



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0116MO-1 for Poplar Bluff School District R-I

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a)

(1) Adopting standards and assessment that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy

It is unclear if the standards and assessments considered by PBR1 will prepare students for college, the workplace and for competition in the global economy. The district has made progress with the development of Essential Learning Outcomes, however the applicant shared few details regarding how the ELO's would be assessed. The district has piloted assessment systems but not adopted or decided on one. Preparing students to compete in a global economy was not addressed.

(2) Building data systems that that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction.

The applicant addresses that personalized learning requires both teachers and students to have access to real time data and that the district will look for an assessment platform that will measure each learners strengths and weaknesses. Improving instruction and student growth was not addressed, however the applicant included data coaches to assist teachers to develop interventions and to accelerate the learning process. It is not clear how students will automatically receive online learning modules or how these will improve instruction.

(3) Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals where they are needed most was not specifically addressed. The applicant did indicate that the teacher and principal committees have endorsed the Marzano evaluation system to link teacher assessment to student growth.

(4) A plan to turn around the lowest achieving schools was not addressed by the applicant.

(b)

Articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests; and

A clear approach to accelerating student achievement was not evident, although the applicant did address personalizing learning though the use of technology. Equity was addressed through providing each student with the same technology device. It was not clear how this action would accelerate student achievement or what exactly each device would do. District wide expansions of standard assessments to monitor progress would be only be explored.

(c)

Describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

It is unclear from the information provided what the classroom experience would be like for teachers and students participating in personal learning environments. Data coaches will assist teachers with assessment information for an assessment not yet selected. Students would have more exposure to a variety of careers. An on-line platform was discussed and the district may offer online or blended learning. The applicant did not specify grade levels or

specific classes.

(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)

10

7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- (a) The applicant chose to select all schools in the district to participate and all schools appear to meet the eligibility requirements.
- (b) A list of schools was provided
- (c) The total number of participating students, low income and high need participating students, and participating educators was provided.

The applicant did not provide enough details in the proposal to support high-quality LEA-Level and school level implementation. For example the proposal did not specifically address a plan for the Early Childhood Center or if the assessment system selected would address pre-K needs. The same technology device will be offered to all students. It is unclear how pre k students and secondary students might benefit from the same technology devices.

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

10

2

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The focus on how reaching outcomes of goal is not supported because lack of logic model or clear explanation of theory of change.

The applicant identified foundational components to personalize learning including cultural changes, PBIS, a Curriculum Loft Program, and technology. These components were not strongly related to outcome goals for students or improving student learning outcomes.

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

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- a) While the goals seem achievable, many do not appear to be ambitious. Thus it is unclear if the application addresses ESEA state targets. For example:
 - By 2017 the applicant proposes to raise achievement on the MAP for Black students to less than 50% (48%) and for IEP students to less than 40% (39%)
 - At the high school level, MAP scores would be worse than the baselines provided by 2017 for IEP students. The baseline is 17.6% and the goal is only 14% at the end of this grant.
- b) At the end of the grant period, significant achievement gaps were expected to remain with some groups not approaching even 20% proficiency. On the elementary MAP, a 20% gap is estimated post - grant between the overall proficiencies and the black subgroup. These wide subgroup gaps are estimated post-grant throughout the tables. Improvements are estimated, however progress on reducing achievement gaps seems inadequate.
- c) The applicants vision did not specifically address graduation rates. The goals for graduation rates in the table across achievement gaps are ambitious. The application addressed college and career readiness standards. The Vision would have been strengthened by addressing increasing graduation rates.
- d) College readiness was addressed in the vision and the post- grant goals seem achievable, while not ambitious. For example, the applicant proposes to raise 4 year college enrollment by only 3.9% over the cycle of this grant.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) Although the applicant demonstrates achievement growth in student learning and achievement, it is modest and does not significantly address a clear record of advancing student learning and increasing equity in learning and teaching. For example, proficiency rates for the black The subgroup increased by only 1% between 2009 and 2012 and graduation rates increased only slightly to 76%. Equity regarding teaching was not addressed. As evidenced in section A, the applicant does not anticipate closing achievement gaps and does not have a history demonstrating this effort. College enrollment in community college was addressed in this section, however the applicant did not give specific information regarding how improvements in enrollment in dual enrollment programs were accomplished.

b) Reforms in persistently low achieving schools were addressed generally. All schools demonstrated growth in mathematics. Two schools lost growth in Communication Arts. Although growth was demonstrated in the previous tables, achievement was not consistently significant and achievement gaps consistently.

c) Data is available on-line, however it is not clear is all students, parents and educators have on-line access. It is also unclear how the data is used, personalized, and disaggregated. No details were provided on how the data would inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. It would have strengthened the application to provide details regarding what data was shared and how all parents have or would have access.

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

5

2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant holds public meetings and offers specific salaries and expenditures through public records upon request. Salary schedules are posted on the division websites. Copies of audits are also available upon request. Several reports are published and posted annually.

It is unclear how the public can request records or how easy the process is. Salary schedules are on the website, however it is not clear in the application what percentage of the population has internet access. It is unclear if reports are published on-line and posted on-line or available in print.

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

10

2

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not address the personal learning environment proposed in this section of the application regarding state context.

- The applicant previously referenced on-line learning. It is not clear if state law allows this educational approach.
- The applicant previously referenced awarding a high school diploma if a student passed a GED test. It is unclear if this is allowable in the state.
- The applicant previously proposed blended learning. It is not clear if this is allowable.
- The applicant previously proposed competency based learning. It is not clear is this model will work within the state matriculation context.

Missouri appears to offer broad authority to schools regarding staffing, curriculum, and budgets. The applicant did reference some smaller class sizes and curricular programs in their plan.

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

15

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a) The district conducted a phone survey and an electronic survey. In addition they developed a parent advisory council and community task force. The developers spoke with community and civic organizations regarding the proposed services and technology that would be purchased. It is unclear how all parents and stakeholders were engaged in deciding how this grant was developed. It is also unclear is collective bargaining is place although more than 70% of teacher seem supportive based on the appendix.

The survey conducted seemed un-related to the grant proposal. It is unclear how stakeholders decided that all junior high students needed a mac book and how this would improve academic achievement.

b) Letters of support from business organizations and political entities were included. Letters from parents and parent

organizations were not included. No student organizations indicated support.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. (i) The applicant indicates that all students will set learning goals and that teachers will help students from pre school to high school set goals. However they also indicate that personal learning goals will not begin until elementary school and that teachers find it difficult to deliver personalized instruction. Counselors will not meet with parents to involve them in goal planning until high school, when students develop a career plan. It is unclear how students will understand how what they are learning is related to successfully accomplishing their goals.

a. (ii) The applicant included information in the appendix that indicated that the Missouri Learning Standards defined the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college and careers. It is unclear if the handbook of ELO's for every grade level will address college and career ready standards. Teachers will spend time with students and parents helping them to understand the ELO's however it is unclear how student learning will be structured, how goals will be accomplished, and how progress will be measured.

a. (iii) The applicant provided insufficient evidence that this project would deepen student learning experiences in areas of academic interest. The applicant indicated only that they would research various products to offer a variety of learning experiences and listed the products and programs that are currently in place.

a. (iv) The applicant did not address how students access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning with the support of teachers and parents.

a. (v) The applicant detailed that the professional development approach that they are currently using promotes inquiry-based learning and that students will learn to think critically, solve problems and communicate using technology. It is unclear how this application will change current practices and assist students in mastering academic content and goal setting.

b. (i) The school district believes all learners should have an individualized experience and will develop a Personalized Plan of Study. Although students will have access to technology and content through on-line lessons, sparse details were provided regarding how the plans would be developed and who would develop them. It is unclear how the plans, technology and content would lead to improved graduation rates or college/career readiness.

b. (ii) In section b. (i), the application expresses that content will be developed through online lessons, videos, weblinks and hands-on manipulatives to complement online learning, however in this section, the applicant appears to describe a contradictory environment including class room management strategies and cooperative learning structures. It is unclear what the instructional approach or environment the applicant is proposing.

b. (iii) Although the applicant is experimenting with three tiers of content delivery and lists programs that might be used, the applicant does not provide a clear plan for delivering high quality content aligned with college and career ready standards.

b. (iv) (A) The applicant believes that data needs to be as real time as possible and indicates that teachers will keep grades up to date and have weekly "data chats" with students. The applicant is vague concerning what a "data chat" is. The applicant feels that teachers should learn from coaches but does not address how this will be accomplished. It is unclear how progress will be determined for all students.

b. (iv) (B) The applicant shared information regarding a data management system for career readiness that is currently available at no charge. The applicant did not address how personalized learning based on a students current knowledge and skills would be developed in this proposal.

b. (v) The applicant acknowledges that students have different needs. The application would have been strengthened by including accommodations and high-quality strategies for English Language Learners, students with special needs, homeless students, students living in poverty, and students behind in academic credits.

(c) The application is vague concerning the tools and resources that will used. Training will be provided through the back to school orientation and students will have an opportunity to attend a summer training. Tutorials will be available online, however it is unclear if all students have online access at home. Student and parent nights will be provided however the

applicant did not provide a clear plan to assess progress toward students tracking and managing their learning.

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

20

2

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A High Quality Plan was not provided by the applicant. Key goals were not included. Activities seem to be the purchase of technology and several technology based programs. The rationals provided were insufficient. A timeline was not included and it was unclear who the responsible parties were.

a (i) The applicants plan is ambiguous and unclear. Five coaches will be added for ten schools. This seems insufficient to meet the level of collaboration proposed. It is unclear what the qualifications of these coaches will be. The professional development plan seems to indicate that the division will continue with the same professional develop program in place. It unclear how teachers will receive training on the technology based programs that will be researched.

a (ii) The applicant proposes to provide technology, coaches, and the same professional development plan that is in place (eMINTS). It is unclear how they will adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches. Few specific details were provided regarding what web based learning resources would be used. The applicant expressed that with so much content available online, it can be distracting.

a (iii) The applicant detailed the data currently available and indicated that that they would use a rigorous online assessment system. It is unclear how frequently student progress would be measured, how progress toward college and career-ready standards would be measured, how data would be used to accelerate student progress.

a (iv) The applicant shares their opinion of what a teacher evaluation "should" be, what the committee believes about the Marzano system, and evaluation of teacher effectiveness is contingent on student achievement. It is unclear what the current practices are, how they would change through this grant, or if the school administration supports the addition of the Marzano system in addition to current practices. It is also unclear how feedback might be used and how this program would improve teacher and principal practice. A system to address principal evaluations was not included.

b (i) It is unclear what actionable information will be provided and how it will be used.

b (ii) The district has a cloud based system for collaborating and sharing resources and is investigating an online learning platform. This is not sufficient to determine the quality of the learning resources, and alignment with college-career standards.

b. (iii) Processes matched to student needs were not specifically addressed.

c (i) The applicant did not provide clear and consistent information regarding how adding the Marzano Evaluation System to the system already in place would help teachers and leaders improve, increase effectiveness, and change school culture/climate to continually improve.

c (ii) The applicant provided information regarding their current Professional Learning Communities and indicated that they would add Learning Coaches and a Data Coach. The applicant did not address closing achievement gaps. It is unclear what training from the coaches would take place to accelerate student performance.

d The applicant has a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals (as defined in this notice), including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education).

The applicant indicated they have a plan to address high quality teachers and administrators. They did not share this plan and provided contradictory information indicating that they seem to hire teachers who do not meet the guidelines in their plans. A plan addressing students receiving high quality instruction was not addressed. Hard to staff schools and subjects was not addressed.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Policies and infrastructures to provide every student, educator, and level of the education system were vague, insufficient and inconsistent. One point was awarded as the applicant addressed the section, however not enough information was provided to document a high quality plan to support implementation.

(a) The applicant indicated the make up their district leadership team. This team will make decisions regarding this grant, however the applicant did not address policies or infrastructures the leadership team has in place or an infrastructure to support participating schools.

(b) In section (a), the applicant indicated that the leadership team will make the final decisions that affect Race to the Top, in section (b), they indicated that they will give building level principals the flexibility and decision making power to build schedules, assign duties, and budget funds. It is unclear if the building level principals will have autonomy over staffing models, roles and responsibilities.

(c) It is unclear if policies and rules are in place that allow students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topics.

(d) It is unclear if policies and rules are in place to allow students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

(e) The applicant provided general information regarding current practices for students who have special needs or ELL accommodations. No information was provided regarding how learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students in this plan would include students with disabilities and English learners.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The information shared by the applicant was vague and did not provide the information needed to determine if an infrastructure would be in place to support personalized learning. One point was awarded as the applicant addressed this section.

a) All students will be given a mac book to take home and teachers will be able to "push" assignments onto the computer if students do not have access to internet at home. Resources for parents and educators were not addressed. Resources for other stakeholders, such as district personnel and support staff were not addressed. It is unclear if the online content referenced in the application can be fully pushed onto student computers and how this will be done when many internet resources and applications were referenced.

b) It is unclear if Help Desk is on site at all schools, how students, parents and teachers with inoperable equipment might file an online request in "Blue Chalk". No references were made to the technical support that might be needed with the programs or applications purchased. No references were made to training students, parents, and staff in the use of the MacBooks and the security issues that might need to be addressed. The plan seems to be just offering all students iPads and MacBooks.

c) The information provided in this section is inconsistent (an online platform will be purchased when the applicant has already indicated that not all students and parents have online access at home). The security of stored personal records was not addressed.

d) The applicant did not indicate if the data systems in the schools were interpretable.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	1

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The plan for this grant does not meet the Race to the Top definition of a high quality plan with key goals, activities to be undertaken, rationales, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible clearly identified. The applicant included general information regarding the need to frequently collect information, however no details were included regarding what would be done with this data to improve the project, how it would be used, or why it was being collected.

One point was awarded as the applicant addressed this section and the need to continually improve. A plan to monitor, measure, and publicly share information was not addressed although an annual evaluation report would be prepared.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Surveys will be given and teachers may offer feedback at board meetings. Stakeholders will meet. A detailed communication plan was not included. It is unclear how any students, parents, teachers, or stakeholders will be able to access grant information or reports. One point was awarded as the applicant addressed this section of the application.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Twelve performance measures were included however they did not meet the minimal requirements of the grant application. One point was awarded for addressing this section.

- (a) The applicant did not provide a rationale for selecting each measure;
- (b) The applicant did not indicate how the measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and
- (c) The applicant did not indicate how they will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to guide implementation progress.

Since the applicant did not meet the minimum requirements for performance measures, no points were awarded.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not address a high-quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the funded activities. No measurements were detailed for professional development, technology, or the staffing proposes. One point was awarded since the applicant addressed the criteria.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) A budget is included to support the project. In the budget, the applicant indicated that textbooks would be replaced by online content. No budget is included for online content. The application indicates in the supply budget that textbooks will be obsolete. No funding is included for online textbooks or that online platform referenced. No funding is included for the data systems referenced. An afterschool and summer program was included that were not referenced in the grant application.

b) The budget did not include programs detailed in the grant and included programs that were not in the grant. This is confusing and lacks the information to determine if it is sufficient. It does not appear to be reasonable to include programs that have no goals or performance measures relating to personalizing the learning.

c) Rationals were vague and lacked detail regarding investments and priorities. The applicant indicated that they would not

be including funds and that outside support was not included. It was unclear which purchases would be one-time or on-going. It was unclear how computers would be replaced or paid for after the grant period.

Two points were awarded for addressing the budget. The application information was not consistent with the budget allocations.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The sustainability plan was insufficient. Clear goals were not included in the application or the sustainability plan. Outside support was not detailed. No information regarding past investments was included. A post-grant budget was not included. It is highly unlikely that a public relations director will develop the funding to make this project sustainable. The district is experiencing economic development, however it is unclear how the property taxes are distributed to the district and if they can be used for this program. One point was awarded as the applicant addressed sustainability.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant did not address the competitive priority.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant did not clearly offer a coherent and comprehensive plan to address personalizing the learning environment for students. The proposal was inconsistent and did not provide evidence that iPads and MacBooks, with no curricular purchases, would improve learning and close achievement gaps. A clear plan with timelines and goals was not included. Many programs were referenced to personalize the learning environment, however references were vague and it was unclear what programs would be adopted. In the budget, none were funded. The budget included traditional afterschool and summer programs that were inconsistent with the proposal for online and technology based classes.

Total	210	41
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0116MO-2 for Poplar Bluff School District R-I

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant proposes to create a personalized learning environment through the integration of digital technology and assessments throughout all grade levels. Proposal is centered around instruction guided by the standards of Common Core and College- Career Readiness. In order to progress instruction to the level of individualization proposed and the level of technology integration, comprehensive professional development is also proposed. To monitor the success of the proposal, a number of assessments will be employed--several of which are already in place. Each grade level and/or grade band has an assessment appropriate to the development of the student at that level to assess progress. Evaluation systems for teacher, principals, and superintendents are being investigated and reviewed with each having a standard of being tied to student achievement.</p> <p>While the applicant does outline its proposal to integrate technology and shift instruction from a direct instruction model to one which is student driven, there does not exist a clearly described approach as to how this will occur. There is a heavy focus on the use of technology and the providing of professional development but not an articulated high quality plan of specifics. Materials are clearly identified but approaches, resources, software, and digital applications are lacking. There is a weak and limited description of how content will be based on student interests or how the overarching classroom experience will be like for the students at each of the grade levels. Overall this scores in the low range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applican's plan is one of including all students in every school in the district. A total of 5202 students and 389 educators are included in the proposal. Schools are identified by name and all enrollment data is included and disaggregated by the specified criteria for each location. Applicant describes process and theory behind selecting all students at all schools, which may be too broad a scope to effectively implement personalized learning environments as proposed. Process for selecting schools was limited in its description.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>As such the proposal involves all students in all grade in all buildings, the applicant has scaled the goals to be all inclusive. Integration of technology at all levels is one means by which to bring about student engagement and individualized learning for both students and teachers but may be too broad to fully implement.</p> <p>There lacks a description of logic model or theory of how this proposal will improve student learning outcomes. Because there is no description evident nor the criteria of a high quality plan, this scores in the low category.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district has set forth some ambitious goals for achievement for each students at all grade bands from elementary to high school. Goals for elementary English Language Arts are scaled for there to be an overall increase of 18.4 percent one year post grant; math is a 16.1 percent increase. While overall goals are ambitious, achievement gaps between subgroups are not closed. Baseline data for 2011-12 for ELA for subgroup White was 52.8 and subgroup black was 33.8 for a gap difference of 19. The goal, one year post grant, has the gap difference increasing to 22. Similar trends are seen when comparing overall to the subgroup IEP. Graduation rates are already at a significant level and the proposed goals have 90% of students graduating. College enrollment rates show increases, however, increases are marginal.</p> <p>Overall this scores in the low range as goals are set though achievement gaps are not closed and in some instances, subgroups would be performing at lower levels at the conclusion of the proposal. Additionally it is not defined what current ESEA targets are to know if the goals are equal to or exceeding these targets.</p>		

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

It is noted the applicant has demonstrated success through the data provided for proficiency rates in Communication Arts and Math. Communication Arts proficiency rates have increased from 50.9% in 2009 to 55.7% in 2012. Math proficiency rates have increased from 44.6% in 2009 to 55.1% in 2012. Graduation rates have increased only slightly within the past four years.

The district has tracked data for each of its buildings and has identified schools which have not kept pace with other schools in its assessment data. No reform measures to improve these identified schools is provided or described.

Data on student achievement is made available primarily through an electronic format--either a parent login site or school website. Data is also provided at parent-teacher conference and paper reports sent home with students. It is not specified what data is provided nor how it is used or described to help improve participation, instruction, or services.

Overall this scores in the low category. Though there has been minimal achievement increases in the overall student population, there is not evidence that gaps have been closed, graduation rates significantly increased, or reforms implemented in schools of need.

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

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district describes that it posts all personnel salaries of administrators, certified staff, and classified staff on its district website and information may be provided upon request though there is no description how requests are made or the degree of difficulty in acquiring the information. Additionally all salaries and expenditures are a matter of public record and provided upon request. Expenditures of the district are published annually in the Secretary of the Board Report and identifies revenue sources and amounts, expenditures by level, and non-instructional expenditures. Applicant identifies transparency in accounting practices and examples of screenshots identifying the salaries and expenditures were provided as supporting evidence of transparency.

This criteria scores in the medium range as evidence for transparency was provided only for the district level and not the individual school level.

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

10

2

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

It is unclear if the district has the authority to fully implement the goals suggested within this proposal. Evidence is lacking whether the district has the authority and autonomy to implement the proposed personal learning environments with the addition of a one-to-one technology initiative. It is not evident whether conditions exist for the district to fully and effectively utilize technology at this magnitude. There is evidence according to the state department of elementary and secondary education and Missouri law that local schools do have the state regulatory freedom and autonomy in staffing, budget maintenance, and curriculum choices which would aid in the implementation of the goals of this proposal.

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

15

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district utilized a number of surveys and formats to garner the input of parents, students, and educators in the identification of needs. Parents received a telephone survey and then a follow-up electronic survey. Electronic surveys were also completed by community members. It is unclear how the surveys connect to the goals of the proposal.

Meetings were held with civic and community organizations to gather additional feedback. Based upon these surveys and meetings, the goals of the proposal were developed though there is no process described how the information impacted the writing of the plan. District began implementing a phase of this proposal in the previous year, and based upon teacher feedback revised the proposal to include additional professional development. Descriptions are disjointed and convoluted and do not clearly describe the engagement of parents or students.

Eighty-seven percent of teachers and principals signed in support of the proposal. Additionally, support letters are provided from large scale community employers, elected officials, and local civic groups.

While there is some evidence of support and involvement of stakeholders in the development of the proposal, it is not evident how feedback was used to develop or revise the proposal.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district proposes to involve all grade levels within the development of personalized learning environments. At the elementary levels, students will begin by setting personal learning goals. As students approach the middle school, they will participate in a career interest survey and create career plans. This plan will be refined prior to entering high school where in grade 11, students will take the ACT or a career readiness assessment. It appears there is not much done with the career plan upon entering high school. There lacks a clear description of a high quality plan with clear timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

The district has adopted the Common Core State Standards which are being utilized as a roadmap for what must be mastered at each level. The district is also in the process of creating Essential Learning Outcomes (ELO) handbook to accompany CCSS and assist students in understanding the building blocks that must be mastered at each level. It is not clear if the ELO handbook is geared for student or parent or teacher use to identify progress toward goals.

The district is presently utilizing a number of digital media and web based applications to supplement classroom instruction. Eight different products are identified for use in the elementary level and two for the high school. High school students also have the opportunity to enroll in Dual Credit and Advanced Placement courses. There does not exist a cohesion among programs or a vertical alignment between grade bands.

The district has trained 30 of its educators in eMINT to aid in creating high quality, technology rich and diverse lessons. It is proposed to expand this training and professional development. Again, a high quality plan for this to occur is not described.

The district proposes to integrate technology to create learning situations and delivery methods which are tailored to the individual student based on their needs, interests, strengths, and weaknesses. A three tier approach is recommended: using technology as a resource, blending digital content and offering some aspects online, full online courses. There is not a clear plan or description of the process by which this will occur.

Parents have access to grades online through a parent portal. Teachers input grades on a weekly basis. While grades are one piece of data, there is no explanation of data available or how it will be used. Also, identification of progress toward standards beyond just classroom grades is not present.

District utilizes the state's web based resource to explore career options and establish education plans. While this is one tool, it is a public tool available to all. There is no explanation as to how the information garnered will be used to create a personalized learning plan beyond just the identification of a particular career.

Identified high need students will receive additional support through a mentor, transition skill classes, and/or graduation specialist. District indicates they will increase learning time beyond the minimum number of days and beyond the normal hours of instruction. There is no explanation of strategies to be used with high need students or how students/parents will know if they are on track toward meeting college and career ready standards.

Orientation lessons, online tutorials, and trainings will be provided to students to assist them with the integration of technology into creating a personalize learning environment. There is no support beyond technological assistance described.

This is receiving a low score because numerous criteria are lacking and there is not evidence of a high quality plan.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant addresses parts of each criterion and the following is noted as a strength:

- The district proposes to build off of a presently existing model of Professional Learning Communities (now in year 3) to facility the goals of the proposal. Included is the hiring of additional staff, Learning Coaches, who will serve as instructional specialists to assist in modeling best practices, coaching teachers in effective instructional strategies, and facilitate reflection over effectiveness.

Some areas were lacking in evidence for the criteria:

- Presently, evaluation systems for teachers and principals are being researched.
- The district intends to build upon existing digital resources as well as recently acquired ones to facilitate personalized learning and provide additional digital resources to students and teachers. A high quality plan to do this is not described.
- A handbook with a compilation of websites has been provided to teachers. As the evaluation system is further researched, developed, and approved, it will be presented to faculty through professional development. There is not a description of a high quality plan to complete this.
- Highly effective teachers and principals are sought from the initial hiring phase. There is not a description of how the number of students who have access to highly effective teachers and principals will be increased.

There is insufficient evidence that a high quality plan has been thoroughly developed. There are not documented deliverables for personalized learning environments or strategies that meet the needs of the students. There is no evidence of consistent measures, vertically, for progress toward college and career ready standards. Information is lacking on how student progress will be accelerated. Information provided on the evaluation system is insufficient.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	2
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has in place a leadership team of central office administrators that will meet weekly to assess the implementation of the proposed plans. It is unclear how this leadership team will communicate with or support the building level efforts. Building level principals have the autonomy to revise schedules, budgets, and responsibilities of staff to implement the proposed plan. Students will continue to earn credit based upon assessments; time dedicated to this task is not addressed therefore it is unclear if progress is based solely on mastery or mastery and time on task. Multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery are not evident; multiple learning styles are described but within the confines of projects only. Accessible and adaptable resources and instructional practices are presented only within the context of accommodation plans and IEP's . Practices and resources that facilitate personalized learning for these identified groups is lacking. While a few components are described in limited fashion, it is not evident that a high quality plan with goals, a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties identified has been developed.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Due to the focus on integration of technology, the applicant proposes instituting a fee to cover usage and maintenance for equipment which is counterintuitive to the purpose of the plan. There is no evidence or description of other accessibility of learning resources, content, or tools beyond the laptop.</p> <p>Support for the technology is addressed through a help desk and an online portal that is managed by technology specialists. While these two avenues of support are addressed as being available for students and staff, there is no evidence of assistance or support available to parents and other stakeholders. There is no plan for connectivity outside of the physical school building.</p> <p>The district does not address how information/data is available to parents in an open format other than a vague description of its pilot use of the platform Blackboard.</p> <p>The applicant does have in place a comprehensive data system which houses all data information related to human resources, student information and budgets. A separate system aggregates student achievement data and it interfaces with the comprehensive system. Both systems are described as appropriate to meet the criteria of interoperable data systems.</p> <p>This scores in the low range because it is not evidenced that a high quality plan is formed to implement this project through comprehensive policies and infrastructure nor have all sub criteria been adequately addressed.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score

(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	1
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan describes an effort from all involved parties to review implementation progress and assess whether revisions are needed though the description is limited in addressing all aspects of a high quality plan. While key individuals involved in monitoring the continuous improvement process and their roles are identified, the key goals and objectives of these individuals are not specified. Goals that are identified are based solely on student end of year achievement data and participation rates. There is an inadequate description of what feedback will be garnered nor how it will be used to review and/or revise the implementation plan. There is no description of how the achievement data and participation rates will be analyzed and/or used to further revise the plan. The identified meetings are described as being public and the information gathered by the participants to be shared publicly; however, it is not clear how the information will be gathered.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Beyond presenting information on the progress of the implementation of the plan to the superintendent and board (found in a separate section), there is no information on how the proposal will be communicated to external stakeholders or their engagement in said plan. There is no evidence that the components of high quality plan are in place nor are they described.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no evidence or description for the rationale for the selected measures or how the measure will be reviewed and/or revised to assess effectiveness.</p> <p>Measures provided within the table are scaled as achievable but not ambitious. Measures demonstrate a target of 70% of students will be taught by an effective teacher one year post grant with 50% being taught by a highly effective teacher. One criteria for the Pre-K to Grade 3 bracket is incomplete and data/targets is not provided. Additionally, subgroups are identified only as grade level or subject area (communication arts, math). Targets for high need students and other sub groups are not described.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>An evaluation for the effectiveness of investments was not described.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>All funds are identified and reasonable for the expenditure denoted. Funds are focused on the purchase of laptops and technology, personnel, and the implementation of a college and career ready assessments for middle and high school students. While all funds are identified, rationale behind the selection is lacking. Purchases of the technology are substantiated within the one-time purchase/investments but long term sustainability is not addressed. It is also noted that items were included in the budget but were not described within the goals of the proposal (summer school, after school tutoring, and programming). It is also noted that items described within the proposal are not identified within the budget (online/web based services and applications). The budget also proposes that textbooks will be eliminated and replaced with digital textbooks. There is no description or plan to sustain connectivity for these items outside of the school setting.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant proposes that ongoing costs of the plan will be offset by speculated increases in tax revenue. Additional monies to maintain the sustainability would be offset by adjustments to internal operations though clear, specific adjustments are</p>		

not described. Applicant does not provide a description of past investments or an evaluation mechanism for time frame beyond terms of this proposal. It is unclear how the technology heavy proposal will be sustained.

Overall this scores in the low range as it is not evident that a high quality plan has been formulated nor explained.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Applicant did not provide description for competitive preference.		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Applicant describes a proposal to invest in technology to engage learners and develop personalized learning through a one-to-one technology initiative. While a conceptual idea is presented of the use of technology, a comprehensive high quality plan of action is not described which specifies activities, software, applications, or integration. It is not evident that the purchase of technology will accelerate student learning nor close achievement gaps as proposed targets do not indicate a decrease in these gaps. Overall, the proposal provides a very limited rationale for the purchase of technology but not a clear, sound plan of how the technology will be used.		

Total	210	43
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0116MO-3 for Poplar Bluff School District R-I

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	1
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: PBR1 has not set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. In addressing the four core educational assurance areas, PBR1 does not address each one sufficiently: (1) Applicant does provide sufficient documentation on what standards have been adopted to prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy. Reference is made to the Common Core State Standards and an appendix is attached which provides an overview of the standards but no there was no explanation of the proposal will support the standards.		

(2) Applicant refers to high quality assessment measures but fails to give sufficient evidence of what the measures are and how they will be used to measure student growth and success. There is no supporting evidence that data will be used to inform teachers and principals on how they can improve instruction.

(3) All teachers will receive extensive training and Learning Coaches will offer professional development specific to the needs of teachers but details are not provided as to what the training will include or how it will help to recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals especially where they are needed most. Applicant states that a teacher and principal evaluation system has been adopted but it's unclear if the system has been implemented in the district.

(4) Applicant does not indicate how they will turn around low-achieving schools within their district.

PBR1's proposal does not articulate a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. Goals are not clearly stated and it's unclear how the applicant will address meeting the needs of participating students.

Applicant does not describe what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

A low score is in the low range due to the lack of applicant presenting a clear and comprehensive plan for their reform vision.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	3
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

PBR1's approach to implement its reform proposal is to include all students in grades PreK - 12 in all of the schools within their district. A description of the process that the applicant used to select schools to participate was not documented in the proposal but applicant did indicate the district wanted to all schools and all students to benefit from the transformation in educational practices. Given that the district has 9 schools and 5,202 students in grades PreK - 12, the approach may be too broad to meet the needs of every school and every student.

Applicant has provided a list of the school that will participate in grant activities.

The total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, and participating students who are high-need have been identified in the application. Applicant does not provide the total number of participating educators.

Applicant has provided some of the elements to support their implementation plan but receives a low score due to the lack of sufficient evidence to support the inclusion of all schools and all students in their approach to implement reform at the district level.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

PBR1's plan does not reflect the characteristics of a high-quality plan because it lacks key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, timelines, deliverables, and identification of responsible parties. The reform proposal includes all schools in the district so scale up to a district-wide change is not relevant. Applicant has identified components of laying a foundation for change, redefining the role of the teacher, changing the culture of the school, technology supported environments, college and career standards, ongoing data analysis, and professional development as critical to successful implementation but fails to establish goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties for each component or fully describe how each component will personalize student learning.

Applicant did not provide a logic model or sufficiently describe how their plan will create change to improve student learning outcomes for all students being served, thus resulting in a low score in this area.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's vision is unclear and is not likely to improve student learning and performance and increase equity due to the goals for reform not being clearly defined. Applicant did not provide data State ESEA targets compared to district data. Data was populated in the charts provided in the application for overall and student subgroups for each participating grade level.

Performance on summative assessments (MO MAP, Common Unit Assessments, IREADY data) was provided for baseline data, goals for each year of the grant period, and post-grant. Based on this data, there was significant growth from SY 2011-12 to SY2012-13 for every content area and every grade level but no explanations were given on how growth was accomplished.

Annual increases are identified in each year of the grant which indicates a decrease will occur in achievement gaps between the subgroups but it is unclear what goals have been established to bridge the gaps and what activities are being implemented to specifically address the gaps.

Graduation rates and college enrollment rates were provided for baseline data and increases were identified for each year of the grant and beyond but no explanations were provided on how the graduation rates or college enrollment rates will be increased or what activities will specifically address these areas. An increase was indicated from SY 2011-12 to SY 2012-13 for both areas but no explanation of how the district had successfully increased the graduation and college enrollment rates.

A low score reflects the lack of sufficient documentation on the applicant's plan to increase student learning and performance.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	2
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>PBR1 has provided data supporting their record of success over the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement but fails to include explanations on what activities or programs were implemented to significantly increase proficiency rates in content areas of Communication Arts and Math. It is also unclear what content areas are included in Communication Arts. Specific activities were identified to explain the increase in graduation rates of 74.3% in 2009 to 76% in 2012 but no data was provided to indicate the growth trend each year.</p> <p>Applicant references that significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools has occurred over the past four years. In Mathematics, overall proficiency rates increased from 4% to 24.5% over the past four years. Evidence was not provided to indicate the growth trend each year or what activities or programs were put in place to accomplish such dramatic increases. Communication Arts proficiency rates increased 1.3% to 21.1% in 5 of the 7 schools but no evidence was provided to support how the increases were accomplished.</p> <p>PBR1's proposal identifies current reports and data sources that are available to parents but does not provide information on how students, parents, and educators will have access to student performance data in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services through their program.</p> <p>The score is low in this area because applicant does not provide sufficient evidence of how it has improved student learning and closed achievement gaps.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>PBR1 provided evidence that it demonstrates transparency by making personnel salaries schedules for all school-level instructional and support staff by posting the information on their district website. Annual audits are made available upon request. School District Report Card is published and posted annually on the State department of education website and include student performance data, salaries of teachers and administrators, total expenditures, per pupil expenditures, and assessed valuation of the district. It is unclear how the community, parents, and stakeholders will have access to the data if it's only web based and they have no access to the Internet.</p> <p>Applicant's score is in the middle range due to sufficient criteria not being met in the area of access to data.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant's proposal does not provide evidence of how personalized learning environments will be implemented in their program. The Missouri State Improvement Program - Cycle 5 Performance Standards, academic achievement, subgroup achievement, college and career readiness, attendance rates, and graduation rates, were presented as aligning with the plan set forth in the proposal but applicant fails to provide evidence of how the district has sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement their program.

A low score is given in this area due to the lack of evidence provided on how personalized learning environments will be successfully implemented with sufficient autonomy under State requirements.

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

15

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

PBR1 engaged parents by conducted surveys and receiving feedback on the needs of the families with the results supporting the needs of trainings for teachers, extended learning opportunities, technology, and preparing students for college and career. However, it is unclear how the applicant aligned the feedback with activities in the proposal. Advisory groups made up of parents and community members, and school staff developed plans to address the areas identified. Timelines were not provided to indicate when surveys and meetings took place but applicant indicates based on the feedback the district implemented activities of 1:1 technology were implemented in August 2012 and 2013. It is unclear if these surveys and feedback were utilized in the development of this proposal or to just implement changes in the district.

Applicant states that Missouri does not offer collective bargaining representation but then indicates that there are two teachers organizations that the superintendent meets with on a regular basis and the representatives attend board meetings. Signatures were collected from schools in the district supporting the RTTD initiative with focus on preparing students for college and career, professional development, and personalized learning environments but does not indicate if the teachers had input or were engaged in the development of the proposal. There is no evidence to indicate how students were engaged in the development of the proposal.

Letters of support were included from business, city organizations, higher education institutes, and boys and girls club in support of PBR1's proposal.

A low middle range score is given based on the lack of evidence stated above.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	2

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides a mission statement, "Achieving excellence through learning: Every child, every hour, every day," but fails to provide a high-quality plan that includes key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, and timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing the activities are not clearly defined to improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. There is no evidence to support the applicant's approach to implement instructional strategies for all participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-standards.

PBR1's proposal focuses on students developing personal learning goals, with assistance of teachers, and career exploration and plans being developed in middle and high school but the proposal lacks evidence to support how students will build an understanding of what they are learning is key to accomplishing their goals. Adoption of Common Core Standards and handbooks highlighting skills and concepts needed by grade level for parents and students is an approach being implemented in the district but it is unclear how this approach will improve graduation rates or how progress will be measured to determine if goals are being met.

Applicant indicates that schools must offer students opportunities to practice concepts and skills in all content areas but fails to provide documentation on how their proposal will provide the opportunities. Products are identified as being used in the schools but it is unclear how these products involve students in deep learning experiences.

Applicant does provide sufficient evidence that participating students will have access and be exposed to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives to motivate learning. PBR1's plan to expand professional development does not sufficiently support students mastering critical academic content and developing skills in goal-setting, teamwork, critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity.

There is no evidence to support how the applicant's plan will provide each student with access to a personalized sequence of instructional content, skill development, a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments, or high-quality content through digital devices that will prepare them college and career.

Plans to provide ongoing feedback are focused on grades and career exploration but it is unclear how this feedback ensures students are mastering college- and career- ready standards and are on the path to graduate on time. It is unclear what accommodations and high-quality strategies will be implemented for high-need students.

Applicant states that extensive training will be provided for students and parents but fails to fully explain what the training will cover and how the district will ensure they understand how to use the tools and resources to track and manage learning.

The low score reflects the lack of a high-quality plan to address the criteria in this area.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

PBR1's proposal does not have a high-quality plan that includes key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing the activities for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. No evidence in the proposal exists to describe how the instructional strategies being implemented enable students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned with college-and career-ready standards, increase graduation rates, or accelerates learning based on the students' needs.

Applicant's approach to help educators improve instruction and increase capacity to support student progress includes providing Learning Coaches to support and guide teachers to move toward a personalized learning environment but fails to provide sufficient evidence of adding these Learning Coaches will bring about desired outcomes. It is unclear how the reform efforts identified in the area of professional development is directly related to their RTTD proposal versus what is already being implemented district-wide.

Applicant references multiple tools and instructional formats that could be implemented to meet academic needs of students but fails to provide documentation of what specific activities are included in their plan and these activities will be implemented. Evidence to support utilizing data to inform and accelerate student progress is weak because multiple data sources and systems are referenced but it's unclear which ones are currently being used in the district and which ones are part of their proposed plan.

PBR1 does not have a comprehensive teacher and principal evaluation process but will utilize RTTD funds to purchase and implement a tool to enhance their current system. Sufficient evidence to support their approach to educator effectiveness is not apparent.

Applicant does not provide sufficient evidence that all participating school leaders and school leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure effective learning environments that meet students' academic needs based on:

- Educators will be provided with tools and training but no documentation on the data sources or processes on the that will help them assess and take steps to improve school culture and climate for continuous school improvement.
- Team approach to analyze student data but no explanation of what types of data will be used and how the district will determine steps to improve.
- Professional Learning Communities (PLC) are utilized to monitor student performance and gaps but no evidence was presented on how the PLC is trained, the systems and practices used to identify the achievement gaps and analyze student performance.
- A high-quality plan was not presented for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective or high-effective teachers and principals. Certifying teachers in content areas and having them meet high quality guidelines, which were not clearly defined, does not meet the criteria in this area.

A low score is given in this area due to the applicant not providing sufficient evidence to support their proposal in this area.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	2

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A high-quality plan to support project implementation was not provided based on:

- Evidence of comprehensive policies and infrastructures that provide every student, educator, classroom, and school with the support and resources they need was not provided in the application.
- Leadership was identified for the district but it was unclear how the leadership team will support the RTTD implementation for all participating schools.
- Giving each building level principal and building level professional leadership team autonomy over schedules, assigning duties, and budgets does not seem feasible without a district-wide high-quality plan.
- Individual student learning plans and timely assessments does not meet the criteria of giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic.
- Allowing students to use "their strongest learning style" does not fully describe how they will have opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards in multiple comparable ways and at multiple times.
- Applicant accommodates IEP and ELL students with current policies and procedures but fails to provide evidence on how these students will be accommodated with the learning resources and instructional practices being implemented in the RTTD program.

The score is low in this area due to the lack of evidenced provided to support the criteria.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not have a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructures for every student, educator, classroom, and school based on:

- A plan was described in the application for participants using MacBooks but applicant does not address how all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders will have access to content, tools, and other learning resources to support implementation.
- Developing a Help Desk to address technical support for implementation does not fully address how all participants will have appropriate technical support.
- Applicant does not address how parents and students will be able to export information in an open data format or how data will be used in other electronic learning systems.
- Applicant provides information on their comprehensive Main Student Information System but does not sufficiently address the use of inter operable data systems.

A low score is given based on the applicant not providing evidence of a high-quality plan to support project implementation.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	1

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's presents an approach to a continuous improvement process but fails to provide a detailed explanation of how the plan will be executed. The approach is not a high-quality plan for rigorous continuous improvement because the plan has not been developed fully with the applicant stating that specific timetables, goals, targets, and deliverables with responsible parties will be developed after the proposal has been funded. The plan does not sufficiently address how PBR1 will monitor, measure, and publicly share information of the quality of its investments funded by RTT-D in professional development, technology, or staff.

The lack of evidence in meeting the criteria in this area resulted in the low score.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	0
---	----------	----------

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not provide information on their plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides information in the required tables on increasing the percentage of each of the performance measures over the four years of grant funding and beyond and does include baseline data. The required performance measures along with 12 other performance measures are identified and described in the narrative along with some information on how often or when assessments will be performed but the rationale of why the measure was selected was not provided.</p> <p>It is unclear how these measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information to support applicant's proposal.</p> <p>Baseline data for identifying students with highly effective teachers and principals was established by determining how many students scored advanced on Missouri Annual Performance reports but the rationale for evaluating teachers based on student performance was not fully explained. Given that a new teacher and principal evaluation process will be implemented with RTT-D funds, it's unclear how this measure will be used to gauge implementation progress.</p> <p>A low score is given in this area due to the lack of evidence supporting the applicant's proposed plan.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a plan to evaluate the activities in the proposed plan. Activities are discussed but the proposal lacks evidence of established measures and a means to identify areas needing adjustments and how the plan will show continuous improvement. Applicant's score is low in this area because there is no supporting evidence of how the plan will be evaluated for effectiveness.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget proposed by PBR1 identifies funds that will support from RTT-D grant but there are no funds identified from other sources used to support the project. Sufficient documentation of the budget is not provided to support the development and implementation of the proposal. Applicant's budget includes line item details for summer school staff, district data coach, Apple "Train the Trainer," and other items that are not fully discussed as activities in the narrative. Applicant does not identify funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs and it is unclear how the budgeted items will ensure the long-term sustainability of personalized learning environments. Score is in the low range due to the omission of the sufficient documentation to support the proposed budget.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant does not have a high-quality plan for sustainability based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options to sustain the project beyond the grant term include expectations of increased property tax revenue in the district and by eliminating computer labs and textbooks with mobile devices but fails to provide evidence of how these changes will be significant enough to support the program. Utilization of a public relations director to create community partnerships with local businesses is feasible but there's not sufficient evidence to support a high-quality plan. No descriptions were provided on how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use the data to inform future investments. Plan does not include timelines, activities, deliverables, or responsible parties to sustain the program. <p>Sustainability for this proposal is based on acquiring funds from expected revenue increases and contributions from businesses within the community. It is unclear why the district is seeking RTT-D funds as opposed to utilizing the funds they have identified to support the program after the grant period ends. The score is low based on the lack of</p>		

documentation provided to support the financial sustainability of the proposal.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not address the Competitive Preference Priority and therefore no score was given for this area.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not meet Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments due to the lack of evidence to support how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. As stated in other sections, PBR1 failed to comprehensively address how it will accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student and fails to provide sufficient evidence that their plan will positively effect student learning and insure goals under this proposal are met. The applicant does not meet the Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	35
--------------	------------	-----------