



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0200AK-1 for North Slope Borough School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a. The applicant consortium has adopted a set of collective beliefs that align well with the core assurance areas. For example, it has adopted either the Alaska College and Career Ready Content Standards or the Common Core Standards and has shown past success in turning around low performing schools. A table is further included which shows the connection between proposal project elements and the core assurance areas. From the information provided it is clear that the foundation of the proposed project is in the core assurance areas.</p> <p>b. The proposal references past success with innovations related to increasing equity through personalized learning. For example, the "education SWAT team" program has been used to increase the pool of effective teachers while at the same time providing for remediation interventions which increase student mastery through personalized support. Past success with individual tutoring has also led to increases in overall achievement especially within the lowest-achieving schools.</p> <p>The three projects referenced align well to personalized learning as well as the core assurance areas and are credible in theory approach. For example, a focus on accessible assessment data, teacher training, and one-to-one tutoring all point to a strong focus on the individual learner.</p> <p>c. Many components of the proposed program are described in such a way that gives a clear picture of what "classroom experiences" will be like for students. These include access to tutoring, online video and internet-based courses, career-technical education programs, and thematic classrooms. Information presented with regard to teacher evaluation also provides a picture of what these experiences will be like for educators. These include professional development, training in the use of data, and cultural competency training for new educators.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a. All schools in the consortium will participate in the project. This includes grades K-12 as well as an early childhood program.</p> <p>b. Tables are provided that include a list of schools to participate disaggregated by district (LEA).</p> <p>c. The tables provided are also disaggregated by number of high-need and low-income students. In all cases, the number of participating students is the same as the number of high-need students. It's not clear on what this classification is based.</p> <p>Overall, including all schools and all students in the proposal is likely to help the consortium reach its goals. Detail regarding particulars of how the project will be implemented (e.g., at which grade levels when, which components first, second, etc) are not included.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The proposal includes a management team flow chart showing FTE allotted as well as responsible parties at each district. These positions are then further described in a lengthy table which includes the activities to take place (listed by goal), a timeline, specific deliverables, and the responsible parties. This information is in line with a high quality plan. Overall activities are aligned to goals but are somewhat general and non specific. For example, one activity is listed as "alignment of district curriculum to ELA and Math College and Career Ready Standards". This is an activity that will lead to the goal of aligned curriculum but does not provide a rationale for how the goal will be accomplished.</p>		

A high quality plan is presented for each goal and includes nearly all necessary components. The rationale for stated activities is lacking. However, many of the activities have already been implemented or piloted in the various districts which indicates sufficient planning and rational exist; it just wasn't included in this particular section. For example, both the early literacy and village literacy advocate programs have already been successfully piloted.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

<b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>All three of the consortium's proposed projects are strongly related to its proposed outcomes which are in turn strongly linked to the outcomes required in the review criteria.</p> <p>a. The project's proposed outcomes on summative assessments relate directly to the state's ESEA waiver. This requires that the percentage of students who are not proficient decrease by half in each of the six coming years. This goal applies to reading, writing, and math. A large number of tables are then presented showing actual goals by subgroup and school.</p> <p>b. Achievement gap goals are included in the tables related to summative achievement test performance. Each table shows reasonable and achievable growth targets (e.g., 50% - 54.5% - 59.2% for 3rd grade Native student reading proficiency) that are not overly ambitious. This growth relates directly to goals for the closing of gaps with minority, at-risk, and low-income groups showing greater progress thereby closing gaps.</p> <p>c. The state department of education is to begin calculation of a college and career-readiness score in 2013. Graduation goals are broken down by group (Native and low-income) for each participating LEA. Goals show a roughly 6% increase in graduation rate per year with more progress shown for at-risk groups thereby resulting in shrinking gaps.</p> <p>d. Goals for college enrollment are not ambitious (e.g., 30% - 31% - 32% - 33% etc). Although the context of the consortium means that post-secondary education is a particular challenge, these goals are not ambitious for the purpose of the review criteria.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>

<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>a. The proposal states that Native students exceed reading scores in several grades. However, this does not demonstrate prior success or progress - rather it shows that students enrolled in this LEA perform better. It's not clear if this better performance is because of past district success or if it's because of a different student population. No evidence is provided that the LEAs have had success over the past four years in the area of closing gaps, increasing college enrollment, etc.</p> <p>b. This section includes no evidence or data that show past success in reforming lowest-achieving schools. Figures are presented with data regarding CTE program completion rates, but these rates do not show steady success. Instead, they show variation over the years.</p> <p>c. Four of the five LEAs make data available via the web to parents, students, and teachers. Teachers also have release time to work on interpreting and using their data. This is a means through which data could inform or improve instruction. However, no evidence is included to show that it has resulted in increased student learning.</p>		

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
---	----------	----------

<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The proposal states that salaries disaggregated by the four categories listed in the review criteria are presented in LEA budgets. Public hearings are used to share this information and school board meetings are televised. The proposal also states that financial information is available on each district's website. However, it is not clear from the proposal that this level of information sharing represents a high-level of transparency. Members of the public would need to attend a school board meeting or make a formal request in order to receive most of the information in the review criteria. It's not clear what information is available via the web.</p>		

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The state has adopted college and career standards that are a major component of the project plans (goal 1). In a similar fashion, the state has implemented a performance index (ASPI) and an early literacy screener that will both be used as part of this project.

The state allows individuals LEAs to implement competency-models as they see fit. Participating LEAs have in the past used this to implement models as alternatives to seat-time based competency.

Many state-level education innovations are described that are similar to or in-line with the proposed project. These include the Statewide mentor and administrator coaching project (similar to the teacher coaching project proposed in this project) and the Alaskan cultural standards (similar to the cultural competency for teachers training as part of this proposal). This all serves to document that what the consortium plans to do in its project is in-line with state regulations and priorities.

Letters of support are included from the state commissioner of education who voiced strong support for the application.

Overall it seems clear that the LEAs have the ability to implement their stated goals and reforms. However, information to this effect was not explicit. Evidence presented came mostly in the form of LEA success stories regarding past efforts that are similar to the proposed project.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

Several letters of support are included in the proposal including those from mayors, federal legislators, and cultural groups. The proposal references that the collective-bargaining representatives signed the proposals but no additional information is parented regarding the engagement of teachers in the development of the proposal. The proposal references that one district held an in-service to discuss the proposal, but no other information is provided regarding other LEAs. There are also no specifics regarding how families or principals were involved beyond the inclusion of letters of support from some groups that might include families in their membership.

Overall it is not clear that parents, teachers, students, or community groups were involved in the creation or overall drafting of the project proposal. Some letters indicate general approval of it, but this does not show how those groups were involved.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>

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

a. The proposal begins this section by referencing Rtl as part of its model / plan. It then references that Tier II interventions will be used for those students who are not at grade level. However, tier II is not only for remediation. It is also for those students who are not being sufficiently challenged by existing programming. The proposal goes on to state that those students who are more than one grade level behind will receive a tier III service. This does not represent a high quality plan as goals, deliverables, and responsible parties are not included. In a similar fashion, Understanding by Design is referenced as being adopted by some of the LEAs. However, it's not clear what role this will play in the proposal. What is presented does not represent a high quality plan.

No reference is made to student goal setting or to how students will be involved in deep, complex content that is related to an area of interest.

b. The proposal states that all students must be tested using state-approved instruments. The proposal then notes that some districts have adopted one tool (AIMSweb) while others have adopted another (MAP). There is then general reference made to the fact that teachers will use data from these measures to provide tier II and tier III services. This information is presented at far too general of a level to equal a high quality plan. It is not clear what will be done to reach what goal, by whom, and to result in what particular outcome. It's also not clear how students will receive the feedback generated by these tests in order to improve their own learning.

Little reference is made to a variety of educational opportunities or how students will have access to a personalized sequence of content. Reference is made to online distance instruction as well as instruction to be delivered by colleges and

universities. Further information is included regarding tutoring opportunities provided during and after school as well as on Saturdays. All of these activities do align with the proposed goals for the project, but none are explicitly linked to goals, a timeline, deliverables, or responsible parties. The example provided in the section on "variety of instructional approaches" are not connected to personalized learning. It's not clear how students will be matched with these opportunities based on their interests.

c. The proposal states that all parents receive a student report and a personalized appointment with a teacher in order to communicate assessment results. Families can also use PowerSchool to communicate with teachers as well as access score reports. This information as provided does not equate to a high quality plan. It's not clear from what is provided how this will happen, what is will help accomplish (goal) and when various actions will be taken.

Overall this section falls far short of providing the level of detail necessary to represent a high quality plan. Nearly all areas (as detailed above) are missing key components.

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

**20**

**7**

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

a. Much of what is stated in this section and has been referenced in earlier sections deals with recruiting new teachers and retaining existing teachers. Most of the information presented in the first two pages of section C2 deals with the state standards. This information is not related to the selection criteria regarding staff training and personalized learning. No reference is made to how teachers will receive training in order to facilitate the achievement of project goals (ai). No reference is made to teacher knowledge or skills regarding differentiation or the connection of instruction to student goals, interests, or needs (a(ii)). Data systems were mentioned in C1 and are again referenced here (C2) but there is no high quality plan for how teachers will use these data or receive training in their interpretation in order to help students make learning gains (aiii).

Specific information is included with regard to educator effectiveness. However, nearly all of this information relates to state policy and requirements (as well as rough timelines). No information is presented regarding how the district will use these data in order to improve teacher quality and the quality of student learning.

b. Progress monitoring (through achievement measures) is referenced as the means through which students will be matched with optimal learning approaches and methods. It's not clear from what is presented how or when this will happen or how it will help the project reach its proposed goals.

Specific reference is made to high-quality learning resources in the form of greater internet access and university collaboration. However, information provided is insufficient to represent a high quality plan. Details are missing regarding action steps, timelines, etc.

No reference is made to the process of providing ongoing feedback to students.

c. The proposal presents a reasonable idea for increasing the number of quality teachers in the LEAs. The districts have already made use of a model through which teachers from other states are recruited in order to provide tutoring and eventually full-time teachers to the districts. This is referenced as the means through which the districts will assure that larger numbers of students are taught by effective educators. However, as presented this idea does not represent a high quality plan. Details for how this idea will be implemented are not provided.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>

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

a. The consortium has a central management structure that includes representation from each participating district as well as a project director. Individual district directors are also planned to facilitate programming and services. The proposal does not reference how this structure will help provide support to districts as they implement personalized learning. Most of the job duties discussed in this section relate to logistics such as the housing of tutors and hiring decisions.

b. No specific reference is made to building-level flexibility. The proposal states the district-level coordinators will know what is needed but no reference is made to how this will happen or what flexibility exists to assure it does.

c and d. General reference is made to a district commitment to mastery-based proficiency as opposed to seat-time based

proficiency. However, no plan is included for how this will be implemented or how it already exists. A general reference is included to understanding by design, but this does not represent a high quality plan. Reference is made to "performance of a skill" as a cultural norm, but this is not explained nor connected to a plan.

e. Rtl and tutoring are referenced in a short paragraph in response to the selection criteria. No detail is provided regarding a plan for how these will assure access to students who are ELLs or ave disabilities.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

a. General reference is made to online courses and tutoring in order to assure access. However, it's not clear how individuals without internet access or computers will have access to these resources. There is also no plan in the proposal for how individuals who live far from resources will have access to them.

b. Technical support personnel are included in the project management plan and will be placed in each district. However, no information is included regarding how these individuals will provide support to parents or families nor how they will be trained in order to provide support that will aid in student learning.

c and d. The proposal states that it is "coincidental" that PowerSchool is already in place to assure parents and students have access to data. However, no information is included for how parents and students will be trained in how to access or use this system or how these data systems will be used to further the goal of personalized learning.

The specifics required for a high quality plan are not included in this section (e.g., goals, action steps, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties).

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>

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

The proposal states that if funded the project will hire an experienced, outside evaluator to facilitate project evaluation. To this end the evaluator will use a participatory or collaborative evaluation process which is outlined in the application. A culturally-responsive method will also be employed.

The proposal goes on to outline that the evaluation will focus on the three main project goals. A list of questions is then presented. It's not clear if these are survey questions or guiding questions that the ongoing improvement process will use. A lengthy table is then included showing how these questions will be addressed with evidence data, instruments, and analyses.

This entire section provides a great deal of detail about the program evaluation. However, it does not address how data from this evaluation will then be used to implement ongoing program revisions. Passing reference is made to focus groups and engaging stakeholders, but it's not clear when or how these people will meet or what data will be used and how to make ongoing program revisions. High quality plan components of a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties are not included.

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

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

This section of the proposal states that quarterly meetings will take place at which the evaluator will share progress reports. Reference is also made to LEA administrators visiting sites and that the project director will be involved with the site personnel. All of this information, even if included with that which was presented in E1, does not provide a high quality plan for engagement. It's not clear how parents, teachers, students, and administrators will be kept up to date on program implementation, successes, revisions, etc. The components of activities, a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties are not clear.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
---	----------	----------

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

Each measure is described in detail.

The preK - grade 3 measure reported is the Alaska Developmental Profile. Although comprehensive, it's not clear that this measure will provide individual student data metrics on academic growth and development. Instead, the proposal states that general data are provided at the district level on a 0-2 scale.

There is no health indicator for grades 4-8. The only indicator included beyond academics (college readiness) is attendance. This is not a social-emotional or health indicator.

Although educator effectiveness measures are described, no reference is made to principal evaluation measures. In the tables provided, no numbers are provided regarding either the teacher or principal effectiveness goals. These numbers are "to be determined" in 2015. The proposal also states that those teachers rated as proficient will be considered effective. However, this is not in alignment with RTT definitions and requirements.

Academic and growth measures are disaggregated by LEA and by subgroup. Some information is missing from tables (e.g., student numbers as opposed to percentages) but those provided are ambitious and achievable (e.g., 25% - 32% - 38% - 44%).

No reference is made to how data will be communicated or how revisions or improvements will be made over time.

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

**5**

**2**

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

No section E4 is provided in the application. However, sections E1 and E2 provide significant information regarding program evaluation.

A structure as well as theoretical framework (participatory evaluation and culturally responsive evaluation) are provided as well as a lengthy list of guiding questions to be addressed as part of the evaluation. This information is necessary but not sufficient for a high quality plan. Missing are a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties.

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

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

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

Several of the budget tables were hard or impossible to read as they ran off the page or included very narrow columns.

a. There are no other sources of funds other than RTT therefore no disinction is included or necessary. The budget is broken down by each of the three main goal / project areas.

b. By far the largest component to the project budget is personnel. This is reasonable given the project focus on tutoring and teacher training. Contractual and travel funding are also reasonable given the geographic location of the applicant and the project described (such as the evaluation components). Travel funds are included to allow for supervision as well as teacher training. Contractual funds are also included to allow for the support of the several partner colleges and universities.

c. Individual budget item rationales and descriptions are included in budget tables. These include any planned changes (such as raises) as well as qualifications for positions. One-time costs are not explicitly identified but it is clear in the budget which items will have costs for one year but not others.

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

**10**

**2**

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

The proposal makes general reference to the fact that LEAs will support costs such as those necessary for professional development once the grant is over. It's also stated that a number of costs, such as computers, are one-time costs. However, even computers require ongoing support and replacement. There is no high quality plan for how either of these (staffing or physical resources) will be kept up or maintained over time.

General reference is also made to the fact that the project proposed is in-line with state goals and priorities. However, this does not demonstrate a plan for sustainability that is supported by government leaders. Overall there are ideas for

sustainability but no high quality plan is provided.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

- 1) The proposal has made several references to Village Literacy Advocates which represent a partnership between communities and pre-school students. These individuals distribute books and will also organize literacy activities. There is no other discussion of collaboration with business, cultural groups, or community organizations. Funding for this collaboration will come from RTT meaning there is no financial collaboration integrating outside resources.
- 2) The results provides are mostly input goals. For example, some goals focus on screening individuals for delays or providing literature to children. These do not represent educational outcomes. Some results do align with community outcomes (such as new early childhood resources in communities).
3. No information is provided regarding how the project will be assessed, evaluated, and revised over time. Some of this is included in the earlier evaluation discussion Section E) but most of it is absent from the application. It's not clear how this component will be monitored and revised over time.
4. Passing reference is made to holistic approaches that were included in other components of the project. These include references to health outcomes that were included earlier in the proposal. Based on this its not clear how these components will be implemented as part of the proposed program or intervention.
5. Much of the competitive preference project deals with building VLA staff capacity to deliver services. However, no information is included here or in Section C for how these individuals will be trained. a detailed plan was not provided in earlier sections and it's not clear from this section what will be done to train individuals in data use, assessment, the engagement of families, etc.
6. The only performance measure included is the Alaska Developmental Profile. This measure is limited in its diagnostic information. Still, goals included do require progress to be made in early development and school readiness.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

This application was close to not meeting the absolute priority. The ideas presented are in-line with the goal of personalized learning, but there was never enough detail presented (e.g., high quality plans) to know if what the applicant planned to do would actually result in personalized learning for students.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>112</b>
--------------	------------	------------

## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

**Application #0200AK-2 for North Slope Borough School District**



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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) The applicant provides a good and comprehensive vision for educational reform that is well articulated describing support efforts in five remote rural districts. The applicant includes data on a sound plan to build on the proposed project addressing the core educational assurance areas by adopting standards to succeed in college and the workplace in order to compete in a global economy. The applicant proposes to align curriculum with appropriate cultural and contextual references and with Alaska’s College and Career-Ready standards. The appropriate tools have been created such as a one credit course, webinars and two conferences to help the five districts align with the new standards.</p> <p>The applicant provides a good plan with the use of regular and ongoing formative assessments, where four out of the five LEA’s use the Response to Intervention model that provides additional assistance and instruction to identified students-at-risk while monitoring academic progress. The development of effective teachers and principals is evident with recruitment methods that encourage a match between teachers and local demands. Effective out of state recruitment strategies are proposed and the use of new teachers’, administrators’ and superintendents’ evaluations.</p> <p>(b) There is a sound approach to increase student achievement and personalized student support with the appropriate curriculum instruction and formative and diagnostic assessments that are aligned with Alaska College and Career Ready Standards. Individual learning needs will be identified and Individualized Learning and Response to Intervention plans will be developed, and results will be available to parents through the PowerSchool parent portal. One-to-one site based tutoring, distance education courses, sequenced career and technical education programs are some of the strategies proposed. The overall plan is sound and addresses the identification of students’ needs for tailored interventions, professional development for effective educators; community based early childhood literacy that will enhance curriculum and methods supported by advanced technology.</p> <p>(c) The applicant describes how the rural classrooms in Alaska include multiple grades with a variety of developmental and levels of ability. Successful rural teachers will receive training and support in order to differentiate the delivery of curriculum and instruction in order to teach important concepts simultaneously to students in a grade span. There is a good plan to provide additional instructional support to students via face-to-face and through distance learning for remediation or acceleration of instruction.</p> <p><b>Weakness:</b></p> <p>(c) The applicant does not provide details on pedagogy and methods that will be used in order to describe the classroom experience for effective delivery of teaching new concepts in a multiple grade classroom, for example, collaborative learning setting grouped by grades or abilities. (3 points not awarded)</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) The proposed project will serve 6,500 students and provide professional development for 530 educators from 45 schools in five rural school districts that collectively meet the requirements for this grant competition. The applicant selected the five LEAs because they are all defined rural remote, not connected by a road system and similar challenges with unique needs. The applicant provides extensive data on tables describing the schools demographics, a management team chart and project implementation timelines listing deliverables and staff responsible.</p> <p>(b, c) The list of schools that will participate in the project is included and clearly describes each participating school, provides a detailed account of the number of students, educators, students with high learning needs, and percentage of low-income families. The applicant provides clear data and a comprehensive list.</p>		

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides an excellent plan that describes implementation steps for district wide reform and change. A detailed account of the three projects, 1) Personalized Student Learning, 2) Development of Effective Educators and 3) Community Based Early Learning Literacy each containing a set of goals and objectives for effective implementation and delivery of the project. The progression of activities and assessments demonstrate meaningful reform steps that will provide district-wide support beyond the schools into the communities served.</p> <p>The applicant includes a sound plan demonstrating a theory of change supported by logic models with timelines, activities and schedule for implementation, deliverables and the person responsible for the activity. Benchmarks for math, reading and writing are provided chronologically from 2006-2013 with performance outcomes.</p>		
<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) The applicant describes an excellent plan to improve student outcomes based on district-wide goals that are ambitious and attainable. The goal targets were calculated using Alaska’s established formula for ESEA Waiver that calls for a reduction by one-half the percentage of students Not Proficient in equal increments within six years in order to determine the proficiency increments over a six year period. The proposal contains clearly described figures with baseline data, per district in writing, reading and math.</p> <p>(b) The applicant provides a good plan to decrease the achievement gap between the Caucasian students identified as the higher achievers and the two largest groups in each of the consortium LEAs, the Alaska Natives and Economically Disadvantaged students. The plan includes baseline data and projected goals that are achievable and increment through the grant period.</p> <p>(c) Graduation rates are also detailed and the applicant provides baseline data with realistic goals projected for the duration of the grant and post-grant goals. The projected goals show increments in graduation rates.</p> <p>(d) The applicant provides post-secondary enrollment data demonstrating a statewide college enrollment rate for Alaska’s students as 30% showing that the target districts’ enrollment is about half the enrollment in four out of the five districts.</p> <p>(e) None noted.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) The applicant provides good data supporting the increased academic performance for Alaska Natives (AN) in the target area exceeding the state-wide range in reading. The achievement level of AN in math exceeded the state average for AN students in grade 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Detailed charts are provided with data on curriculum alignment, integration and mapping that incremented academic performance exceeding the state-wide range for Alaska.</p> <p>(b) The proposal supports the vision that student learning will be improved closing the achievement gap and there are good descriptions of the applicant’s aligning core content area instruction and effective career and technical education, all requiring the mandated proficiency in math and language arts. The applicant describes a track record of success and describes how a higher number of graduates now qualify for the Alaska Performance Scholarship due to increased success rates on the WorkKeys assessment.</p> <p>(c) The applicant provides good supportive data concerning four of the five LEAs using the PowerSchool information system in order to report student performance to parents, students and educators to collaborate and review performance data. The district provides one day a week with shorter work schedule to facilitate analysis, monitor, review and respond to the data for improving student learning.</p> <p><b>Weakness</b></p>		

**The applicant provides narrative of individual success in some areas but does not address if they have been successful in increasing achievement in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools**

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

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

(a) The applicant has a good plan that describes a high degree of fiscal transparency. The Board has responsibility for preparing and adopting the annual budget, public reports fall under the responsibility of the Superintendents.

(b) School and district budgets show salaries disaggregated; a public hearing must take place prior to the adoption of the budget and a budget advisory committee will receive public input and report recommendations to the Board.

(c, The applicant provides within the budget narrative personnel salaries, including teachers.

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

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

The applicant provides convincing evidence of successful conditions in the State of Alaska where the state has an ESEA Waiver that removes Alaska from an accountability model that has inaccurately labeled Alaskan schools. The waiver includes accountability for the underdeveloped rather than the underachievement of Alaska's Native, English-language learner and low socioeconomic groups. The state's education regulations provide schools and systems with structure and accountability that allows flexibility to implement personalized learning environments.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

(a) The applicant provides a good description of a good quality, meaningful engagement of stakeholders, defined as students, parents, administrators, community, district personnel, state legislature, School Board Presidents and collective bargaining representatives have participated with input, signed agreements, participated in surveys, provided feedback, and actively worked on strategies to support student achievement. Meaningful participation, engagement and feedback from parents and community have provided opportunities for revisions to the plan.

(i) The proposal contains good evidence that collective bargaining representatives have been engaged with School Board Presidents and with the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development in order to align with the state's approved ESEA waiver and use of current, accurate data.

(ii) Not applicable.

(b) The applicant provides a list of organizations and institutions that have provided letters of support to the proposal. The list includes state and local educational agencies, professional and community organizations, tribal organizations, Center for Alaska Policy and Research, KACN TV Public Broadcasting, Future Educators of Alaska, numerous mayors' offices and several colleges and universities.

**Weakness**

The applicant does not make it clear besides information to teachers how will teachers will be engaged. Engaging meaning teachers will be working with or on some aspects of the plan during its creation.

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>

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

The applicant provides a good plan that will focus on teaching and learning strategies that will increase academic performance and successfully serve the target population of Alaskan Native and Economically Disadvantaged students in

the five rural districts of the Alaska region. The use of formative assessments that will indicate individual student needs will drive a plan for instruction that will determine the areas of academic support needed.

The emphasis in teaching students with the support of parents and educators will focus on learning strategies that will engage students in deeper learning experiences, increasing comprehension of the material learned by individualized attention, tutoring and career and vocational applications. Student engagement will be attained by identifying the students' career goals and delineating how to achieve those goals through knowledge of the foundation topics that include reading comprehension and mathematics.

All five consortium districts are engaged in aligning the state's English Language Arts and Mathematics curriculum, to either the Alaska College and Career Ready standards or the Common Core Standards per the Alaska's ESEA waiver. The distance education modality will provide students with exposure to diversity and multicultural interaction that will enhance their learning experience. Other skills will be developed such as goal setting, critical thinking, teamwork and other important career and personal skills.

Students are provided a personalized sequence of skill building and exposure to diversity via distance learning activities including accommodations such as tutoring at monitored locations and one-on-one tutors, these interventions will detect weak academic areas and provide the interventions needed. Mechanisms are in place for other activities that include goal setting strategies and academic monitoring in order to stay on course for graduation and manage their learning.

There is an excellent plan to inform and engage parents, students and educators in the learning plan. In addition to providing access to data via the information system PowerSchool, parents and educators will meet to discuss progress report and identification of delays requiring special support services.

**Weakness**

The applicant does not make it clear besides information to teachers how will teachers will be engaged. Engaging meaning teachers will be working with or on some aspects of the plan during its creation. The applicant addresses training for students but does not provide details. The applicant does not indicate what type of training and assistance the students will receive to use the new technology. In addition, should the students require help outside of classes, there is no indication what will the students have as options.

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

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

(a) (I, ii) The applicant describes a good plan that addresses teaching and leading by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready skills. In addition to the academic support services provided to the students with individualized assessments and delivery of academic interventions, there is a concerted effort in professional development, cultural immersion for educators and administrators and the attainment of Alaska's ESEA waiver to be able to address the cultural and linguistic needs of the students in the target schools.

Target schools face challenging situations related to effective educators' retention with an average teacher turnover of 20% and sometimes escalating to 50%. Recruitment of effective educators is part of a plan that provides professional development, not only in rural education but in the cultural context of the Alaska Natives and Economically Disadvantaged students. An educator review team was involved in the development of state standards, so that teachers would easily understand the focus and purpose of each standard so that Alaskan schools would be able to use Alaska CCR and correlate to materials produced for the College and Career Ready Standards.

(iii, iv) There is a good plan to use resources produced by the Alaska Department of education such as needs and gaps analysis, presentation materials for administrators, standards implementation guides, and professional development materials to be used by the districts. Educators are provided training related to the tools and resources available in order to implement a high-quality, focused professional development for staff and closing the achievement gaps.

The applicant provides a plan to evaluate newly established educator in regulations and all the districts following the timeline to implement the new the system approved in the Alaska's ESEA waiver. In 2013 the school districts will use the gap analysis and stakeholder awareness and training tools developed by Alaska's Department of Education and Early Development in order to critically examine existing educator evaluation tools and processes and select a new instrument that will be aligned with the new regulation requirements. The emphasis on student learning data as a component of educator evaluation ratings will increase from 20% to 50%.Weakness

The applicant does not provide solid evidence the program will engage teachers in all aspects of the roll-out of the program. The training to increase high quality teachers in the system is not described in detail.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>

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

The applicant provides a good plan with details of the organization with the consortium governance structure; each consortium LEA has one seat and one vote, the consortium decision process shall be consensus and by majority for operational decisions. A Leadership Team will consist of six positions, all full time: a Project Director, Budget Manager, a Distance Tutoring Director, Tutor Recruitment Director, Early Childhood Implementation Director and a College and Career Ready Coordinator.

There is a good plan to provide leadership at the participating schools; the District-level Project Coordinators will have sufficient autonomy and flexibility to make changes in the school calendar, teacher or student absences, preferred methods for communicating with parents, and processes adopted by individual schools. The district level Project Coordinators will supervise the face-to-face tutors assigned to the district as well as a local early childhood centers.

The applicant indicates a sound plan to provide credit for mastery of the new and more rigorous Alaska CCR standards, and many of the skills demonstrations are performance-based. Since the new CCR Standards are being implemented, teachers will be supported through professional development as they expand their professional practice to include new strategies for inquiry and assessment. Teachers also receive professional development and cultural awareness training in the design and delivery of sheltered instructions for ELL students.

**Weakness**

The applicant does not provide solid evidence of a plan to increase the number of high skilled teachers in the system. There is very little detail provided as to what type of training teachers will be subject to for an increase in teacher capacity. In addition, the applicant does not show what learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable to all students, including those with disability or are English learners are available in the program.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

The applicant provides an excellent plan that comprises a mixed use of curriculum delivered via distance education with technical support and two models of tutoring. Students who are below the appropriate benchmark level will be offered tutoring support and students who are college-ready will be assisted in college preparatory courses and gatekeeper requirements for college access including financial aid assistance and peer tutors. Stakeholders' involvement include students, educators, administrators, staff, peers, tutors and other community support services as needed.

The proposed project demonstrates a good plan to use information technology system, PowerSchool, which provides academic progress data to students, parents and educators in a secure manner, for monitoring academic progress and provide academic interventions as needed. This allows parents and students to use data in an interoperable data system.

**Weakness**

The applicant does not provide concrete details of what type of technical support or training is available for students, staff and teachers is available to increase the knowledge and use of new technology.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>

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

The proposed project has a good plan with qualitative and quantitative evaluation components in order to monitor project processes and outcomes. The applicant will monitor the program and participants' progress with participatory or collective

evaluation strategies that involve stakeholders in the access to information, input, analysis and recommendations on a timely and regular basis.

Relevant research is documented in the application of participatory or collective evaluations and a culturally responsive evaluation approach. Having a team of evaluators that is culturally sensitive to the program environment will ensure that cultural nuances will be captured and used for interpreting progress and outcome data.

The applicant provides a good plan to address each one of the three projects, Personalized Student Learning K-12, Development of Effective Educators and Community-Based Early Childhood Literacy. Detailed charts describe the process and outcomes evaluations by identifying the questions, gathering evidence, describing the data activity, the instruments used, and analysis.

District reports will be produced and lists of resources available. Videoconferencing and Skype are already in use due to the rural nature and hard to access locations. The information system, PowerSchool, is available to stakeholders that will show where the investments from Race to the Top have been used in professional and staff development, technology and services.

**Weakness**

The applicant provides details on evaluation of the services provided by teachers within the classroom but the applicant does not explain how the data will be use, according to results, what remediation process is in place should the data collected indicate problems within the classroom.

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

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

There is good evidence that the applicant has a high-quality plan that includes quarterly Consortium meetings throughout the RTT-D project. The regularity of reports will allow for feedback and continuously improvement of the plan. An external evaluator will prepare a report prior to each meeting with current data, the LEA Superintendents maintains regular communications with the regional Native organizations and they are all well connected to resources and the communities in their districts. Regular monthly meetings in addition to the use of technology and other means of communications will allow for input and feedback needed for continuous improvement. Due to the nature of the target population, communication and feedback to the community is insured. The fact that an external evaluator is involved also insures that the appropriate data and information will be available to the target community at large.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
---	----------	----------

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

The applicant provides a good plan that includes 18 performance measures, addressing the performance measures for all applicants, for pre-K to 3, 4-8 and 9-12 grades. The proposal contains baseline data and target annual goals for the duration of the project and post-grant stages.

The applicant provides the number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). The percentage of students on track to college and career-readiness is provided for grades 9-12 grades.

**WEAKNESS:**

The applicant does not provide percentage of participating students by subgroup whose teacher of record and principal are highly effective for all students in the target population. (1 point not awarded)

The applicant does not provide the number of participating students who are on track to college and career-readiness for grades 4 -8 at the target schools (1 point not awarded)

The applicant does not provide clear evidence that there is a high quality approach to continuously improve its plans with timelines for activities and interventions. (1 point not awarded)

Although the applicant's goals are ambitious it is not clear if the program has all the necessary mechanism to be able to achieve the goals.

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

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

The applicant indicates the program has made accurate decisions in how they intend to use the funding. It is also relevant the program is using an outside evaluator to assess the progress of the program.

**WEAKNESS:**

The applicant does not address this criterion clearly. The applicant does not provide detailed information on how they will use all funding and activities covered by the funding.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The budget is reasonable, cost-effective and adequate to support the program.. The proposed budget is adequate to support the planned project services and activities and all costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives and scope of the project. The budget was developed in conjunction with the plan of operation. All costs are allowable in accordance with the US Department of Education regulations for this grant and adhere to cost principles. The budget was developed considering the cost of living and doing business in Alaska, the number of participants the project can effectively serve, and community commitments</p> <p>Costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives and scope of the project. For example, the budget contains only costs specifically necessary to achieve the project’s objectives and maximizes participant contact with staff, students and the target community in the provision of services. The applicant provides information on the narrative on one-time investments. For example, the applicant indicates "Other portions of the project, such as technology, are one-time purchases." In addition, the charts provide in the budget section also refer to one time investments and on-going expenses.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>F2. Consortium LEAs explore and identify alternatives to tutoring and/or use data and results to promote system change that makes sustainability possible. The consortium LEA Superintendents discuss sustainability regularly during consortium meetings and in policy meetings, with the School Board</p> <p><b>Weakness</b> The applicant does not provide a specific plan with facts and figures for sustainability.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant meets this Competitive Preference Priority by including a good plan to train Village Literacy Advocates, recruited from the local communities and creating capacity for parenting and provide childcare development knowledge that is transferrable into the larger community to effect individual leadership. Some of the consortiums LEAs have district-sponsored preschools. Village Literacy Advocates will be implemented in communities without preschools, and will conduct book distribution on birthdays. Another major function of the VLAs is to implement monthly literacy activities for families and communities.</p>		

The applicant works in collaboration with agencies and many of the resources will be created by university pre-service teachers as part of their literacy methods courses. The VLAs will work with the Early Childhood Implementation Director and Early Childhood Coordinator to identify and bring other resources to the community as well. The project partner, KACN-TV will assist with video production and broadcast of parenting tips and activity examples

The activities and emphasis in early literacy advocacy and foundation will serve as a literacy foundation for later academic achievement. The proposed activities will prepare children to enter kindergarten ready to succeed in school while advocacy and community involvement will encourage and establish family and community support.

**Weakness**

Training of new teachers and teachers in place to increase the high-quality teachers is not made clear in the narrative. Not data on how Literacy Advocates will be trainend.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides ample evidence through the application it will meet the core educational assurances significantly improve learning and teaching through personalization, support for students and educators, accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning and increase the effectiveness of the educators. The projected goals are ambitious and attainable with excellent details of the plan. The applicant provides details in various sections of the application showing it will seek involvement from parents and community leaders to identify needs and solutions of the program.

The applicant indicates as part of the application process the district will build long term partnerships that will provide a foundation to expand the career development of every school within the target area. Through the application the applicant demonstrates a persistence effort to employ the latest technology and research to improve and enhance the learning environment within the target schools. The application indicates a transparency of objectives and goals and a plan to involve parents, educators, teachers and the community as a group in the creation of the program, implementation and responsibility to the students.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>168</b>
--------------	------------	------------



**Race to the Top - District**

**Technical Review Form**

**Application #0200AK-3 for North Slope Borough School District**

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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

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

Applicant describes a credible approach to accelerating student achievement through a personalized approach to learning.

Classroom experience is described as a combination of face to face and online options, however, additional detail would provide needed clarity. Development of instructional staff is described, but may not be sufficient, given the challenges that are described. Many of the strategies described are already in place, and don't really represent reform.

As a result, the section does not meet the standard of articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision at this time.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant describes the districts, schools, students and educators who will participate, and all appear to meet the competition's eligibility requirement. Since the districts are large in geographical parameters, but small in numbers of participants, all are included, and at-risk students are to be assessed formatively in an ongoing protocol.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant provides a plan for improving student achievement through personalized instruction, however, many of the steps identified relate to work, foundational data collection, planning and organization to be done in the future. Three projects are cited that are being piloted and reported to be showing positive results, however, these statements are not accompanied by any data to support gains. Scale up efforts are not described in detail. Literacy coaches in the community will help reach outcome goals and support district wide change.  
 As a result, this section does not meet the standard of "high-quality" plan at this time, since scale-up efforts require additional clarification.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant provides ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are based on its ESEA waiver, as well as required targets for those goals over several years. Information is provided regarding how the calculations have been structured with respect to proficiency, decreasing achievement gaps, graduation rates, and college enrollment. College enrollment goals are not ambitious. Tabular information is presented for age groups, subgroups, and goal areas.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant cites progress that is at goal or nearing goal in reading and math for several grade levels, although this does not appear to represent a "clear record of success in the past four years. More information regarding high school graduation and college enrollment would be welcome.  
 Proposal targets closing achievement gap, primarily with literacy initiatives, but does not specifically address lowest-achieving schools, although most schools in the district are low achieving.  
 Tabular information supports a record of gains in student learning.  
 A web-based application gives access to performance data, and teachers are using these data during a shorter school day (once a week) to make plans to respond with instructional remedies.

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

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**  
 Public access is provided for all of the categories of school-level expenditures by radio broadcasts of budget meetings and by postings on district websites.

These efforts represent a high level of transparency already in place.

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

**10**

**9**

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

Applicant describes the parameters of the ESEA waiver which cites a situation of underdevelopment rather than underachievement. The state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements appear to support the implementation of personalized learning environments as described in the proposal.

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

**15**

**10**

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

The applicant demonstrates support from multiple constituencies, including teacher bargaining units. Many letters of support are provided. Information on how students and families were involved in the development, and how their feedback affected the proposal is minimal.

As a result, this section does not entirely meet the standard of meaningful stakeholder engagement at this time.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>

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

The applicant has a plan that uses RtI to address student learning needs, with a strategy of using online tutoring to support mastery of critical academic content and face to face support from a College and Career Ready near-peer tutor. Frequent assessment and data-driven instructional decisions are cited that include a personal approach to learning and ongoing feedback. Interventions are cited for tiers 1,2, and 3 or RtI. Applicant describes relationships with teacher education programs out of the state in order to recruit tutors to provide personal remediation for students who are assessed as less than proficient. Students and parents are able to use Pearson's PowerSchool to access information about student achievement and progress, however, clear training protocols for using the software need clarification.

Some weaknesses in linking activities and clear outcomes interfere with designating this as a high-quality plan.

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

**20**

**15**

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

Applicant cites changes to instruction that will be necessary as a result of revised Alaska standards crosswalked with CCSS and recent inservice that was designed to help ready educators for this job; half-day release time strategies are cited for professional development as well as a "train the trainer" model for making it available to all teachers. This is being put in place to provide a wide range of educators with training on the tools and resources they need to meet individual student needs. The proposal cites many examples of what teachers need to do, but does not always provide clear plans regarding how these goals will be reached.

A new educator evaluation system is being put in to place that uses student achievement as a 50 percent factor in analysis of teacher performance.

Students will have new access to receive effective instruction through blended learning classes that will give them access to highly qualified teachers. In addition the plan describes a recruitment protocol for increasing the pool of effective educators and helping them develop the cultural competence needed to be effective in this context.

This section does not meet the standard of "high quality" plan at this time, Additional clarity regarding how effective learning environments will be structured using cited approaches would be welcome.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
<p><b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Applicant presents a high quality plan to support project implementation through an organized cadre of staff with specific duties to provide support and services to all participating schools. Applicant reports having enough autonomy to provide participants with flexibility in scheduling and personnel decisions. Budget is not discussed.</p> <p>A quality plan is in place to base student progress on competency rather than seat time, although no mention is made of multiple times of demonstration or multiple comparable ways of demonstrating mastery.</p> <p>Applicant cites a plan to use RtI strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners as well as sheltered instruction for ELLs.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Applicant has a plan to support students and educators and parents with access to content, tools and other learning resources both in and out of school, including two types of tutoring. Applicant is already using PowerSchool to permit parent and student access to data which is reported to be interoperable with HR. They will add Safari Montage Creation Station to permit upload of projects and assignments to be shared.</p> <p>District will provide technology support for its satellite based Internet, although no mention is made of how this might operate out of school hours. This is a weakness of the proposal.</p> <p>As a result, this section does not represent a high quality plan at this time.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has a plan to evaluate the progress of its project by employing a professional evaluator who will use a mixed methods approach with stakeholders to monitor and analyze progress toward project goals. The evaluator will also work with stakeholders to examine strengths and weaknesses. In addition, applicant plans to launch a culturally responsive evaluation approach that will describe the context of the program being evaluated. The applicant identifies many questions that will guide the research with respect to its main projects. While some of the questions are formulated to identify any changes that were made in projects, they don't really describe how feedback on progress informs corrections or improvements during or after the term of the grant.</p> <p>As a result, the standard of "high-quality" plan has not been met at this time. Additional detail regarding making corrections on the basis of feedback would provide greater clarity regarding this criterion.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant describes methods of meeting and communicating among administration and stakeholders, but does not really address clearly how this communication will lead to continuous improvement. While methods of communication are described, actual engagement of the stakeholders would benefit from additional clarification.</p> <p>As a result, this section does not meet the standard of "high-quality" plan at this time.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant cites ten measures it will use and provides information regarding how each will be expected to function as an</p>		

assessment for different populations and grade levels. Assessments for academic growth, FAFSA completion, and non-academic well being are identified. Tabular information describes which groups will use which assessments with target scores over several years of the grant. Information regarding how these assessments might be changed if deemed to be insufficient for the purpose is not found. Additional information about specific groups would help in the assessment of "ambitious and achievable".

Goals for college enrollment do not appear to be ambitious.

As a result, this section does not meet the standard of providing both ambitious and achievable measures in the plan at this time.

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

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

This section was not found.

While the applicant (in other sections) provides information regarding monitoring progress toward achieving goals, information regarding actual improvement of plans is minimal.

A high quality plan is not found in other sections regarding this criterion.

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

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

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

This section was found at the end of the proposal with a description of most funds being requested. Several of the pages were not fully readable as they were "chopped off" landscape format being presented in portrait mode. As a result, some of the data were missing.

No funds other than grant funds were reported.

Additional information would be welcome regarding one-time investments vs. those that will be ongoing as well as strategies that will ensure the long term sustainability of the project. Letters of support are offered, but more clarity regarding sustainability would be helpful.

As a result, this section does not meet the standard of "identification and description" that is required.

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

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

This section reiterates goals and concepts proposed in earlier parts of the application, but does not appear to include how to sustain the work following the grant period. Additional information regarding support from state and local government leaders and financial support for the three years after the term of the grant would be welcome.

As a result, this section does not meet the standard of "high-quality" plan at this time.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes a plan to provide improved assessments and literacy support to local villages rather than a specific partnership entity, although one partner (KACN-TV) is cited as assisting with video production. Capacity of staff would be improved by additional training to improve inter-rater reliability in early childhood assessments. Additional staff building information would be helpful. Outcome evaluation is identified earlier in the proposal, although additional information about

routine assessment and resolving challenges would be welcome.

As a result, this section does not meet the standard of "coherent and sustainable" partnerships at this time.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<p><b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Proposal addresses how it will address development of personalized learning environments for students that rely on continuous assessments and Rtl interventions and tutoring to provide support where needed. More effective educators will be available to students as the result of blended learning options and new staff to oversee college and career ready standards will take responsibility for increasing the rates at which students graduate and do so as college and career ready candidates.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>144</b>