surveys will be conducted to obtain stakeholder feedback and recommendations Provide ongoing feedback opportunities utilizing online groups, briefs, and platforms. <p>However, it is unclear as to what some of the measures listed in the table intent to assess. For example, the applicant lists survey data as a measure, but does not include what this survey will assess and who is the intended audience for the survey. In addition, the progress and achievement measure lacks specific detail as to what this measure entails and who is the intended audience. It is also unclear as to the purpose of this measure.</p> <p>The applicant will also continue to implement and improve upon their leadership and coaching model to embed continuous improvement into educational leaders. The continuous improvement plan includes multiple stakeholders and community members to provide feedback regarding grant implementation.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a plan that will utilize Battelle for Kids to craft cohesive, aligned messages that will bring clarity to school improvement. The</p> | | |

applicant has detailed communication goals and their target audience for ongoing communication and engagement with stakeholders:

- Provide communication support services
- Publicly share information
- Manage a college and career ready campaign

Each of these goals align with the applicants vision on implementing personalized learning communities. However, the applicant's plan lacks clarity as to how they will support high need families with ongoing communication and engagement. In addition, the applicant states their intent to support external audiences such as parents, families, and higher education institutions, but does not provide specific details or a plan as to how this will be accomplished.

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 4 |
|---|----------|----------|

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 This section scores in the high range because the applicant details performance measures and their rational. However, details lack a clear description of timeliness of data so it can be used to inform project modifications. For example, the Leading Social-Emotional Indicators for grades 6-12 performance measure does not provide detail as to how often data will be made available to make programmatic decisions.
 The applicant includes a process for reviewing measures to make informed decisions on effectiveness. This process includes LEAs regularly reviewing performance data to make program implementation improvements.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 The evaluator provides a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of grant initiatives. The applicant will utilize an independent third party evaluator to conduct their program evaluation. The applicant details specific criteria for selecting a third party evaluator to include specifies knowledge and expertise, strong evaluation background, strong references, and encompass adequate resources. The applicant presents a comprehensive plan detailing how each LEA will work in tandem with the third party evaluator. This is supported by the utilization of the current Ohio Research Center, which will assist in the structure of the evaluation plan and provide critical feedback throughout grant implementation.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 This section receives a high score because the applicant provides a detailed budget including descriptions of grant funds to include funds that will be utilized for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs. Training stipends and professional development vendors will be one-time investments as opposed to newly hired staff salaries, which will be ongoing costs. The applicant's budget identifies all funds that will support the project in addition to providing reasonable and thoughtful rational for each budget item.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 This section receives a high score because the applicant has provided a high-quality plan that details a three year sustainability budget which includes district costs, three year post grant funding needs, and projected long term sustainability. Each participating LEA will create a sustainability task force within the first three months of the project. The task force will be responsible for developing the districts sustainability roadmap. The applicant will utilize current funding streams from state, federal, and local revenues, such as title I, local levy funds, and other shared services, to sustain grant initiatives.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:
 This section scores high because the applicant's plan builds off an already coherent and sustainable partnership across all LEAs included in the grant application. These partnerships have shown positive results in supporting families, educational staff, and increasing student achievement.
 The applicant's desired results include initiatives, processes and procedures for reducing chronic absenteeism, improving student experience, full implementation of personalized learning plans, increase the percentage of high need 9th grade students who attain 5 or more credits by the end of the year, and increasing the percentage of high need students to access higher education through dual enrollment.
 The applicant has a coherent plan for building capacity that includes full continuation and integration of community partnerships and stakeholders. For example, the Foundation for Appalachian Ohio is a natural partner for the applicant due to its strong regional presence. In addition, the continued partnership with the Performance Measurement Delivery group will track and analyze student data and their personalized learning pathway.
 The applicant provides a detailed plan to ensure integrated services meet the needs of all learners. This is accomplished through the creation of Apiration Partnerships, this partnership will focus on the identification and integration of relevant support services.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

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

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has met absolute priority 1 by implementing personalized learning environments through the support of all LEAs and the state. The applicant provides a coherent plan for increasing student achievement, increasing the effectiveness of educators, and expand student access. The applicant will streamline and implement current successful initiatives to make them available to all middle and high school students.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 163 |
|--------------|------------|------------|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0094OH-2 for Maysville Local School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

. The applicant has set forth a clear comprehensive and coherent reform vision that addresses the four core assurance educational areas and articulates a clear approach to the goals that accelerates student achievement and deepens learning through personalize learning experiences.

. The Applicant provided reasonable evidence of the Consortium's need to apply for the RTT-D Grant based on : 1. low percent(20%) of the State's high school students graduating and attending a two or four year college. 2. (40%) of students requiring remediation. 3. challenges that the small LEAs faces to increasing college participation and decreasing college remediation. 4. low percentage of students living in rural areas not having access to resources and the mindset to be successful.

. The Applicant provided a clear and detailed table reflecting strategies and projects that the Consortium will implement to address their five benchmarks which highlights their proposal's vision. The five project's benchmarks will focus on : graduation rates, percentage of students who surpass yearly college-career readiness indicators from K-12, percentage of students who take the ACT college readiness assessment and score above a composite score of 21, percentage of students enrolled in technical , two year or four year higher education institutions within one year of graduating from high school and percentage of students who take ownership of their learning by demonstrating learning mindsets, strategies and skills for academic success.

. The Applicant provided a thorough description by citing a case study of what the classroom experience would be like for the LEAs students, teachers, parents and principals in a personalized learning environment : STUDENTS(having access to digital learning platforms that personalizes lessons and provides feedback), TEACHERS(integrating within their instructional practice digital learning plateforms that personalizes lessons, incorporating blended learning formats) PRINCIPALS (using performance data system for wise decision making about school improvement) , PARENTS (engaging in the personalized learning pathway system to see how they can better prepare their children for college and reduce expenses.)

. The Applicant provided reasonable evidence of a focused approach to the Consortium's(Ohio Appalachian Collaborative) to address the targeted goals of increasing student achievement. A table was provided reflecting the LEA's Consortium' Shared Vision Plan and Unique Needs. The table outlined and described how the Consortium will share their proposal's goals and systems in meeting the needs of individual LEAs.

. The applicant articulates the plan's goals however, they are broad and lack specificity to encourage a realistic and credible approach of accelerating student achievement as established by the plan's vision.

.
.
.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided thorough evidence of 22 LEAs participating schools across 6-12 grade bands selected to participate in implementing the

proposal's reform plan. The Consortiums' method of selecting the participating LEAs were based on their experience in working as a collaborative as educators through shared professional development and leadership training. All LEAs were matched with the State's Fiscal Year 2013 Spreadsheet for Small Rural School Achievement Program and Rural Low-Income School Program to determine the LEAs eligibility under the rural criteria. LEAs school enrollment by grade level and economic disadvantage was analyzed to determine income eligibility of participating schools. A table was provided that clearly summarized the LEAs eligibility status to be selected for participating in the proposal's reform. All schools serving in grades 6-12 in all 22 LEAS are participating in the proposal.

. The Applicant identified 22 member LEAs serving 16,003 students in grades 6-12 and 1,465 educators participating in the Consortiums' proposal reform. The total includes 7,779 high need students based on free and reduced lunch and from low-income families. A table is provided listing the Consortiums' participating LEAs and schools .

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant presented a reasonable plan design for scaling up the proposal for grade 6-12 which is outlined in their Fifth Assurance Theory of Change Model which summarizes the plan's goals, priorities, delivery strategies for implementing the plan and provides sustainability. A clear detailed plan was not presented for scaling up their proposal to elementary schools and district-wide change.

.The Applicant did not provide evidence of how the proposals reformed services will be scaled to support change beyond the participating schools, however the plan will translate into meaningful reform for all schools participating in the project in grades 6-12.

. The plan's Theory of Change Model does not provide a training plan component for parents and families in the use of their digital learning system. Without this plan parents will be unable to support and help their children to make improvements in their education.

The activities outlined in the Model was not sufficiently specific and the outcome goals are not clearly articulated to address how the plan will improve student learning outcomes.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided a thorough and detailed comprehensive chart on students' summative assessments for proficiency status and growth for student achievement which includes baselines and goals. The Applicant described the proposal's Performance Measures on summative assessment in each goal area and with each subgroup. The State's Achievement System will serve as the baseline for determining student achievement in reading and math over the years of the grant funding. A clear and detailed table was provided outlining the annual goals for the following subgroups: all students, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students. Annual goals race/ ethnic subgroups were not provided fully for all areas.

. The LEAs Consortium's plan of closing the achievement gap by 50% over the course of the grant using the State's baseline data system in reading and math is too ambitious within the four year period of the grant which includes all subgroup populations .

. The Consortiums' annual graduation rate goal(1% each year) and the annual college rate goal to increase 7 to 14 percent during the course of the grant funding are reasonable and achievable..

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 8 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

.The Applicant provided evidence of a well developed approach for implementing student learning outcomes and closing the achievement gap by using resources aligned to their goal of increasing student achievement for all students. The Consortium have seen increase in student performance measured by the State Department of Education's Performance Index (increase from 95.3 to 96.4 between 2010-2013) A chart was provided reflecting the Consortiums' gains in grade 8-10 in the subject areas of reading and math.

. District - level value-added results have increased over the last four years due to the LEAs network teams training of valued-added data which demonstrates a clear record of success of their work. The Applicant provided a detailed chart reflecting the Consortiums' District -Level Composite Value-Added Results for 2010-2013.

. The Applicant provided evidence of the Consortiums' two specific student population subgroups (economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities) increased student achievement in meeting or exceeding the State's annual measureable objectives. The Applicant clearly demonstrated success in supporting these subgroups in improving their achievement. The Applicant provided a well developed graph reflecting the Consortiums' increased graduation rate and college enrollment. Graduation rates did not show a significant improvement.

- . While the Applicant demonstrated one year's increase in student achievement, the Applicant did not provide evidence of how other groups achieved or exceeded the State's increased student achievement in meeting the State's annual measurable objectives within the 4 year period.
- . The Applicant identified strategies for improving their lowest performing schools but does not provide evidence of the strategies impact on student achievement.
- . The Applicant's proposal data is vague in explaining how students with disabilities and economically disadvantage students obtained a four year record of success and what programs were in place to provide the success.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant provided evidence of the extent it has already made available school-level expenditure by the use of the district's online annual Profile Report.
- . The Applicant provided reasonable evidence of the use of the Consortiums' website which enables stakeholders to obtain informal data regarding actual personnel salaries: instructional, support staff, teachers administrators, and non-personnel expenditures. All LEAs will make expenditures and salary data available through other means than the website if requested.
- . The State Department of Education publishes and post online District Profile Reports which includes teachers and administrators average salaries, expenditures for building operations, instruction pupil and staff support salaries and total expenditures. Expenditures are available in public documents that are printed and sent to members in the community.
- . The Applicant provided a spreadsheet with detailed information of each LEAS expenditures located in Appendix (1-3).

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant provided sound evidence of the State's commitment and support to implement the personalized learning environments under legal, statutory and regulatory requirements. The State has adopted statewide plans: 1. in implementing methods for students to earn units of high school credits based on subject area competency, 2. refining blended learning using digital technology tool, 3. funding dual enrollment option model,4. budgeting for more available resources for blended learning.
- . The Applicant provided a detail outline table reflecting the State's Instructional Improvement System that will be used in supporting the Consortiums' personalized approaches to teaching and learning and with utilizing their digital management system.
- . It is not clear if there are successful conditions in hiring highly qualified teachers in the critical rural areas. Evidence of sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory and requirements are not in place to hire highly qualified effective teachers which is critical to ensuring personalize learning.

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 13 |
|--|-----------|-----------|

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant demonstrates clear and strong evidence that key stakeholders were engaged at each level of planning for this proposal. A table was developed that highlighted stakeholders support and engagement in developing the proposal. Individual LEAs group meeting with their school's stakeholders were held to review the proposal and provide opportunities to suggest revisions for the plan. Group meeting were extended to educators, families, civic and business leaders, philanthropic leaders, partnerships and Board of Education members for providing discussions and feedback in the stages of the proposal's development.
- . Eighteen of the Consortiums' LEAs are represented by a collective bargaining unit and signed MOU's by their union president. Four LEA's are not represented by a collective bargaining unit agreement however over 70% of each of the LEAs' teachers are supporting the proposal. A clear and detailed table has been provided reflecting the outcome of the engagement process of the four LEAs's districts which can be located in Appendix B.4
- . The Applicant provided evidence of letters of support from the LEAs' proposal partners, parent and student organizations, local and state governments officials, Department of Education and community - based organizations.
- . The Applicant did not provide clear evidence of how parents were directly involved in the grant's implementation or how their feedback helped with the revision of their plan.
- . The Applicant did not clearly describe how stakeholders were engaged in all stages of plan's development.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 15 |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant has provided an achievable plan building on previous success and continuing to focus on identified needs and goals to support improvements in achievement gaps. The plan incorporates strategies to prepare students to be college and career ready. The proposed personalized pathway digital management system will include blended learning that will help students manage their own learning strategies. The Applicant established a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching. . The Applicant provided a focused plan and several strategies to offer extensive instructional approaches. The plan identifies the goals, activities, deliverables, rationale responsible parties and a timeline that addresses improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment .. The Applicant provided a detail incisive chart outlining the Consortiums' focused goals, activities and provided a rationale of the district use of the existing digital learning platforms to get students and parents online to assess their strengths and interest as they prepare their academic coursework toward meeting college and career standards. The rationale used to determine activities was thoughtful and well established. . The Applicant did not provide evidence of a process in place for struggling student to increase their achievement in Math and Reading . The Applicant did not provide quality strategies to address how to get struggling students and student with disabilities on track toward meeting college and career-ready standards. It is not clear of how high need student's accommodations were met. . The Applicant states that students will have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives but is unclear of what activities will be in place to ensure students have access to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives or how the activities will be measured. . The Applicant stated that students will be able to show progress through their personal pathway program but there is not a plan reflecting how students will master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity and problem-solving. however there is not a plan in place that adresses these skills and traits. .The Applicant provides evidence of mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students to ensure they understand how to use the tools and resources provideded them in order to manage and track their learning but do not have a coherent plan in place to train teachers and to ensure that the training is effective. . The Applicant did not provide evidence of students having access to data that provides students ongoing and regular feedback and frequent updated data for their use to determine mastery toward progress of college and career ready standards and personalized learning. Recommendations based on students current knowledge and skills were not evident in the proposal. | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 18 |
|--|-----------|-----------|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant describes a well defined plan for improving leading and teaching through personalized learning environment. The consortium have involved the LEAs in creating a common professional learning system based on their district's educator's network, professional learning communities, and online peer to peer exchange. Three System of Support Components were identified (District-based Coaches, NetworkTeams of teachers and principals, and District Leadership Teams) who will work closely with LEA's professional learning system in providing support and feedback to educators for improving leading and teaching through personalized learning environments. . The Consortium developed a reasonable plan in the use of it's Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Grant in helping highly effective teachers to serve as curators of instructional knowledge and resources. Twelve Middle and High School teachers will serve as curators that will share resources tied to six personalized learning forces. . Evidence was not provided reflecting how teachers and principals will improve their practices and effectiveness by using feedback district's evaluation system. . . The Applicant provided a plan for engaging participating educators in trainings but does not provide evidence of how the training will be monitored or measured for effectiveness. .The Consortiums' Network will develop a robust Teacher Network that will provide focused professional development for teachers and develop professional communities for improving instructional practices to support effective teachers who teach in rural areas and hard to staff schools. . The Applicant provided thorough evidence of frequently measuring student's progress toward meeting college and career standards with use of data to inform accelerating student progress and improving individual and collective practices of educators, but does not state how the data will be used to improve teacher's instructional practices. . The Applicant provided evidence of the district' commitment to connect and develop existing state supported digital learning systems through their Personalized Learning Pathway Management System to provide all educators access to ongoing and regular data informed feedback on their student's engagement, productivity and mastery of college and career ready instruction . The Applicant provided evidence of participating educators having access to, and know how to use, tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress. Each participating LEA will be assigned a full time Personalized Learning Practitioner to help teachers engage in how to use tools, resources used the Personalized Pathway platform wisely and well..Assigning one PLP to each LEA will provide substaintial support to empower all participating educators to help their students. | | |
|--|--|--|

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 9 |
| <p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant described the Consortiums' Governance Structure. Each LEA will have a full-time Personalized Learning Practitioner position who will receive training to implement the proposal's objectives and goals, Leadership Teams were developed at the Consortium central office to renew and reorganize structures in giving LEAS participating schools sufficient flexibility and autonomy over schedules, and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and school level budget. . The Applicant presented the Consortiums' focused Personalized Learning Network survey that will be used at the beginning and end of each school year as they evaluate and oversee the grant. This information will be shared at school boards, LEAs central offices and with all the Consortiums' stakeholders. This shows transparency within districts and across LEAS. . The Applicant did not provide evidence of resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and accessible to students with disabilities and with English Language Learners or provided evidence of how these subgroups would be supported in having an opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery and having opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and multiple ways. While the plan allows all students to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery through multiple times and ways, specific strategies for these subgroups are not provided. | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided a reasonable plan and evidence to support student learning by providing technical support and learning resources both in and out of the school for implementing the plan regardless of student's and parents income levels. The Consortium(Ohio Appalachian Collaborative) will partner with the State's Connect Ohio Services to assist students and parents who lack connectivity at home. . The Applicant provided reasonable evidence that technical support will be provided that allows parents and students to export their information in an open data format. The Consortiums' Personalized Learning Pathway Management System will provide access to students, educators and parents regardless of income to necessary tools, content and other resources both in and out of school to support the proposal implementation. . The Applicant provided thorough evidence of the Consortiums' use of interoperable data system throughout the grant funding. The district's regional interoperable data management partnership will audit and improve base data system and align data and learning platforms to support human resource data, student information data and instruction improvement data. . The Applicant provided a plan in addressing their school's infrastructure however they did not provide sufficient evidence of supports and processes in place to help struggling students meet their specific needs. . The Applicant presented a comprehensive plan but lacked a high quality plan including detailed timeline for implementation nor a specific plan to make informational technology available to low income families and students to allow them to access their data in an open data format . | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 10 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided a well defined plan, however it does not meet the definition of a high quality plan with specific detail. The plan includes providing regular feedback progress on activities during and after funding of the grant. Yearly implementation surveys and district's developed Delivery Scorecards will be used to help monitor, measure and publicly share information on the quality of the RTT-D investments and the proposal's development. A Continuous Improvement Process Strategy Table is provided that focuses on the Consortium's feedback on the proposal's activities. . The Continuous Improvement plan will start in January 2014 and spread across all participating LEAs. The Applicant provided a clear and detailed graph of the Leadership Development Process that outlines the basic elements and strategies for the Consortiums' leadership development for continuous improvement in addressing personalized learning. . The Applicant provided a Continuous Improvement Process Strategy chart outlining how the consortium will measure and publicly share information on the quality of RTT-D investment. The Continuous Improvement Plan lacked specificity in it's alignment to the chart and did not provide evidence of how the plan will be monitored and measured to determine their success. . The Applicant states that the Personalized Learning Practitioners will monitor and support the work of school leadership teams but lack specifics in what is being monitored and what is being measured. | | |

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>.The Applicant provided a high quality plan of sound and focused strategies being implemented for ongoing communication and engagement for all stakeholders. Three main strategies were proposed: 1. Improving communication and resources to build capacity among educators 2, Publicity sharing information to highlight the quality of the plan's investments 3. Managing a college-career ready student engagement campaign to connect and develop community and parent/family awareness for personalized learning and dual enrollment.</p> <p>. The Applicant provided reasonable evidence of the Consortiums' communication goals and target audiences (Internal and External) in addressing it's district-wide capacity in delivering and supporting the proposal's personalized learning opportunities to increase student's mastery of academic skills</p> <p>. The Applicant did not address the specific needs of English Language Learners, Special Education and high need students in providing communication support. The Applicant did not address the needs of external stakeholders particularly parents of high need students by providing strategies to engage parent and families. Without engaging parents, the strength of the plan is diminished.</p> <p>. The applicant provided a plan but the plan lacks clarity of how they will support high need families.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>. The Applicant provided evidence of achievable performance measures by overall and subgroups, with annual targets for required applicant-proposed performances during and after the grant funding. Effectiveness level of teachers and principals were established for each grade and subject. Numbers and percentages of participating students by subgroups who are on track to college and career readiness were indicated. The Applicant demonstrated ambitious and achievable targets for all measures.</p> <p>. The Applicant did not provide a rationale for selecting the performances measures or how to review the measures over time if it is insufficient to gauge the proposal's implementation progress.</p> <p>. The Applicant lacked a clear description of data being reported so it can be used to inform project modification. The data does not ensure enough detail to support the timeliness of the plans development. If data is reported only annually,the reporting will not be done in a timely fashion.</p> | | |
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>. The Applicant has provided a high quality plan because they will utilize a third party evaluator. They have detailed a rigorous process for selecting this evaluator and there is a comprehensive process in place for all LEAS to work with this evaluator. The evaluation will be aligned to the goals of the performance measures. Each of the District's project Delivery Groups will monitor the plan's evaluation and make appropriate adjustments. The proposal's evaluation plan identifies each project's data source, data information, and collection of data dates. Each project will have an ongoing scoreboard to help keep progress of the proposal's development.</p> <p>. Evaluation forms and surveys will be provided to all stakeholders to determine the effectiveness of the plan.</p> | | |

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|------------------|--------------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Applicant prepared a thorough and reasonable proposed budget required for the Consortium's proposal's projects to be successful and indicated one-time funds and other sources for funds to be budgeted. The budget is prepared as a total and then for each project. A narrative is included that explains and justifies the rationale for the needed funds. Having reviewed this section again carefully, the applicant presented a high quality plan for the project's budget. The project's investment of one time grant funding is described laying the foundation for the development of sustainable, feasible and reasonable cost for continuation and scale up. They will maximize their cost by use of state sponsored digital learning and instructional platforms, hiring PLP's for support funded by State and local sources.</p> <p>. The Applicant provided a thorough detailed chart reflecting the breakdown for all expenditures of the proposal's four year funding.</p> <p>.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>. The Applicant provided evidence of sustaining financial capacity by organizing a sustainability task force comprised all stakeholders in LEAs schools. The group's role will be in addressing the sustainability of the proposal in the following areas: Collaboration, Human Capital, Systems and Governance and Management. Strategies were developed and explored to gain LEAs' community and public support for local levies to increase focus on performance and productivity. As described, this plan is a high quality plan for sustainability.</p> <p>. The Applicant provided evidence that the plan will be sustained and scaled up by expanding partnerships and to seek possible grant sources to provide continuous funding and support from state and local government leaders.</p> <p>. The Applicant provided a well designed Three Year Sustainability Plan that identifies per district cost of potential sources use of funds and the district's</p> | | |

long term sustainability funding.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 10 |
| Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>.The Applicant provided evidence of implementing sustainable partnerships with parents, families and community. The Consortiums' partner, Appalachian Ohio, will assist in identifying and tracking five population-level desired results that targets focus groups, family and community results and annual results. These desired results will focus expanding the Consortiums' work with highest need students by scaling the model to include additional elementary students, supporting services for families and students, establishing parents and students advisory groups to serve low income students and families, helping LEAs connect strategies and services support students and families (public health, before and after school programs, social service providers, community-based organizations higher institutions and early learning programs).</p> <p>. The Applicant developed an ambitious plan for how the partnerships will evolve in alignment with Consortiums' RTT-D Plan. The plan's goals, actions, responsible parties and timeline are identified.</p> | | |

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |
| Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>. The Consortiums' proposal is clear and comprehensive and provided evidence of how the participating schools will build on the core educational assurance areas to improve teaching and learning. The Consortium did a thorough job of responding in each section of the grant and aligning it to closing the achievement gap and creating personalized learning environments for students. It explained clearly how it would build, enhance and add to its existing programs to ensure that its students are college and career ready.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 161 |
|--------------|------------|------------|



**Race to the Top - District
Technical Review Form**

Application #0094OH-3 for Maysville Local School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>A detailed, comprehensive project is described in this section and in referenced sections throughout the Narrative. The 22 LEAs that form the RTT-D project consortium have all signed M.O.U.s that they are in agreement with the reform plan as described. The project is designed to incorporate a single vision for all member LEAs, while allowing them to ". . . cluster together around similar objectives . . .". As described in this section, the project will maximize the return on investment through member LEA shared resources, personnel, training, and data.</p> <p>The project is described as designed to build on the four core educational assurance areas of all students in grades 6-12, and to narrow the rural opportunity gap for at-risk students. However, not found is a clear and credible approach to identify and address the personalized learning needs of rural, as well as urban, gifted and talented (GATE) students who are generally fewer in number relative to other high-needs student populations. These students often have special needs that are overlooked or inadequately addressed due to funding limitations and/or a lack of highly-qualified teachers to support personalized learning for GATE students in dual enrollment, AP, accelerated, and/or blended learning format courses.</p> <p>As described in this section, member LEAs appear to have broad autonomy to implement programs that meet their identified needs districtwide and throughout the community. However, not described in detail is how the success of these programs will be ensured so that member LEAs avoid straying too far from the RTT-D consortium vision and to assure the focus on project outcomes is maintained while personalizing individual LEA needs.</p> <p>A project classroom experience is a case study to illustrate how project goals and activities may change the education system, the school culture, classroom teaching and learning, and parent engagement. The LEA is described as more than 50% low-income and ". . . many [students] live with family members who are unable to read." The ideal described is that at the end of the first month of school, the teacher ". . . has met with [the student] and his parents to go over his personalized learning pathway options. With guidance and support from his parents . . ." Although the description is a snapshot of</p> | | |

the project vision, unclear in this section is how the LEAs will conduct outreach and education programs, as well as provide support (e.g., child care, transportation) for those parents/family members who live in poverty, are unable to read, have minimal or no access to computers and Internet services, or have limited or no English speaking skills. Based on information provided throughout the Narrative, these are the families whose children may be at highest risk of failure. Frequent, ongoing evaluation of project parent/family involvement activities may ensure a high-quality plan is ambitious and feasible. Parent/family support is a key cornerstone to project success. Informed parents/families are less intimidated by the education system; more supportive of teachers and innovative teaching strategies; willing to attend parent conferences, school and LEA events; participate in parent-teacher organizations; maintain a knowledge base of important school and LEA events; complete online surveys and provide feedback via other formats; and take advantage of education opportunities and technical support in order to support their children.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The process the applicant used to select participating schools was to engage internal and external stakeholders who all had access to the applicant's RTT-D Round 1 application and technical review to be able to assess and revise the plan for this RTT-D Round 2. Consortium LEAs decided to focus on all students in grades 6-12, because students in grades 6-8 represented a variation in grade levels across member LEA schools (i.e., K-6, 6-8, 7-8). LEAs were matched with SRSA and RLIS programs eligibility. Four face-to-face meetings and three webinars were attended by representatives of the member LEAs; 125 teachers and principals participated in an initial version of the Personalized Learning Network. Participating schools are listed, including rural classification, total and participating student enrollment, and percent of participating students who are economically disadvantaged; the students and schools collectively meet RTT-D eligibility requirements.

Not described is why the member LEAs did not include K-5 schools in the project. Inclusion of K-5 students and teachers would significantly increase the literacy and math preparation for grade 6, particularly for high-need students.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A logic model provides an overview of the "theory of change" that will guide the project. Not articulated in this section is a high-quality plan that can be scaled-up and translated into meaningful reform throughout the member LEAs. A logic model presents a project overview that aligns project resources, activities, outputs, and outcomes with the overarching goal in order to support project efficacy and scale-up; however, the logic model is generic and broad without a clearly defined link between some activities and outputs. For example, the activity "Provide leadership development and support for principals" is linked only to the output of "54 principals are prime drivers of personalized learning". Not clearly stated in the output is how leadership development and support may encompass other areas that are critical to principal support for personalized learning (e.g., teacher evaluation, curricula adoption). Some outputs may be overly ambitious and unrealistic. For example, in the logic model "All students, parents and educators use [state] digital learning system . . ." is an ambitious output; however, the expectation that this will be accomplished by all (assumed to mean 100%) of these three groups may be unrealistic, considering the barriers faced by rural and high-needs students and families as described throughout the narrative.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Information in this section includes a summary of how member LEAs and participating students will be assessed to meet RTT-D requirements through performance evaluation systems. Tables include grades 3-12 student achievement and growth performance measures for AMO for economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities. Graduation rates and projected increases over five years are listed by overall student populations for member LEAs. Current 2-year and 4-year college enrollment and 5-year projections are listed for each LEA. Overall, projected increases for some student populations appear to be realistic and achievable. However, evidence is not presented that it is realistic for LEAs with achievement gaps to narrow those gaps by 50% by the end of the 4-year grant period.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 7 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

As described in this section, the 22 member RTT-D consortium will continue with current programs for improvement in student outcomes and LEA reform. Not clearly explained is whether or not the current member LEAs' records of success over the last four years are significant and based on existing projects and strategies that are in place and have produced expected gains for effective education. Summaries of several current strategies that address student achievement and teacher effectiveness are cited (e.g., PLCs in a middle school). Member LEAs' student graduation rates for economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged students are higher than the state rate. College enrollment rates, although low, increased between 2009-11.

The RTT-D project is intended to build on this success and continue gains that have been made; however, evidence is not found to document a 4-year, clear track record of success demonstrated by ambitious and significant reforms in persistently low-achieving schools. Evidence is not found that a majority of the members have implemented pilot programs at minimum on a small scale and data from the pilot programs support scale-up. Member LEAs are described as achieving student improvements in education in the persistently lowest-achieving rural schools throughout the project area. Based on the state Department of Education Performance Index, the average index score increased from 95.3 to 96.4 over three years (2010-13), a 1.1 increase. Although grades 8 and 10 students appear to have shown significant improvement in reading, not found is an explanation of the significance of a three year 1.1 increase and if that number reflects all grade levels and student demographics on multiple subject content assessments. When compared to the state Performance Index it is difficult to determine whether or not the project benchmarks are indicative of a 4-year success record.

Several of the member LEAs use online systems and student reports to provide educators, students, and parents with access to student performance information and data. As described in this section, it appears that member LEA personnel are in the process of training or will be trained during the project to use and be able to train students to use the new State Improvement System. It is unclear if there is a contingency plan in the event the new

system(s) does not perform as expected. Not found is a description of teachers who have been trained and have demonstrated improvement in student learning to a degree that suggests use of the online system will contribute to improved student participation, instruction and services. Often teacher professional development does not transfer to either immediate or ongoing improvement in curricula design, instructional delivery, and/or student growth and progress. Not found is a clearly defined plan to ensure student performance data will be used by educators who struggle with or decline to implement best practices and strategies and need additional training, mentoring, and support so that their students do not fall behind and fail to reach expected goals.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant provides a concise explanation that member LEAs, state Department of Education, and the state make available school-level expenditures from state and local funds in the RTT-D required four categories via online or hard copy formats. A non-profit organization provides online information about all public school personnel salaries. All stakeholders have multiple locations to search for this information and cross check its accuracy. For project sustainability purposes, transparency of LEA member finances that are expended with fidelity may encourage stakeholders to be more willing to continue partnerships and approve tax bonds and/or other means to raise funds and donate resources.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 Cited in this section are state "Revised and Administrative Code Regarding Personalized Learning Code" applicable to LEA autonomy to implement personalized learning programs. This autonomy is critical to project implementation without constraints and delays that could potentially negatively impact the project; however, the information in this section appears to focus on students without reference to autonomy regarding teacher and other instructional personnel certification. Not described in this section are codes that support successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to allow LEAs to certify educators through alternative pathways if they are highly-qualified and experienced to teach in critical need content areas in high-needs rural schools, and/or train other teachers. Not described is whether or not sufficient state authorized autonomy will be provided to LEAs to implement alternative pathways to certification in order to hire highly-qualified teachers in critical need areas (e.g., classes for students with disabilities, English language learners, STEM, AP) to optimize project success, eliminate delays in starting teacher training and project activities, and contribute to maximizing funding and resources to complete the project on time and within budget.

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 13 |
|--|-----------|-----------|

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 As described, the applicant engaged in a daunting task to reach out to diverse groups of stakeholders with a vested interest in all 22 member LEAs. To ensure support for the project and solicit stakeholder input to identify priorities and revisions for the initiative, "nine stakeholder engagement and support activities" were conducted. Letters of support are included from ~85 stakeholders among the ". . . hundreds of students, nearly 300 educators and over 2,500 community and business representatives." Through one large group meeting of more than 100 educators, two open webinars, and additional project design meetings, teachers and teacher union leader input was solicited. With at least five educators representing each LEA, 125 teachers and 25 principals self-identified to represent the participating schools in each member LEA. Letters of support of the project from each non-collective bargaining LEA were signed by 70% or more of the teachers in each LEA. The applicant can be applauded for accomplishing this work, organizing the logistics over a large geographical area with multiple partners, and collecting and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data from stakeholders to ensure a high-quality RTT-D project plan. In order to strengthen and modify components prior to launch and throughout the project, ongoing evaluation of stakeholder engagement is described as an integral component of the project.

 Not found in this section is how the applicant may have engaged all external stakeholders, particularly parents/families of low-income, high-need students, to provide input and feedback regarding project development and proposal revision to ensure their vision, issues, and specific needs were considered and incorporated into the final project proposal.

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

| | Available | Score |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 15 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 Described in this section is an overview how parents and educators will support all students to become engaged and empowered learners through a variety of activities including, but not limited to, knowledge and experience gained from participation in workshops, use of online information and data portals, and parent education programs offered at schools. A table is provided that aligns Goals, Activities, and Rationale for the goals and activities. Educators, parents, and students will be able to utilize state Race to the Top grant funded resources that are available or in the development stage (e.g., digital learning platforms). A timeline for key deliverables appears to be achievable; however, deliverables are not clearly aligned to activities and the five goals.

 Described is a broad overview of an approach to learning that is designed to engage and empower students with a focus on high-needs students. With the support of parents and educators, all students will create and utilize personalized learning plans that include, but are not limited to, ownership of their own education through engagement, empowerment, and assessment of their growth and progress. Students will engage in skill development and content mastery employing multiple formats, such as blended learning and collaborative project-based learning, as well as strategies to establish academic and career pathways based on self-interests. Through use of an online platform to access college and career planning information and support, students will be guided to follow five steps to develop a pathway that involves them in deep learning and supports their efforts to master critical

academic content while developing practical skills. Lacking in this section is a detailed explanation of the five steps and how those five steps will be personalized for individual students.

Although parents are included in activities, not found in this section is a specific plan to engage in ongoing outreach, education, and training programs for all parents, particularly those who may be at the poverty level, non-English or limited English speaking, and/or lack the means to be an engaged parent or family member (e.g., transportation, child care, technology in the home, homeless, lack of literacy or technology use skills). Parents who may want to support their children and the schools may require assistance to overcome barriers that can be minimized or eliminated with strategies defined in a detailed plan for outreach and assistance. A high-quality, detailed, comprehensive plan is not described.

The applicant states that students will have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual learning; however, the information provided is broad and generic. Not adequately described is specifically how the access and exposure will be designed, the steps involved, the number of students who will be supported by what number of educators, and what activities will occur how often to enable access and exposure.

Described are instructional approaches and environments that are intended to provide accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students, as well as mechanisms that will be in place to provide training and support so that students understand how to use tools to track and manage their learning. For example, a primary goal is to provide infrastructure capacity in rural areas so that students, as well as parents/families, have access to internet connectivity outside the classroom. Not found is a detailed description of what the process will entail, how student and parent needs will be addressed while the infrastructure is in the construction phase, or how student and parent/family needs will be addressed if the system is delayed for a longer period of time than anticipated.

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 18 |
|--|-----------|-----------|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

As described in this section, teachers and leaders will engage in professional development activities and collaborative learning communities to ensure that they are skilled in delivering instruction in multiple formats and invest in student success utilizing the personalized learning formats. Each LEA will have, at minimum, one Personalized Learning Practitioner who will review policies, regulations, and governance structures for support of project activities that provide multiple venues for teachers and administrators to learn new skills and instructional methods. As students benefit from personalized learning so do teachers, who will be able to personalize their professional development.

All participating educators will have access to "digital platform tools and resources to manage their own professional practice", access to student data on efficacy of curricula implementation and instructional delivery, and data on effectiveness of student personalized learning plans on growth and subject content mastery.

Overall, the member LEAs have developed a comprehensive plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly-effective teachers and principals. Up to 75 highly-qualified high school teachers of dual enrollment courses will have access to online and face-to-face professional development and training. Highly-effective grades 6-12 teachers throughout the member LEAs will be able to partner with isolated teachers who may be the only teacher of a particular subject in a small district. Teachers will be able to utilize e-books, e-coaching, and networking for professional development. Student engagement and performance data will be available to all teachers to support alignment of professional development to best practices.

Lacking in this section are specific details about the educator training, PLCs, and mechanisms to support students. How many teachers will participate how often in specific webinars, workshops, PLCs, and conferences is not defined. How teachers will be supported post-professional development activities is unclear. For example, not specifically defined is how often teachers will receive guidance, mentoring, modeling, and/or technical assistance to design and implement new instructional delivery. Not precisely detailed are the specific mechanisms and timelines for support and accommodations for students to receive training, retraining, timely feedback to ensure they do not lag behind in understanding how to use the tools and resources to create and manage their personalized learning plans and experiences.

It is not clearly defined in this section specifically how the LEAs will design and implement steps to improve instructional practices if professional development is inadequate, ineffective, or disregarded by teachers and administrators. Critical to determine if the activities are constructive and cost-effective is evaluation of the effectiveness of classroom and schoolwide applications of professional development on student progress and achievement, as well as school success.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 9 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Based on information provided in this section, the applicant has used constructive feedback from RTT-D Round 1 to improve the design of the project governance structure. Each member LEA will employ one full-time person who will receive extensive training and begin within the first six months of the project to personalize each member LEA infrastructure so that it aligns to and is capable of supporting success of the RTT-D project. All member LEAs have signed M.O.U.s to conduct rigorous superintendent evaluations during summer 2014 to determine training and support required by superintendents to facilitate their implementation of project defined practices, policies, and infrastructure to replace inadequate, long-standing formats and cultures.

Organization of each LEA central office will begin with one full-time Personalized Learning Practitioner (PLP) who will receive extensive training to oversee implementation of the project. Each PLP will assess the adequacy of policies, regulations, and governance practices, and oversee baseline data collection on the initial implementation fidelity survey. The PLP will then collaborate with member LEA Transformation Teams on development of project Scopes of Work that will provide services and support to schools for implementation of project goals, objectives, and outcomes.

Building (i.e., school) leadership teams will work with central office Transformation Teams, District Leadership Teams, and building principals to ensure that students, teachers, and principals have access to tools and online resources to implement project strategies. However, information is not found in this section to address criterion (D)(1)(b) regarding sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors that include, but are not limited to, staffing decisions,

roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school level budgets.

To provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple, comparable ways, the state Legislature redefined blended learning ". . . to call for operating standards suitable for using digital technologies to help schools support learning any time, place, path or pace where credit can be based on demonstrated mastery . . .". Students will be able to expand options for their personalized learning plans and progress at a more appropriate pace. Not clearly defined are specific options that will be available to students.

Not found in this section is a response to (D)(1)(e) requiring a description how project practices, policies, and rules will impact availability of and access to resources and instructional practices that can be adapted to all students, including those with disabilities and English language learners.

Not found in this section are specific examples of responses to a consortium ". . . survey of LEA interests and an inventory of personalized learning opportunities and practices in districts with a particular focus on middle and high schools." Not included is specific feedback that informed the decision to engage in a ". . . shared focus on strengthening and expanding mastery-based dual enrollment courses."

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

As stated in this section, the schools are "wired" to be able to support project implementation. However, due to problems experienced in rural areas with connectivity for use of technology, the LEAs will partner with a non-profit to ensure that all students, parents, teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the project. The majority of stakeholders in the project are guaranteed access to online systems and as a result, most of the project expected outcomes may be feasible. Specifically how access is guaranteed is not clearly and precisely defined.

Not found in this section is specifically how high-needs low-income and other disadvantaged students and families will be engaged and assessed to determine their need for access to computers and/or other technology, as well as internet connectivity, to successfully participate in the project. Without a detailed, specific outreach plan to engage these frequently marginalized and/or disenfranchised stakeholders, these high-needs students and families may not receive the full benefit of project strategies due to limited or no access to connectivity and tools.

The member LEAs will partner with a non-profit that will improve access to broadband and related technologies that are frequently inaccessible or have intermittent accessibility for rural stakeholders. A digital management system will be available for all students, parents, educators, and other internal and external stakeholders to ensure access to data, electronic learning systems, and technical support. Students and parents will be able to export data in an open data format and use software that securely stores personal records.

The consortium Personalized Learning Network will partner with multiple Education Service Centers to design and build an interoperable data system that will provide extensive data via safe and timely delivery. Key elements to build and utilize the system include auditing and improvement of the base data system, alignment of data and learning platforms, and use of an initial web-enabled database while the permanent system is built. Described is a comprehensive plan to build and utilize data systems that provide clean, reliable, valid data that will support all internal and external stakeholders, project activities and programs, and evaluation of student growth and achievement and other project outcomes.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 8 |

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

As described in this section, the "Continuous Improvement Process Strategy" includes an overview of how components of the project will be monitored, several methods to measure project performance and effectiveness, and multiple venues to publicly share information with stakeholders. Continuous improvement strategies will be informed through use of a protocol that has been successfully used in previous grant activities; the applicant intends to build on that track record.

In the table "Continuous Improvement Process Strategy" it is unclear what some of the measures listed are intended to assess. As written, these measures appear to be somewhat generic objectives, rather than measurements of effectiveness of a strategy for monitoring the project. For example, "Increase chances of high-need student populations having access to highly effective teachers" lacks quantitative and descriptive details (e.g., number of opportunities in which a specific number of high-need students engage, how all students will have access to highly effective teachers, specific improvement in an identified student learning area). Some monitoring strategies, measures, and how information will be shared lacks alignment. For example, unclear is specifically how the PLP monitoring and support of the work of school leadership teams directly aligns to the measure of progress and achievement of high-need students in grades 6 and 9.

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
|---|----------|----------|

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The communication plan overview includes three strategies to disseminate project information to internal and external stakeholders. A project priority is to work with a major partner to design a high-quality communication system. As described in this section, the communication plan is already in progress and may be ready to launch shortly after initiation of the project; target dates for specific strategies appear to be realistic.

Not found is a strategy to target communication to and ensure involvement of high-needs, marginalized parents and/or family members (e.g., poverty level, non-English or limited English speaking, and/or lack the means to be an engaged parent or family member). Unclear is specifically how engagement, involvement, and support of this stakeholder group will be accomplished in order to improve learning outcomes for large numbers of high-need, at-risk students.

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 4 |
|---|----------|----------|

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has proposed a high-quality plan to meet performance measures as required by RTT-D. Ambitious, achievable performance measures are aligned to the project goals, expected outcomes, and benchmarks described in this section and throughout the Narrative. A rationale for selection of each performance measure is included. Ongoing assessment of the efficacy of performance measures is a key component of a high-quality plan to realistically evaluate project effectiveness and inform any need for modification. Some data not currently reported by student demographic subgroups (e.g., FAFSA participation rate) will be available and tracked based on project expansion and improvement of new data systems. The new data will allow educators to set ambitious but realistic and achievable annual increases for performance measures, which may be more or less ambitious than initially planned. Lacking specific detail is the timeliness of data reporting aligned to specific measures. For example, state Achievement Assessments are reported each Fall, which may not provide adequate time to design and implement interventions and mitigations to project strategies.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Presented is an outline of a high-quality evaluation plan to measure the effectiveness of investments. "The selection of an independent third-party evaluator is critical" indicates the applicant's understanding that a highly-competent, impartial, external evaluator is necessary to ensure fidelity of the project. The evaluation protocol will include collecting and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data produced through formative and summative assessments and feedback. As described, the applicant will be assisted by an organization of researchers and research institutions to ensure all stakeholders are identified, participate in the evaluation process, and remain focused on the project goals and expected outcomes. As long as all of the partners collaborate and communicate so they do not duplicate efforts that increase funding investment or produce conflicting reporting, the evaluation plan may be the key foundation component for project success and achievement of goals, objectives, and outcomes on time and within budget.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a high-quality, detailed Overall Budget Summary with Budget Narrative and Project-level summaries with Project-level Narratives. The cost basis for expenditures is described, funding is aligned to project activities, and allocations appear to be reasonable and sufficient to support project activities, collaboration, and continued partnerships. Sustainability is described as realistic and attainable; "LEAs through their participation in the Delivery Groups will have discovered and disseminated ways to save costs, generate revenue, repurpose funds, and share services in order to maintain the key elements of the [project] . . .".

Project investment of one-time grant funds is described as laying the foundation for development of sustainable, feasible, and reasonable costs for ongoing continuation and potential scale-up of the project. A one-time investment in PLPs is described as sustainable through the development of local capacity, training of internal leaders, and an ongoing search to secure external funding. Network services, existing external partner contributions, and innovative management practices are described as some of the one-time investments that will transfer to ongoing, long-term sustainability.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

"Each of the participating LEAs understands that a significant portion of the sustainability of this project into the future must be realized through internal efficiencies, recovered revenue and repurposed budget priorities" indicates that the member LEAs understand reliance primarily on federal and state funding may not be adequate to support sustainability without ongoing internal cost-effective measures. Each member LEA will organize a " . . . sustainability task force within the first three months of the project." The task force will be responsible for identification of resources, evaluation of systems for cost-effective investment, and evaluation and recommendations for ongoing activities and shared services among member LEAs. As described in this section, a high-quality, realistic sustainability plan may ensure post-grant project success.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The primary result expected in the project is identified as "aspiration", or the desire to aspire to a more productive and successful life than is thought to be possible. This theme underlies the project, which is critically important for rural students who often come from impoverished families, are first in family to be able to graduate high school, do not have role models who have trained for careers, or have considered entering college and graduate career ready. The project is designed to change the school climate and culture so that aspiration to succeed despite barriers and challenges is the mindset of all students. Student ownership of personalized learning with multiple formats in which to succeed and supported by a community of stakeholders who have a vested interest in student and school success is critical to the realization of outcomes for this project. The applicant concisely describes not only in this CPP, but throughout the Narrative, generally high-quality strategies to achieve success. Member LEAs have collaborated to define partnerships with public and private organizations; select data-driven improvement activities and expected results for students, teachers, and administrators; evaluate the project with a high-quality protocol; methods to use data to ensure no student or family is overlooked on the pathway to success; and ensure that the project is a feasible, realistic, cost-effective program that will be sustainable.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

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

| | | |
|---|------------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |
| <p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has proposed an ambitious yet achievable, data supported, comprehensive project that addresses the RTT-D four educational assurance areas and is likely to be sustainable beyond the grant period. The 22 member LEAs will maximize investments in funds, human capital, and resources through a collaborative effort to achieve defined goals, objectives, and outcomes within budget and on time. Teachers and leaders will receive ongoing professional development aligned to their personalized learning plans so that school climate, culture, and expectations will best serve the needs of a diverse and predominantly rural student population in grades 6-12. The applicant has secured an additional \$1M in donated services to support project implementation that is expected to change the education view from low to high aspiration for students, teachers, administrators, parents/families, and community stakeholders. The region is poised to improve economic investment through new industry. The project is expected to educate and prepare the local workforce to sustain anticipated regional economic development and expansion, as well as become a role model for a dynamic education system that addresses the needs of rural communities.</p> | | |
| Total | 210 | 160 |